

St Ann's and Harringay Area Forum – 21 January 2014

Issues raised in discussion of Site Allocations and Tottenham Area Action Plan document, following introduction by the Cabinet Member and a presentation by planning officers.

- **Concern was raised regarding the impact any development at the Area Retail Park Site (S4) would have on traffic in the area.**
Cllr Ejiofor indicated that it would be hard to redevelop this site without fully revisiting the traffic issues, and that any final proposals would have to reflect what local residents felt was appropriate. As the document would then go for inspection by the Planning Inspector, any proposals would only be passed if they were fully evidenced. If people felt that there were issues that were not included in the document that needed to be addressed, they were urged to respond to the consultation.
- **Questions were asked regarding the current status of the Site Allocations document, whether the final shape of this document could still be influenced and, if that was the case, how local residents could make their representations in the most effective way in order to influence the final outcome.**
Officers confirmed that the document was not decided, and was currently in a very early form. It had to be viewed within the context of wider growth aspirations for the whole of London, but this document sought the views of local residents on what their community priorities were. Following this consultation, the feedback received would be incorporated and a further proposal for the document would be produced, and this would go out for further consultation in the Autumn.
- **Residents asked how much scope for discretion there was for determining what they wanted and did not want locally, within the London-wide paradigm.**
The importance of this consultation exercise was emphasised, as once the document was agreed and finalised, it would underpin decisions to grant planning applications locally. If there was no significant response to the consultation regarding site allocations, the borough would have little discretion when it came to determining development proposals and there was a risk that these could be imposed by the Secretary of State. It was noted that allocating no sites was not an option, but that this process gave the local community the chance to make choices about where and what type of development might be appropriate locally.
- **Residents asked whether officers were aware that parts of Haringey were identified on the Government's map for unconventional gas drilling / fracking, and how this would fit with the plans as set out in the document**
As an emerging strategy, any proposals around gas drilling would form part of the evidence-gathering process, and would be incorporated into the Local

Plan. It may be that the outcome of such work would change the potential appropriate uses of some sites, or preclude their use altogether.

- Residents asked for a clearer idea of the questions that were being consulted on, and whether the finalised list of site allocations would effectively lead to outline planning permissions (with an indication of acceptable height, density on a particular site), or whether it was more general guidance. It was suggested that a list of more specific questions could be provided in order to help frame responses to the consultation, and it was also suggested that a Q&A session be held with officers so that residents could have some guidance on what would be relevant to include in their consultation responses.

Cllr Ejiolor advised that the general question for people to think about was what do you want the area to look like in 20 years' time? What do you want to see there? Residents and stakeholders were encouraged to say whatever they felt was appropriate, and at this stage in the process, should give their thoughts on what they read in the document. Officers agreed that they could produce a summary of what was being asked in the consultation, and that this could be circulated after the meeting. Officers gave assurance that all forms of response would be taken into consideration.

- It was felt that, as a local high street, West Green Road was in need of improvement and that there were problems with the existing housing stock there. This needed addressing with the same seriousness as Green Lanes and elsewhere in the borough, especially if there were proposals to increase housing levels in nearby areas.

Officers encouraged people to let them know about other possible sites in their consultation responses, however it was suggested that housing around West Green Road was more of an estates renewal issue.

- There was feedback that the document was quite technical, and therefore hard to understand. Residents wanted more green space, less traffic and fewer HMOs. Someone asked what weight the views of local residents would have against those of developers, and what would happen if it reached a stage where the local community were firmly set against what was proposed.

It was reported that the Council had to balance what people wanted against what it was possible to deliver. Planning always had to be in the public interest, but it was noted that the definition of public interest was not fixed, and that there was a London-wide regional interest in housing growth. It was emphasised that at this stage, communities had choices regarding what they felt would be appropriate at different sites.

- Residents asked how many new houses were proposed for the West of the borough, as there had been mentioned of an additional 10k new houses in Tottenham. Concerns were expressed that focussing on development in Tottenham would lead to a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough in terms of an increase in traffic levels, a reduction in green spaces, more high-rise blocks and a reduction in

health facilities, which was not fair. It was felt that additional housing would not meet the needs of the local community, unless it was social housing, as 'affordable housing' was still unaffordable for many residents.

- With regard to potential sites such as the Wickes site, people asked what the point of suggesting this as a possible site for housing, when the land was owned by so many different interests.
- It was noted that many of the questions that had been asked related to the consultation process rather than the content of the report, and it was suggested that this reflected a lack of faith in consultation processes locally. The new AD – Planning and Building Control was asked whether he was aware of the defects in local consultation process, how these could be remedied, and whether there was any independent oversight of the way in which consultations were planned and implemented. Stephen Kelly, new AD, Planning and Building Control advised that he was not aware of the problems that were referred to as he was very new to the post, but advised that his role was to ensure that the process was well managed. If it was felt that there was a need for greater dialogue, then the Council had to look at how this could be addressed. Mr Kelly confirmed that there was independent examination of the consultation process, and whether, on the basis of the feedback arising from this process, the final proposals were sound. Local residents were asked to provide examples of the problems they had identified in recent consultations, so that these could be considered.
- It was felt that education facilities, more school places and health facilities were essential for this part of the borough. It was important for any plans for the east of the borough to make healthcare provision integral to the proposals.
- A question was asked regarding what was being done about empty homes, and also how the proposals addressed social cohesion issues in the borough. It was reported that the Council worked with landlords around releasing empty properties for use, and employed a range of existing policies in order to address this issue. With regards to the west of the borough, people were invited to send in any suggestions they had for potential development sites in this area.
- A request was made for figures relating to targets for new homes, divided between the east and west of the borough.
- It was felt that infrastructure was sometimes seen as an afterthought once large developments had been granted permission, and people requested that infrastructure needed to be considered alongside and development proposals in order to ensure sustainability.

Officers agreed that this was important, and confirmed that as part of this process it was necessary to demonstrate that infrastructure had been taken into account in order to deliver the development identified. It was confirmed that stakeholders relating to infrastructure requirements, for example education and healthcare partners, were being consulted as part of this exercise.

- It was requested that crime routes be taken into account within the process, as development of some of the sites identified would involve opening up routes that had previously been closed in order to prevent crime, in partnership with the police. The opening up of these routes without due consideration of such issues would be detrimental to the public amenity, such as at Doncaster Gardens.

Officers thanked everyone present for their participation – it was suggested that it would be useful to hold a further meeting to consider the proposals in further detail and officers agreed to look into arranging this.