

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Focus for Discussion:

**Matter 3 Does the Core Strategy provide a suitable and evidenced strategic direction for matters relating to climate change, waste management and water resources?**

- i. To what extent is the Core Strategy and SP4 in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement?
- ii. Is SP4 sufficiently flexible and in accord with PPS22 (see para 8?) and its guide? Is SP 4 in accord with PPS1 and the Climate Change Supplement? Are the targets within SP4 realistic? Are they adequate? How do the targets within SP4 relate to other intended LDF documents?
- iii. Does the CS 4.1.19 preclude the location of energy hubs in areas not cited? Sufficiently flexible?
- iv. Is the historic significance of heritage assets recognised adequately by the CS?
- v. Does the CS make appropriate reference to the energy hierarchy (and the London Plan)?
- vi. Are matters relating to climate change acknowledged adequately within the CS?
- vii. Is a 20% renewable energy target justified and consistent with LP?
- viii. Is there a need to alter 4.1.17 to ensure effectiveness in terms of viability/practicality?
- ix. Does SP 4 replicate unnecessarily Building Regulations and its intended changes?

SP5

- x. Are issues relating to flooding and PPS25, including the Sequential Test, addressed adequately within the CS?
- xi. Should targets be included for the minimisation of water use?
- xii. Should reference be made to water recycling, SUDs and attenuation?
- xiii. Is the Thames Tunnel referenced adequately (in supportive terms) within the CS? Should it be included as a target and Strategic Objective of the CS?

SP6

- xiv. To what extent is the Core Strategy and SP6 in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement?
- xv. Does the CS achieve conformity with the London Plan and its draft replacement with regard to waste?
- xvi. To what extent will the CS safeguard/provide adequate sites to manage Haringey's waste?
- xvii. How is hazardous waste to be managed?
- xviii. Is the evidence base sufficiently robust – waste evidence/data up to date?
- xix. Are monitoring targets adequate?

3. Focus for Discussion

**Matter 4 Is the advocated approach to sustainable transport the most appropriate strategy within the context of the Borough? Does the evidence support sufficiently the premise that the approach will be effective?**

- i. To what extent is the Core Strategy and SP7 in general conformity with both the London Plan and its draft replacement? Is the CS approach to transport (and parking) consistent with these documents and PPG13?
- ii. Is there sufficient flexibility in the CS approach to car parking standards?
- iii. How will these reflect the advice of PPG13 and PPS4?
- iv. Should the Council prioritise walking and cycling as modes of transport? Should the CS indicate a road user hierarchy?
- v. Does the CS address adequately the role of cycling within the Borough?
- vi. Monitoring indicators adequate?
- vii. Will the CS change proposed with regard to rep 424 be effective?
- viii. Should the CS adopt a default approach to speed limits on residential streets?
- ix. Are matters of air quality within the Borough evidenced robustly and addressed adequately?
- x. How does the CS relate to TfL business plan?
- xi. Is there a need to cross reference CIL more clearly with regard to the provision of transport infrastructure?
- xii. Is there adequate reference to the Tottenham Hale Interchange Project? (see Savills June 2011).

4. Other Matters

5. Close