

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Factual Updates – Planning for Growth, Minor Changes
3. Focus for Discussion:

***Matter 1 - With due regard to its means of production, does the CS provide an adequate strategic vision for the Borough leading to an effective spatial plan containing clear objectives for the plan period in accord with the aims of PPS12?***

- i. To what extent is the Core Strategy in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement? To what extent does the CS accord with the advice of PPS1, PPS12 and associated guidance?
- ii. How has the CS approach to sustainable growth evolved in relation to alternatives? Is the evidence base in support of the chosen strategic approach robust and credible against alternatives? To what extent has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the CS? Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and that those reasons are still valid)?
- iii. Does the CS reflect local distinctiveness adequately?
- iv. What evidence underpins SP 1 and is this base robust and credible? Does the CS provide sufficient detail on how much development is intended to happen where and when? By what means it will be delivered? Is the delivery strategy for achieving the objectives adequate? Should the strategy and various visions include greater clarity upon the quantum of development in individual areas? Should there be targets (indicative?) for creations of jobs/employment/business space?
- v. Has the production of the Core Strategy followed the SCI? Has this led to timely, effective and conclusive discussion with key stakeholders on what option(s) for a core strategy are deliverable?
- vi. To what extent has the production of the CS followed the LDS? How does the CS relate to other intended LDF documents, for example the intended Development Management DPD, in content and timescales? Will the CS be capable of effective operation/implementation in the interim?
- vii. Is the CS aligned and coordinated adequately with the Sustainable Community Strategy? Are there areas of discord/omission?
- viii. Does the CS contain sufficient justification of its policies?  
Is more explanation needed of how the policies relate to the key issues and spatial objectives?  
Is it sufficiently clear how the policies meet the needs of the Borough identified in the course of the CS preparation?
- ix. Does the CS acknowledge adequately border issues?
- x. Proposals Map – are the changes proposed sufficiently clear and comprehensive? Are the saved policies of the UDP clear and referenced?
- xi. Are/should Areas of Change (and Areas of Limited Change) to be defined – are such definitions necessary for the suitable application of policy?
- xii. What evidence supports the need for a business relocation strategy within the Haringey Heartlands and an energy centre for the Eastern Utility Lands?
- xiii. Are the designations within the CS relating to Wood Green clear and coherent, are they justified by the evidence base? Ie Wood Green Growth

Haringey Borough Council Core Strategy Examination  
Hearing Session 1 28<sup>th</sup> June 2011

Area, Wood Green Town Centre, Wood Green Area of Change, Wood Green Area of Intensification and Wood Green Area Action Plan? Why expand the Area of Change (which includes residential) beyond the Town Centre and Heartlands Area? Could site redevelopment be more effectively resolved by use of planning briefs?

- xiv. What evidence supports bullet 3 on page 74?
- xv. Does the council's aspiration for Haringey Heartlands/Tottenham Hale address adequately the need to provide necessary open space, play areas and community facilities?
- xvi. Is the provision of adequate social infrastructure addressed by para 3.18?
- xvii. Should the provision of new green space be explicitly acknowledged within the CS eg 2nd bullet of table on page 74

4. Focus for Discussion

**Matter 2 Is the Core Strategy's approach to housing provision deliverable, sufficiently justified and consistent with the London Plan and national planning policy in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS 3)? Is the Core Strategy effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the Borough?**

- i. Is the CS in conformity with the London Plan and its draft replacement? Housing targets consistent? Evidence of deliverability on 820 units/yr as opposed to 680? Is there flexibility within the Core Strategy to accommodate any change to the regional housing targets which may emerge in the short (or medium) term?
- ii. Is the evidence base to the housing policies robust and credible? How does this relate to the PPS3 and its associated guidance? To what extent is the content of PPS1 and 3 particularly satisfied by the Core Strategy?
- iii. To what extent, and in what ways, was the chosen spatial distribution of housing considered against alternatives? Is the spatial distribution of intended housing over the plan period clear? Is there consistency within the housing figures contained within SP 1 and elsewhere in the plan?
- iv. Does the Council have a demonstrable housing land supply consistent with PPS3? What reliance is made upon windfalls? Where is the evidence?
- v. What are the density characteristics of Haringey for the application of SP2 bullet 1? Are these intended to be shown on the proposals map? How will planning proposals be resolved in such regards?
- vi. Is the CS's consistency with the Council's Housing SPD (section 9) clear?
- vii. What are the needs referred to within para 3.2.16? (need to cross reference SHMA?)
- viii. How much affordable housing (and of what size/tenure mix) is required and how will it be delivered? Targets needed for affordable housing – adequate in addendum?
- ix. Is the policy requiring 50% affordable on every site of 10 or more justified and sufficiently flexible? Is revised affordable housing threshold justified by evidence base?
- x. How will off site provision of affordable housing be managed? – justified? Consistency between 3.2.21 and 3.2.25?
- xi. Is 'affordable' adequately defined and consistent with PPS3? (*Note: PPS3 revised June 2011*). Targets adequate? Tenure splits justified by evidence base? Adequate detail with regard to the need and intended supply of dwelling house sizes – is this consistent with the evidence base (eg Housing SPD and SHMA)?
- xii. How will the details of family housing be delivered? Does SP2 address adequately issues of family housing need throughout the Borough?
- xiii. How is the need for students, sheltered and migrant households addressed by the CS?
- xiv. Is the evidence for gypsy/traveller pitches robust?  
Is the Council's approach consistent with Annex C of Circular 1/06 and that of the London Plan?

5. Other Matters

6. Close