

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/3534
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Building to the rear of 26 High Road, Wood Green, London, N22 6BX
Proposal	Change of use from bathroom showroom (use class: E) to banqueting suite at ground floor (use class: sui-generis) and restaurant/bar/shisha bar at first floor (use class: E and sui-generis). Installation of new doors and windows on south-east elevation.
Case Officer	James Mead
Valid Date	31/01/2023
Applicant	Regal Housewares Ltd
Agent	Mr Harrison

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This application concerns a building to the rear of 16 – 26 High Road. It is proposed to change the use of this building from a bathroom showroom (use class: E) to a banqueting suite at ground floor (use class: sui-generis) and a restaurant, bar, and shisha bar at first floor (use class: E & sui-generis). Minor external alterations are also proposed to the building.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is occupied by a part two, part three and part four storey building, which was most recently in use as a bathroom showroom (use class: E). This building sits to the rear of 16 – 26 High Road, with the south-eastern elevation fronting onto Whymark Avenue and the north-eastern elevation facing Bury Road. The site is situated within the Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre and the setting to the west, on the High Road, is typical of such a location being made up of a mixture of retail, commercial and residential uses. Neighbouring directly to the west of the site there are premises in use as shops, with a bar/restaurant also present at upper floors. Opposite the site on Whymark Avenue are buildings that are in mixed commercial and residential use. The land to the north-east of the site is outside the town centre boundary and instead is residential in character, being comprised of mainly terraced properties.

2.3 The building is located within the Wood Green Opportunity Area and within the Wood Green Growth Area, as identified in the London Plan and the Local Plan. Such designations mean that the wider area has been identified as one that has the capacity for growth, with opportunities to

accommodate new employment, housing and infrastructure. The site is within Site Allocation SA14, as allocated in the Site Allocations DPD. The draft Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP) also allocates the site at Site Allocation WG SA13. These site allocations encompass the site, together with a number of other buildings on the High Road, that are to the north-west and south-west (16 – 54 High Road). Both the site allocations designate this land for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the current High Road frontages, with new town centre premises sought at ground/first floor and residential above. The potential to deliver a new Crossrail 2 station entrance is referred to in Site Allocation SA14. The land is within a Crossrail 2 Safeguarded Zone and is also identified as an Area of Surface Interest.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.4 The most recent planning history relating to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2018/3145: Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment to provide part 3-8 storey buildings providing mixed use development, comprising residential accommodation, flexible retail units, flexible workspaces, a hotel, and a public courtyard, with associated site access, car and cycle parking, and landscaping works. Approved with conditions and legal agreement.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

1) *LBH Transportation*: A Transport Assessment Report is required that considers the number of people that could be attracted to the proposed banqueting and restaurant facilities, their modes of travel, demand and provision for servicing/delivery, cycle parking, blue badge car parking provision, parking stress impacts etc. A detailed site management and crowd management plan is required – this should consider the range/size of events that could be hosted/accommodated. The provision for refuse storage is proposed to be accommodated in the adjacent car park. Details of both the refuse storage and car park are required.

2) *LBH Waste Management*: There is limited impact on the waste/recycling arrangements. The proposed storage area is the current site and the commercial waste and recycling collections are tailored to meet the business needs and not necessarily undertaken by the local authority. It is not clear if the local authority collection services or a private contractor will be used to transport the waste, so it would be useful to see the details concerning this point as the proposal develops.

3) *Metropolitan Police Designing-Out Crime Officer*: Cannot support the application as it's been presented and there is concern at the lack of information regarding safety and security. Areas of concern involve the security implemented at the site. Crime prevention has not been addressed nor has the Designing-Out Crime Unit been consulted at any time. The area has been susceptible to crime.

4) *Transport for London (TfL)*: A full trip generation assessment is required to fully assess this proposal. Trip generation for all parts of the development will be needed, based on the most relevant and latest multi model data. Details of the proposed construction access arrangements should be provided to TfL to confirm impacts on the strategic road network and the surrounding transport network.

5) *Transport for London (Crossrail Safeguarding)*: No comment in respect of the proposals.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 138 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 2

Objecting: 2

Supporting: 0

4.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- The amount of parking spaces would be decreased.
- There would be increased noise pollution.
- Environmental Health should comment on this application.

4.3 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- The proposal would be in direct competition with another restaurant/bar – this comment is noted, however this is a private interest, which is not a material consideration.
- The website does not allow comments to be made – this comment is noted and the consultation period was extended accordingly.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development;
2. Design & Appearance;
3. Neighbour Amenity;
4. Crime Prevention;
5. Transport; and
6. Waste & Recycling; and
7. Other Considerations.

Principle of Development

Town Centre

5.2 London Plan Policy SD6 notes that the vitality and viability of London's town centres should be promoted and enhanced by encouraging strong, resilient, accessible and inclusive hubs with a diverse range of uses, including main town centre uses, night-time economy, civic, community, social and residential uses. When considering proposals, Boroughs should take a town centre first approach and apply the sequential test to applications for main town centre uses, in accordance with London Plan Policy SD7. London Plan Policy HC6 outlines that decisions should support the night-time economy, where appropriate, particularly in town centres where public transport such as the night tube and night buses are available.

5.3 Local Plan Policy SP10 notes that the Council will promote and encourage development of retail, office, community, leisure, entertainment, recreation, arts and cultural activities within town centres, according to the Borough's town centre hierarchy. This policy also outlines that proposals which foster a diverse evening and night-time economy in Wood Green will be supported, providing measures are in place to address issues such as community safety, policing, litter and noise/disturbance. DM DPD Policy DM41 sets out that proposals for new retail, leisure and cultural uses in town centres will be supported where they: (a) are consistent with the size, role and function of the centre; (b) sustain/enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre network; and (c) contribute to the delivery of Haringey's spatial strategy. DM DPD Policy DM45 explains that the conversion of ground floor town centre premises to non-town centre uses will not be permitted.

5.4 This proposed scheme seeks to provide a banqueting suite at ground floor level (use class: sui-generis), whereas the first floor would be used as a bar, restaurant and shisha bar (use class: E & sui-generis). The proposed first floor use would clearly equate to a 'main town centre use', as identified in the glossary of the NPPF. However, the definition of 'main town centre use' does not specifically refer to banqueting suites. The applicant has explained that the banqueting suite would be utilised to host private events. Such a use would be characteristic of a 'main town centre use', as it would generate footfall and would be a leisure/entertainment venue, comparable in nature to a restaurant/bar/conference facility. Therefore, it is considered, on balance, that the banqueting suite can be viewed as a 'main town centre use' for the purposes of this application. The town centre first approach and the sequential test referred to in Section 7 of the NPPF, London Plan Policy SD7 and DM DPD Policy DM41 require 'main town centre uses' to be located in town centres. In this case, the proposed 'main town centre uses' would be situated within the Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre. As such, from this overarching spatial perspective, there is no in principle objection to the proposed uses.

5.5 The application form indicates that the uses would operate between 12:30 and 00:30 Monday – Saturday, and therefore would be part of the night-time economy. London Plan Policy HC6 notes that the night-time economy should be supported in town centres with access to the night tube and night buses. The site has a PTAL rating of 6b, and therefore has excellent access to public transport. Turnpike Lane Underground Station and Bus Station are located a short distance to the south of the site. Night tubes and buses operate from these stations, and therefore visitors to the proposed night-time venue would have access to this form of public transport. Therefore, from this viewpoint, there is no in principle objection to the night-time uses.

5.6 A diverse night-time economy is to be supported in the Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre, subject to other policy considerations, in line with Local Plan Policy SP10. Furthermore, various policies require consideration of how proposed uses fit with the size, scale and role of the town centre within which they sit. It is accepted that there are several other bars and restaurants in the town centre, some of which offer shisha. In particular, such a venue neighbours the site to the south-west. Whilst this is noted, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in such a significant presence of these uses in the town centre to harmfully impact the diversity of Wood Green's night-time economy.

5.7 In regard to the size of the proposal, it is acknowledged that the venue would have a significant floor area, which would appear to be larger than other similar uses in the locality. Whilst this is noted, the London Plan designates Wood Green as a Metropolitan Town Centre and it is the largest centre in the Borough. The London Plan also identifies Wood Green as a NT2 town centre meaning it is of regional or sub-regional significance, in terms of its night-time economy. Given these classifications and the overall size of the centre, it is not considered that this venue would be of out scale with this metropolitan town centre.

5.8 Various policies require proposals in town centres to sustain the vitality and viability of such centres. The proposals would result in a viable use being retained for this building, and as such, from this perspective, the scheme would not harm the viability of the town centre. It is noted that the building does not sit on a primary or secondary shopping frontage, as it sits to the rear of the High Road and instead fronts onto Whymark Avenue. However, the premises is still within the town centre boundary and is close to the High Road. Therefore, it is considered the proposed use would not draw footfall away from the High Road or main shopping frontages. Instead, it is likely that the proposed use would create further footfall on the High Road and within the wider town centre, consequently supporting the vitality of the area.

5.9 Overall, in regard to the town centre, the proposed scheme would deliver 'main town centre uses' in this metropolitan town centre. Therefore, the proposals would align with the town centre first approach and would pass the sequential test. The proposed use would contribute to the night-

time economy and there is no objection to this, given the accessibility of the town centre to public transport and the designation of this centre as a NT2 night-time location. It is also not considered that the proposal would result in an over accumulation of such night-time uses. The venue would be of substantial size, however it would not be out of scale with this metropolitan town centre or the NT2 night-time classification. The retention of a use for this building and the creation of footfall in the town centre means that, in these terms, the viability and vitality of the centre would be protected. From this perspective, the principle of this scheme would not be contrary to the policies relevant to development in town centres.

Site Allocation

5.10 Where development forms part of an allocated site, the Council will require a masterplan be prepared to accompany the development proposal for the wider site and beyond, in line with DM DPD Policy DM55. This should demonstrate that the proposal will not prejudice the future development of other parts of the site or frustrate the delivery of the site allocation. This policy also expects the applicant to have engaged with and sought the views of the landowner and occupiers of other parts of the allocated site. Where a masterplan is to be prepared, but has not come forward, as part of a planning application, proposals must demonstrate that they will not compromise delivery outcomes sought by the site allocation.

5.11 The site forms part of Site Allocation SA14 in the Site Allocations DPD and is also allocated in the draft Wood Green AAP at Site Allocation WG SA14. These allocations designate land between 16 – 54 High Road for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment, delivering town centre uses at ground floor and residential above. These site allocations cover land from the junction of High Road with Whymark Avenue, including the site, and then encompass numerous buildings to the north-west. Planning permission for a mixed-use development was previously granted on part of the site allocation, including the land subject of this application, under reference: HGY/2018/3145. It is not entirely clear how this current proposal fits with this extant planning permission.

5.12 This proposed scheme has not addressed the requirements of DM DPD Policy DM55. No masterplan has been provided to prove that the proposal will not prejudice the future development of other parts of the site allocation, or frustrate the delivery of the full site allocation. This proposal has also not addressed part (c) of DM DPD Policy DM55, as no information has been supplied to demonstrate that the delivery outcomes of the site allocation can still be achieved. Furthermore, no commentary has been provided to explain how the applicant has engaged with, and sought the views of, the landowner and occupiers of other parts of the allocated site. As such, there is currently insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would enable the delivery outcomes of Site Allocations SA14 & WG SA13 to be achieved and realised. Instead, officers have concerns that the proposal would compromise the delivery of the full site allocation. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to DM DPD Policy DM55.

Design & Appearance

5.13 London Plan Policy D3 outlines that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. Optimising site capacity means ensuring development is of the most appropriate form and land use of the site. Proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 and DM DPD Policy DM1 require development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance, so to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity.

5.14 Elevational alterations are proposed across the south-eastern and north-eastern elevations, with new doors and windows intended to be installed. These works would be minor in nature and would not have a notable visual impact on the appearance of the building. Therefore, it is not considered that the external works would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene or the wider town centre.

Neighbour Amenity

5.15 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that the design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific it is stated that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight that is appropriate for the context, while also minimising overshadowing. Furthermore, DM DPD Policy DM1 states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects to adjacent buildings and land. Schemes should also avoid overlooking and loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

5.16 London Plan Policy D14 outlines that noise should be managed by avoiding significant adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life. New noise and other nuisance generating development proposed close to residential should put in place measures to mitigate and manage any noise impacts, in line with London Plan Policy D13. DM DPD Policy DM1 notes that proposals should address issues of noise, fumes and odours likely to arise from the use and activities of the development.

5.17 The scheme does not involve the extension or enlargement of the existing building. Therefore, issues such as: overbearing impacts, loss of light, overshadowing or harm to outlook would not arise for nearby properties. The first floor windows on the south-eastern elevation of the existing building currently appear to be frosted. If deemed necessary, a condition attached to any approval could require the fitting of obscure glazing in the replacement first floor windows, so to restrict views towards York House and Whymark House. No other concerns regarding overlooking would result.

5.18 The proposed bar, restaurant and shisha bar at first floor level has the potential to be a noise-generating use. It is noted that there are no residential properties directly adjoining the site, however there are flats opposite the site and other dwellings present to the north-east. Noting the proximity of residential properties, a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been provided.

5.19 The NIA identifies properties opposite the site at York House, as the closest residential receivers. However, there are also properties on Whymark Avenue to the north-east that would be close to the development. Notwithstanding this, the NIA concludes that adverse noise impacts on nearby residential properties can be avoided, subject to several mitigation measures identified in Section 6.4 of the NIA. Whilst this is noted, one of the mitigation measures outlined is that 'all openable windows should remain closed at all times'. The scheme involves the provision of spaces for shisha and smoke free legislation notes that areas used for shisha should not be 'substantially enclosed'. Therefore, to operate a shisha bar sufficient windows would be required to be open at all times. Consequently, there is conflict between the recommendations of the NIA and the shisha bar element of the proposal. With the windows open, as required for the shisha bar, the noise generated by the proposed bar, restaurant and shisha bar could impact the amenity and living conditions of nearby residential properties.

5.20 The NIA mainly focuses on noise generated from inside the proposed bar, restaurant and shisha bar. However, very little information has been provided to explain how noise and disturbance caused by comings/goings or potential gatherings outside of the venue would be managed. The NIA does suggest that patrols would be undertaken to prevent unnecessary noise.

Whilst this is noted, there is not sufficient detail regarding this to enable officers to conclude that any noise or disturbance generated externally would be appropriately managed, particularly as the venue is intended to operate until 00:30. Consequently, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that noise and disturbance created externally would not harm the living conditions of nearby residential properties.

5.21 In addition to the above, the submission has not clearly explained what type of events are envisaged to be held in the proposed banqueting suite at ground floor level. It is not clear whether the banqueting suite could host events that involve amplified music. The NIA has also not considered any noise generated by this use. Without further information on the events intended to be held in the banqueting suite, it not possible to determine whether noise generated from this use would harm the amenity and living conditions of nearby residential properties. Therefore, insufficient information is available for full consideration of the noise impact of the banqueting suite.

5.22 Overall, in terms of amenity, the requirement to have windows open for the shisha bar element of the proposal could result in noise disturbance affecting nearby residential properties. Insufficient information has been provided to explain how noise and disturbance generated by comings/goings and gatherings outside the venue would be managed. The application has also not provided sufficient information for officers to fully understand potential noise or disturbance that could be generated by the banqueting suite. In light of the above, it is considered that the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring residential properties would be adversely impacted by noise and disturbance, contrary to London Plan Policies D13 & D14 and DM DPD Policy DM1.

Crime Prevention

5.23 London Plan Policy D3 requires proposals to achieve safe, secure and inclusive environments. Safety and security should be improved through developments in town centres, in line with London Plan Policy SD6. Proposals should improve access, inclusion and safety and make the public realm welcoming for all night-time economy users and workers, in accordance with London Plan Policy HC6. Local Plan Policy SP11 requires development to incorporate solutions to reduce crime and the fear of crime by applying the principles set out in 'Secured by Design' and Safer Places. Similarly, DM DPD Policy DM2 notes that regard should be had to the principles set out in 'Secured by Design'.

5.24 The Metropolitan Designing-Out Crime Officer (DOCO) has commented on the application and they note that this area has been susceptible to anti-social behaviour and other crime. The proposed submission has not addressed crime prevention and has not explained how crime mitigation measures would be incorporated into the development. Furthermore, the proposal has not demonstrated that the 'Secured by Design' principles have been considered and applied to the development. The lack of information regarding crime prevention means that officers are unable to conclude that the proposal would contribute to a safe environment. This conclusion is backed up by the comments of the DOCO. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D3, SD6 & HC6, Local Plan Policy SP11 and DM DPD Policy DM2.

Transport

5.25 London Plan Policy T1 notes that developments should make the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes. The cumulative impacts of development on public transport and the road network capacity, including walking and cycling, should be taken into account and mitigated, in line with London Plan Policy T4. Local Plan Policy SP7 outlines that the Council will tackle climate change, improve local place shaping, enhance public realm, improve environmental quality and enhance transport quality by: minimising congestion, promoting public transport, promoting walking/cycling,

promoting road safety and seeking to locate major trip generating development in locations with good access to public transport.

5.26 Developments should facilitate safe, clean and efficient deliveries and servicing in town centres, in accordance with London Plan Policies SD7 & T7. Cycle parking should be provided at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 of the London Plan. Car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity, in accordance with London Plan Policy T5. The maximum parking standards of the London Plan should be applied to development proposals. DM DPD Policy DM32 notes that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where: (a) there are alternative and accessible means of transport available; (b) PTAL is at least 4 and (c) a controlled parking zone (CPZ) exists.

5.27 Both the Transportation Officer and TfL have requested that a Transport Assessment be supplied for this proposal. However, no Transport Assessment has been submitted. It is accepted that the site has a PTAL rating of 6b, indicating excellent access to public transport. Therefore, a large proportion of the trips to the site would be likely to be made by public transport. However, a trip generation assessment is still required so that a full understanding of the anticipated travel patterns to the site can be gained. Without this information, it is not possible for officers to fully consider the transport impacts of the proposal.

5.28 The plans suggest that the development would be car-free, with no on-site parking provided. A car-free development is considered acceptable in principle in this location, given the high PTAL and the existence of a CPZ in the locality, in line with DM DPD Policy DM32. Whilst this is noted, the lack of a Transport Assessment means that there is currently no estimation of how many customers would travel to the site via car, and therefore require parking. Furthermore, it has not been indicated whether any scope for staff members to travel to work via car has been considered. This lack of information means that officers are not able to fully assess whether sufficient off-site parking exists (presumably in public car parks) to serve future customers and staff.

5.29 The Transportation Officer also notes that no information has been provided regarding access to blue badge parking. The London Plan requires one accessible blue badge parking space for non-residential elements. Therefore, further information is required relating to access to blue badge parking. No details of cycle parking have been supplied. Cycle parking that meets the requirements of the London Plan is required, particularly longer-stay cycle parking for members of staff. There is also no information regarding delivery and servicing. Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether appropriate delivery and servicing arrangements would be incorporated into the development. Inappropriate delivery and servicing arrangements could cause obstruction of pedestrian routes or hinder flow of traffic.

5.30 Overall, in regard to the transport considerations, the lack of a Transport Assessment means that there is currently insufficient information for officers to fully assess transport impacts. Without the required information, officers are not able to consider the trip generation, travel modes, parking requirements, blue badge parking access, cycle parking provision or delivery/servicing arrangements. This lack of information means that the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies T1, T4, T5, T6 & T7, Local Plan Policy SP7 and DM DPD Policies DM31 & DM32.

5.31 The site is located within a Crossrail 2 Safeguarding Zone, and therefore TfL's Crossrail team were consulted. This consultee has responded outlining that they have no comments on the proposals. As such, there is no reason for officers to make further comments on this.

Waste & Recycling

5.32 DM DPD Policy DM4 requires proposals to sustainably manage waste that arises from development during the design, construction and occupation phases. All proposals should make on-site provision for general waste, the separation of recyclable materials and organic material. Adequate internal and external storage space should be provided to manage the volume of waste arising from the site. Accessible and safe access to on-site storage facilities both for occupiers and collection operatives should be delivered.

5.33 The submitted Design & Access Statement explains that the premises would have a dedicated refuse area in the adjacent car park. There is no in principle objection to this. However, if this application were to be approved further details would have been sought regarding the levels of storage and how this storage would be accessed.

Conclusion

5.34 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as no information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would enable the delivery outcomes of the site allocation to be achieved. Instead, officers have concerns that the proposals could frustrate delivery of the site allocation. There is also concern that noise and disturbance from the new uses could adversely impact the amenity and living conditions of nearby residential properties. Insufficient information has been provided to prove that crime mitigation and safety measures would be incorporated into the development. Therefore, it is not clear whether the proposal would contribute towards a safe environment. The lack of a Transport Assessment means that the transport impacts of the proposal cannot be fully considered.

5.35 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION.

Refusal Reasons:

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would enable the delivery outcomes of the site allocation to be achieved. The proposed scheme could frustrate and compromise the delivery of the site allocation. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM55 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed development, by virtue of its noise-generating characteristics, would result in noise and disturbance impacting the living conditions of nearby residential properties. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that noise generated from the proposed uses would be appropriately managed and mitigated. Therefore, the amenity and living conditions of nearby residential properties would be harmed contrary to Policies D13 & D14 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that crime prevention has been fully

considered and crime mitigation measures would be appropriately incorporated into the development. It has not been proved that the 'Secured by Design' principles have been applied to the development. In the absence of the necessary information, it cannot be concluded that the development would contribute towards a safe environment. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3, SD6 & HC6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policy DM2 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

Insufficient information (in the form of a Transport Assessment) has been provided to enable full assessment of the transport impacts of the proposed development. There is a lack of information regarding trip generation, parking requirements and delivery/servicing arrangements. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether or not the proposal would result in adverse transport impacts. In the absence of the required information, the proposal would be contrary to Policies T1, T4, T5, T6 & T7 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP7 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM31 & DM32 of the Development Management DPD (2017).