

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/3482

Ward: Fortis Green

Address: Coppetts Wood Hospital, Coppetts Road, N10 1JN

Proposal: Demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 80 residential units (C3 use), comprising: 69 flat apartments across 3 building blocks rising from 3 and 4 storeys to part 5 and 6 storeys and 11 houses, rising from 2 to 3 and a half storeys, together with associated infrastructure, vehicular and cycle parking (subterranean and ground), public realm and landscaping works

Applicant: Catalyst Housing Limited

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Christopher Smith

Site Visit Date: 26/10/2016

Date received: 18/09/2016 **Last amended date:** 20/12/2016

Drawing number of plans:

2702_20_001 Rev. 1, 002, 004 Rev. 1, 101, 102 Rev. 2, 103 Rev. 2, 104 Rev. 2, 105 Rev. 2, 106 Rev. 2, 107 Rev. 2, 108 Rev. 2, 109 Rev. 2;
2702_20_300 Rev. 1, 301, 302 Rev. 1, 303 Rev. 2, 304 Rev. 2, 305 Rev. 2 (October 2016 – to be checked), 306 Rev. 1, 307 Rev. 1, 308 Rev. 1, 309;
2702_20_500 to 510, all Rev. 3;
AQ1;
IA-395-LGA-P-01, 02;
IA-395-TP-P-01;
S15-289-200, 201;
16008/07.

Supporting documents also assessed:

Design and Access Statement dated July 2016, Planning Statement (by Savills), Statement of Community Involvement dated July 2016, Bat Emergence Survey dated June 2016, Bird Breeding Survey dated June 2016, Reptile Survey dated May 2016, Site Wide Sustainable Drainage Strategy (Revision: X2 – Ref. J2393-Doc-06), Daylight and Sunlight report dated August 2016, Basement Impact Assessment (Including Site

Investigation) (Revision: X1 – J2393-Doc-07), Air Quality Assessment dated September 2016, Transport Assessment dated September 2016, Travel Plan dated September 2016, Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report dated October 2016, Water Management Statement dated October 2016; Phase II Site Investigation Report dated July 2016; Heritage Statement dated September 2016; Biodiversity Strategy dated September 2016, Landscape Design Statement dated September 2016, Ecological Assessment dated June 2016, Arboricultural Implications Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement dated July 2016, Thermal Comfort Assessment dated September 2016, Energy Report dated September 2016, Block E South Elevation / Site Entrance Sketch (dated December 2016), Surface Water Exceedence Flow Path mark-up drawing dated 22nd November 2016.

1.1 This application is being reported to the planning committee as it is a major application recommended for approval.

1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The development is acceptable in principle, given the derelict and vacant nature of the existing buildings on site and that site allocation SA55 of the Councils Site Allocations DPD pre-submission version 2016 promotes residential use at the site and given the housing need in the Borough;
- The development provides a high proportion of affordable housing well above the borough-wide target and an acceptable density with an appropriate mix of dwelling types;
- The demolition of a non-designated heritage asset of limited significance is acceptable in the context of this application, as any negative impact on local heritage considerations is outweighed, by the very high quality of the design of the proposed scheme and also given the substantial public benefit from the development in the form of 54% affordable housing;
- The development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of a loss of sunlight or daylight, outlook, or privacy, or in terms of a negative impact from excessive noise, light or air pollution;
- The development would provide high quality living accommodation for residents, including accessible and adaptable units, 10% wheelchair accessible units, sufficient private and communal amenity space provision and dedicated play space for under-5s;
- The development would provide a policy compliant number of parking spaces which is acceptable given the site's relatively low access to public transport, a proposed Travel Plan, and other sustainable transport initiatives which will be secured by condition and legal agreement;
- The development would protect a significant number of high quality trees within the existing site and plant an additional 60 trees of varying species, and would also provide bat and bird boxes;
- The development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on carbon reduction and sustainability through mitigation methods such as green/brown roofs and

solar panels, as well as providing sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water run-off;

- The development would not lead to excessive increases in air pollution and land contamination matters would be adequately dealt with by condition;
- The application is acceptable for all other reasons as described below.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 2.2 That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 31st March 2017 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in his/her sole discretion allow; and
- 2.3 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission shall be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval
- 4) Heritage management strategy
- 5) Construction management plan
- 6) Delivery and service plan
- 7) Electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- 8) Cycle parking
- 9) Piling method statement
- 10) Construction hours
- 11) Hard/soft landscaping
- 12) Tree protection
- 13) Site levels
- 14) Removal of permitted development rights
- 15) Secured by design
- 16) Energy efficiency
- 17) Boiler details (individual)
- 18) Boiler details (communal)
- 19) Boiler flue details
- 20) PV panels details
- 21) Sustainability assessment

- 22) Living roof details
- 23) Living wall details
- 24) Biodiversity provision
- 25) Overheating prevention
- 26) Land Contamination mitigation
- 27) Noise mitigation
- 28) Dust management plan
- 29) Plant monitoring

Informatives

- 1) Community co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Party Wall Act
- 4) Street Numbering
- 5) Fire prevention
- 6) Drainage
- 7) Pipe ownership
- 8) Water backflow
- 9) Groundwater risk management
- 10) Water pressure
- 11) Legal agreements

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

- 1) Affordable Housing
 - 54% of the total units (43) shall be marketed as affordable housing and provided by a registered provider;
 - 43% of these units (18) shall be made available for affordable rent
 - 57% of these units (25) shall be made available for shared ownership
- 2) Car Club
 - Pay for the cost of membership to a car club for two years for all first residential occupiers of each dwelling in the development who hold a valid full drivers licence
 - Provide £50 credit for each membership registration
 - To provide marketing evidence to occupiers in respect of the car club
 - The car club shall utilise low-emissions vehicles only
- 3) Considerate Contractors Scheme
- 4) Jobs for Haringey
 - Not less than 20% of the onsite workforce employed during the construction of the Development to comprise of the residents of the London Borough of Haringey;

- That 20% to undertake appropriate training;
 - To assist local suppliers and businesses to tender for works as appropriate;
 - To provide the Council with information to enable the effective implementation of the above;
 - All of the above are to be followed unless practical considerations dictate otherwise.
- 5) Travel Plan including Monitoring
- Within three months of the development first being occupied the applicant is required to:
 - appoint a co-ordinator
 - submit the Travel Plan and have it approved by the Council;
 - pay the monitoring contribution of £3,000.
 - The Plan is to specifically include a cycle strategy to support the proposed 5% mode share for cycling, in addition to providing further information on security and access for the proposed cycle stores
 - Conduct annual reviews of the Travel Plan and amend the Plan as may be reasonably required by the Council
 - To comply with the Travel Plan during the lifetime of the development.
- 6) Securing of a S278 agreement
- a. Works to the public highway to provide the following to Coppetts Road:
 - i. vehicular access point to the proposed development
 - ii. raised pedestrian crossing
 - iii. traffic calming measures
 - iv. footways resurfacing site
 - b. Works are estimated to cost £40,000

2.4 In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

2.5 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of on-site affordable housing would have a detrimental impact on the provision of much needed affordable housing stock within the Borough and would set an undesirable precedent for future similar planning applications. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy SP2 'Housing' of the Council's Local Plan March 2013 and Policy 3.12 (Negotiating Affordable Housing on Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Schemes) of the London Plan.
2. The proposed development in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Haringey Employment Delivery Partnership would fail to support local

employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population, As such, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9.

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations for mitigation measures to promote sustainable transport, service and delivery plans, and a parking management plan by reason of its lack of car parking provision would significantly exacerbate pressure for on-street parking spaces in surrounding streets, prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such the proposal is considered contrary to the requirements of Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2015, Saved Policies UD3, HSG11 and M10 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
 4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2 and Local Plan Policy SP4.
- 2.6 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.5) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
 - (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
 - (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

CONTENTS

- 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
- 4.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE
- 5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
- 6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
- 7.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPENDICES:

- Appendix 1: Consultation Responses
- Appendix 2: Plans and images
- Appendix 3: Quality Review Panel Notes
- Appendix 4: DM Forum Notes

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

This is an application for demolition of all existing buildings and the erection of 80 residential units (C3 use), comprising: 69 flat apartments across 3 building blocks rising from 3 and 4 storeys to part 5 and 6 storeys; and 11 houses, rising from 2 to 3 and a half storeys; together with a new vehicular access from Coppetts Road, vehicle and cycle parking at ground and below-ground levels, hard/soft landscaping works and play space.

The application site is a designated site (SA55) for residential and community purposes in the Council's Site Allocations DPD Pre-Submission version 2016.

43 of the units (54%) would be affordable properties with 23% of the total number of units as affordable rent and 31% of the total as shared ownership.

79 car parking spaces would be provided (including 8 'accessible' bays for mobility-impaired people) in addition to 140 cycle parking spaces.

The proposal would provide a quality designed scheme that would provide a quality living environment for future occupiers of the development and would safeguard the visual amenity of the locality generally.

The proposal would include a pedestrian-only access from Osier Crescent, a communal garden and a pocket square to the south of the site.

The application site contains no listed or locally listed buildings, and is not located within a conservation area.

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The site is the former home to an isolation hospital for infectious diseases that was operational from 1888-2008 and has since been left vacant. It comprises two buildings fronting onto Coppetts Road – a part-two part-three storey former hospital administration building and a two storey temporary building, with three further two storey buildings located towards the rear (west of the site). A single storey former mortuary building is also located to the north of the site.

Coppetts Road forms the eastern boundary of the site. To the north is The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, a two storey building with a large green space. To the north-west is the London Centre for Children with Cerebral Palsy, which recently received planning permission for expansion. Also to the north of the site fronting onto Coppetts Road is a row of residential properties named Strawberry Terrace.

To the western and southern boundary is Osier Crescent, a recent development that was completed early 2000s and ranges in scale from two to four storey substantial sized family homes, and three to four storey flatted blocks with large pitched roof.

To the east of the site across Coppetts Road, and within the London Borough of Barnet, are several two storey blocks of flats and dwelling houses, plus Coppetts Wood Primary School.

The site is broadly situated in between the Muswell Hill playing fields and the Halliwich recreation ground with Coppetts Wood further to the north.

The site is broadly situated in between the Muswell Hill playing fields and the Halliwich recreation ground with Coppetts Wood further to the north.

The application site contains no listed or locally listed buildings, and is not located within a conservation area.

3.4 Relevant Planning History

The planning history for the application site since the 1990s is described below:

HGY/1998/1692. Outline planning permission for redevelopment for residential purposes. Granted February 1999.

HGY/2000/1243. Erection of a temporary 36 bed nurses accommodation block on north east corner of site. Granted December 2000.

HGY/2001/0144. Redevelopment for residential purposes to erect 116 new dwellings comprising (12 x 1 bed & 56 x 2 bed flats, 22 x 3 bed houses and 26 x 4 bed houses) with access from Coppetts Road. Granted September 2001.

HGY/2008/2196. The demolition of existing buildings (except for the administration building that fronts Coppetts Road), the conversion of the administration building fronting Coppetts Road, and the erection of four two storey house plus dormers, and four blocks of flats between 2 and 4 storeys in height to provide a total of 55 units with car parking (48 spaces), access to roads and landscaping. Resolution to grant permission at planning committee in January 2010 – legal agreement not signed – therefore no extant planning consent.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 Planning Committee Pre-Application

4.2 The Pre-Application Briefing was held on 27th June 2016.

4.3 The minutes of the meeting are described below:

- The Committee sought clarification on the factors that would determine which of the two options for the site the applicant would bring forward.
- Representatives for the applicant advised that currently option 1 for the demolition of all buildings on site and total redevelopment was the preferred option.

4.4 Quality Review Panel (QRP)

4.5 The QRP considered the development proposals on 18th May 2016. The minutes of the last meeting are set out in Appendix 3 and summarised below.

4.6 The panel recommended:

- The retention of the administration building fronting Coppetts Road, in addition to other buildings on site;
- Maximum four storey development, perhaps with a setback fifth storey;
- Re-design of amenity spaces;
- Buildings located further away from mature trees;
- All mature trees should be retained;
- Osier Crescent should be retained as the sole access to the site;
- North-facing single aspect units should be avoided.

4.7 Development Management Forum (DMF)

4.8 The DMF was held in June 2016. The notes of the meeting are set out in Appendix 4 and summarised below:

- Some attendees felt that the designs were not in-keeping with the character of the area and expressed preference for more traditional architecture. Other residents viewed the development more positively.
- Residents indicated that Osier Crescent and Gilson Place are heavily parked.
- Some residents of Osier Crescent raised concern that the separation of the buildings from their properties was insufficient.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the impact on public transport.

4.9 Discussions also included impact on local ecology, public services (incl. buses), servicing arrangements for the site and impact on traffic levels.

4.10 The following were consulted regarding this planning application:

Internal

- Conservation Officer
- Design Officer
- Transportation
- Housing
- Regeneration
- Arboricultural Officer
- Cleansing
- Drainage Engineer
- Carbon Management
- Pollution – Air Quality and Contaminated Land
- Education Services
- Emergency Planning

External

- Transport for London
- Thames Water
- London Borough of Barnet
- Metropolitan Police
- London Fire Service
- Natural England
- National Health Service

4.11 Responses are set out in full in Appendix 1 and are also summarised below as follows:

4.12 INTERNAL

4.13 Conservation Officer

4.14 The buildings on site are not listed or locally listed, nor in conservation area, but do have some local significance as non-designated assets. However, the significance is tied into its historic use as a hospital and the architectural interest of the site is limited as the internal fabric of the building has been substantially altered. The conversion of the building would result in a much poorer version of development than that currently proposed which cannot be justified given the limited heritage value of the existing buildings. The demolition of the buildings is acceptable as the less than substantial harm that would occur is outweighed by the high quality design and the wider public benefits of the development.

4.15 Design Officer

4.16 The proposed design of the building is considered to be of high quality therefore justifying the height and clear visibility in this location. The quality of residential accommodation will be high, and the relationship of the proposed development to the street and context will be positive and go a long way towards beginning to repair the urban grain of its location.

4.17 Transportation

4.18 The site is in an area of low public transport accessibility but it is within short walking distance of four bus routes. Local car ownership is at less than 1 per dwelling as indicated by 2011 census data. There are no records of vehicle accidents in the vicinity that involved pedestrians. The impact of additional traffic at key junctions has been modelled and found not to have a detrimental impact on the transport and highways network. The number of car parking spaces provided is slightly higher than the Council's parking policy recommends, but this is considered acceptable in this area given the relatively low public transport accessibility. Construction of the development, including an amended vehicle access, and servicing will be managed by condition and legal agreement. Parking demand will be controlled via a Travel Plan and other sustainable transport initiatives. As such, there are no objections raised to the proposed development.

4.19 Housing

4.20 The development exceeds the Council's borough wide policy target by providing more than 40% affordable housing. Although the tenure split of these units is in favour of intermediate housing over affordable rent this is acceptable in this case as the overall number of units provided as affordable housing is well above the borough wide policy threshold above. 10% of units are fully wheelchair accessible. As such, this scheme is supported.

4.21 Regeneration

4.22 No comments to make.

4.23 Arboricultural Officer

4.24 The majority of high quality Category A and B trees would be retained. The new landscaping proposal includes over 60 new trees. Planting a selection of new trees of various species, forms and sizes would improve the sustainability of the site and enhance biodiversity, while also increasing the quality of life for future residents. Re-development of the site would have minimal impact on the important trees on site, if protective measures are installed in accordance with the recommendations of the arboricultural method statement. As such, there are no objections to the proposal.

4.25 Cleansing

4.26 The plans are acceptable for waste collection purposes.

4.27 Drainage Engineer

4.28 The calculations regarding the rainwater runoff and storage from the proposed development are acceptable and meet the Council's requirements.

4.29 Carbon Management

4.30 The scheme delivers a 35.2% improvement beyond Building Regulations 2013 which is policy compliant. The development is anticipated to meet the Home Quality Mark Level 3. The scheme includes living roofs and a living wall which is supported, and so is the proposed provision of bat and bird boxes. Some properties are at risk of overheating but measures are available to limit this and as such this matter can be dealt with by condition. No objections to the proposal.

4.31 Pollution

4.32 The development is not air quality neutral and provides a significant increase in parking above the Council's parking policy. As such, sustainable transport initiatives are recommended to reduce the potential demand of the parking spaces. The site investigations in respect of contaminated land are reasonable but further assessment will be required. Conditions are recommended to deal with these matters.

4.33 Education Services

4.34 Although the development would lead to an increased demand for primary school places it is noted that sufficient capacity of reception places in the local area is available. No objections are raised.

4.35 Emergency Planning

4.36 No comments to make.

4.37 EXTERNAL

4.38 Transport for London

4.39 The development provides an acceptable level of car parking (80) and cycle spaces (140), although further information is required on the exact type and location of these. There are no objections to the trip modelling or the proposed refuse/servicing arrangements.

4.40 Thames Water

4.41 With regard to water infrastructure and sewerage capacity, and subject to conditions and informatives, no objections are raised.

4.42 London Borough of Barnet

4.43 No objections raised.

4.44 Metropolitan Police

4.45 The development should be able to achieve the relevant 'Secured by Design' accreditation. Therefore, subject to conditions, there are no objections to the proposal.

4.46 London Fire Service

4.47 Fire fighting appliance access is satisfactory. No objections.

4.48 Natural England

4.49 No comments to make.

4.50 National Health Service

4.51 No comments received.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following were consulted:

- 395 neighbouring properties
- Two site notices were erected close to the site

5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

5.3 No of individual responses:

- 74 Objecting:
 - Osier Crescent: 1, 4, 8, 11, 31, 35, 41, 44, 49, 52, 63, 73, 107, 112, 113, 126, 128, 130, 134, 146, 152, 158, 162, 209, 273, 277 (x2), 283, 285 (x2), 293 (x2), 295, 305, 309, 311, 313 (x2), 315, 319, 323, 327, 329, 335.
 - Coppetts Road: 13, 84, 94, London Centre for Children with Cerebral Palsy, Coppetts Wood Primary School;
 - Gilson Place: 52, 59, 71, 140, 150, 157 (x2);

- Martins Walk: 4, 16, 22, 23;
 - Strawberry Terrace: 4 (by telephone only), 7;
 - Newton Avenue: 20;
 - Cannon Road: 27 Ambrose Court;
 - Fortis Green: 153 – Flat 4.
- 1 Supporting:
 - Martins Walk: 22.

5.4 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association;
- Halliwick Park Allotments Committee.

5.5 The following Councillors made representations:

- Cllr Martin Newton (Fortis Green Ward);
- Andrew Dismore AM (London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden).

5.6 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Excessive scale, bulk and massing;
- Out of keeping with character of the area;
- Inappropriate design;
- Loss of historic character;
- Existing use should be retained;
- Inappropriate location for flats;
- Lack of off-street parking;
- Exacerbation of existing traffic and on-street parking problems;
- Loss of trees and other foliage;
- Loss of local wildlife;
- Insufficient soft landscaping;
- Insufficient play space provided;
- Insufficient provision of local social amenities;
- Exacerbation of existing waste collection problems;
- Insufficient public transport provision;
- Increased noise disturbance;
- Increased air and refuse pollution;
- Loss of outlook;
- Loss of day/sunlight;
- Loss of privacy;
- Impact on neighbouring building foundations;
- Increased potential for criminal activity and anti-social behaviour;

- Loss of safety for pedestrians/road users;
- Inappropriate emergency access;
- Negative impact on existing emergency accesses;
- Lack of community facilities on site;
- Local schools should receive funding from the development.

5.7 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Loss of a private view;
- Impact from construction works;
- Submitted documentation is inaccurate;
- Consultation was insufficiently undertaken.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the Development
 - Housing Need
 - Site Allocation
 - Demolition
 - Change of Use
2. Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Density
 - Affordable Housing and Affordable Mix
 - Housing Mix
 - Density
3. Impact on Local Heritage
 - Assessment of Heritage Significance
 - Alternative Development Options
4. Design, Appearance and Layout
5. Impact on the Amenity of Adjoining Occupiers
 - Impact on Day/Sunlight, Outlook and Privacy
 - Noise, Light and Dust
 - Impact on Foundations
6. Living Conditions for Future Occupants
7. Parking and Highway Safety
8. Trees
9. Sustainability and Biodiversity
10. Flood Risk and Water Management
11. Air Pollution and Land Contamination
12. Emergency Planning and Security
13. Local Employment

6.2 Principle of the development

- 6.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes overarching principles of the planning system, including the requirement of the system to 'drive and support development' through the local development plan process and support 'approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay'. The NPPF also expresses a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.'
- 6.2.2 The NPPF encourages the 'effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed'. In respect of applications that include provision of housing, the NPPF highlights that delivery of housing is best achieved through larger scale development.
- 6.2.3 Housing Need
- 6.2.4 The NPPF (paragraph 47) states that local authorities should act to 'boost significantly the supply of housing'. Paragraph 49 also states that Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 6.2.5 London Plan (FALP 2016) Policy 3.3D states that the Council should exceed its individual housing target in an attempt to fairly contribute towards the minimum net increase in housing required across London of 42,000 new homes. Policy 3.4 of the same document states that housing output should be optimised given local context.
- 6.2.6 Local Plan Policy SP1 relates to housing, and indicates that the Council will aim to provide homes to meet local housing needs in Haringey and to make full use of Haringey's capacity for housing by maximising the supply of additional housing to meet and exceed its identified and challenging target (recently increased by 83% to 1,502 of new dwellings per annum).
- 6.2.7 Given the policy context above, it is considered that there is a clear and identified need for housing London-wide as well as in the Borough of Haringey and this site provides land of an appropriate size and scale for a comprehensive housing development, subject to all other relevant planning considerations being acceptable, as discussed in the sections below.
- 6.2.8 Site Allocation
- 6.2.9 Located in the Fortis Green Ward, the site area is approximately 0.7 hectares in size and forms part of the site allocation 'SA55' as identified within the Council's emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The allocation also includes the school to the north and Crouch End Vampires football club, although

neither of these properties form part of this planning application. The allocation identifies the site as being suitable for residential development of a minimum of 21 units, plus 'other' unspecified community land uses of approximately 1,497sqm in floor area.

6.2.10 The specific 'site requirements' for this allocation are as follows:

- Each individual use on the site must demonstrate it is no longer required, or has been re-provided elsewhere, before any change of use may occur. This includes:
 - Crouch End Vampires
 - Greenfields School
 - Hospital function at Coppetts Wood Hospital
- Depending on the future findings of updates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, this site could be converted to create a new school. If this is not needed for this purpose, it could be converted to residential.
- Parks and other service vehicle access to Playing Fields, and the relationship this site enjoys with the Park, will need to be considered through any proposals.

6.2.11 The 'development guidelines' for the site allocation are set out as follows:

- The possibility to include the Church of Jesus of the Latter-day Saints building into this scheme should be considered.
- The amenity of the properties on Coppetts Rd should be respected by the new development.
- A piling statement will be required prior to any piling taking place.
- Applicants must consult with Thames Water regarding both wastewater and water supply capacity upon the preparation of a planning application.

6.2.12 It is important to note that several of the above referenced requirements and guidelines are not relevant to this development as only the former hospital land is within the site boundary for this current application. The football club and school to the north are not involved with this application.

6.2.13 The viability of the existing hospital facility is discussed in the 'change of use' section below.

6.2.14 The submitted Planning Statement by Savills notes that the applicant has been in on-going communication with the adjoining London Centre for Children with Cerebral Palsy (LCCCP) about occupying the site now or in the future and no formal interest has been lodged by the school in respect of expanding onto the hospital land. The LCCCP acquired the neighbouring former Greenfields School

building and grounds, which also form part of this Site Allocation but do not form part of this planning application, in 2015, and moved their operations from their site in the centre of Muswell Hill to this site, initially temporarily. They have now made this move permanent.

6.2.15 The LCCCP have, in fact, recently received planning permission to expand within the boundaries of their own land – a development that would not prejudice the use of application site in principle. As such, the expansion aims of the LCCCP appear to have been satisfied without the requirement for additional land within the school grounds. Given the number of schools in the locality it is considered that local educational demand is satisfied. The applicant has confirmed that they have not been approached by any other education providers interested in using the application site for education purposes.

6.2.16 It is also relevant to note that the Council's Education Services team have indicated that sufficient education facilities for current and future residents are available in the locality without this site needing to be developed for education purposes. As such, it is clear that the site is not required for education facilities.

6.2.17 The site does not lie adjacent to Muswell Hill Playing Fields and is not anticipated to impact negatively on service access to or from that public facility in any way.

6.2.18 In terms of the development guidelines above, the church to the north is more than 30m from this application site and thus it is not appropriate to consider its incorporation into the current proposal. The potential impact of the development on residential amenity, piling and water management matters are considered in the sections below.

6.2.19 Demolition

6.2.20 The existing buildings on the application site are not listed or locally listed, and do not fall within a conservation area. As such, planning permission is not required to demolish these structures.

6.2.21 Change of Use

6.2.22 The application site is currently vacant but the last active use of the site was as a hospital, which falls within Use Class C2 (Residential Institutions) Existing buildings on site cover a floor area of 2,510sqm. Permission is sought for the use of the entirety of the site for residential (Use Class C3) purposes.

6.2.23 Policy DM49 of the Development Management DPD pre-submission version states that the Council will seek to protect existing social and community facilities

unless a replacement facility is provided which meets the needs of the community. Where a development proposal may result in such a loss, evidence will be required to show that; a) the facility is no longer required, b) the loss would not result in a local shortfall in provision, c) the existing facility is no longer viable and there is no demand for a suitable community use on the site.

6.2.24 It is relevant to note that the change of use of the site to residential has already been given a resolution to grant by the Planning Sub-Committee in 2010 as part of a planning application submitted to the Council in 2008. However, formal planning permission was never issued as the related legal agreement was not signed.

6.2.25 The applicant's supporting documentation confirms that the hospital was in long-term decline as its occupation gradually reduced from the 1980s onwards to its complete closure in 2008. The site has lain vacant since. The hospital's specific function during most of the course of its history was as an Isolation Hospital, mainly for occupants with infectious diseases. However, by 2000 only two beds remained for patients with hazardous infections only. The rarity of such infections and changes in treatments has reduced the need for hospitals with this type of care. Furthermore, since these beds moved to the Royal Free Hospital there is now no requirement for a specialist hospital in this area. In addition, general health care facilities have predominantly been located at other sites in Haringey, and in neighbouring boroughs. As such, replacing this disused former specialist healthcare facility is not anticipated to lead to a local shortfall in health facilities.

6.2.26 The existing buildings on site, and indeed other supporting infrastructure such as hardstanding, have been disused or substantially under-utilised for many years and are now in a state of disrepair. Modern health services are typically provided within much larger purpose-built facilities in centralised locations and as such it is considered that providing alternative or entirely new health care uses at this site is not a reasonable economic option for the site. As such, the Planning Statement notes that there 'is no interest in the site from hospital operators' with the NHS disposing of the site as surplus to requirements in 2008.

6.2.27 Therefore given that the site is designated for residential development by site allocation SA55, the existing site is no longer a functioning health facility that is economically viable in the long-term, the site is not needed for education purposes, and the proposed development would meet a defined housing need, it is considered that the development meets the relevant policies described above and is acceptable in principle in land use terms, subject to all other matters also being acceptable such as affordable housing, mix and density, impact on neighbouring occupiers, design quality, etc, as described in the remainder of this report.

6.3 Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Density

- 6.3.1 London Plan Policy 3.12 states that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should be provided on all development sites. Policy 3.11 states that affordable housing provision should be split 60:40 for social rent and intermediate rent or sale respectively. Policy 3.9 states that a balanced mix of tenures should be sought in all parts of London to enable social cohesion.
- 6.3.2 The current Policy SP2 of the Council's Core Strategy states that sites that are capable of providing 10 or more residential units will be subject to a 50% affordable housing target (based on quantity of habitable rooms), although this policy is currently subject to amendments reducing this level to 40%, subject to financial viability, as part of the Council's revised pre-submission Core Strategy. The same policy recommends that priority is given to affordable rented tenures, whilst overall mix of affordable housing will be considered on a site by site basis. This policy, and also Policy DM11 of the Development Management DPD pre-submission version 2016, both state that new developments should provide a bespoke mix of dwelling types in response to site circumstances, whilst ensuring inclusiveness within the development.
- 6.3.3 Affordable Housing and Affordable Mix
- 6.3.4 The proposed development consists of a high proportion of affordable housing at 54% of the total number of units (53% by habitable room) and this level of provision is considered acceptable and welcome as it comfortably exceeds the emerging borough-wide policy requirements.
- 6.3.5 The affordable provision of housing equates to 43 units overall. These units would be split so that 23% of the overall number of units on site (18 units) would be for affordable rent and 31% of the total units would be for shared ownership (25 units). This ratio becomes a 43%-57% split in favour of shared ownership when the affordable housing is considered as a separate entity. The affordable provision includes mainly one and two bedroom properties although six of the affordable rent properties would be family sized homes.
- 6.3.6 The Council's Housing team have advised that although the tenure split of these units is in favour of intermediate housing over affordable rent this is acceptable in this case as the overall number of units provided as affordable housing is significantly above the borough-wide policy threshold of 40% indicated above. Housing officers also welcome and support the proposed provision of six family homes as part of the affordable housing provision.
- 6.3.7 As such, it is considered that the amount, tenure split and type of affordable housing proposed is wholly acceptable.
- 6.3.8 Housing Mix
- 6.3.9 The overall mix of housing within the proposed development is as follows:

Unit Type	Units	%
1B 2P	22	27.5
2B 3P	2	51.25
2B 4P	39	
3B 5P	6	11.25
3B House	3	
4B House	8	10
TOTAL	80	100%

6.3.10 As referenced above 43 of these units are identified as affordable housing. 11 units (13.75% of the total) are family houses which are in demand throughout the Borough. The Council's Housing team have also commented to confirm that the split of units as proposed is acceptable in this location. As such, it is considered that the proposed mix of housing provided within this development is acceptable.

6.3.11 Density

6.3.12 Policy 3.4 of the London Plan states that, having regard to local context, design principles and transport connections, development should seek to optimise housing output in line with the indicative density ranges matrix (within Table 3.2 of that document). As such, density is considered most relevant as to whether the amount of development proposed is appropriate for a particular site.

6.3.13 Core Policy SP2 and emerging Development Management Policy DM11 refer to the London Plan matrix mentioned above but also state that the optimum housing potential of a site will be determined through a design-led approach.

6.3.14 The application site is located in an area that is considered to be partially urban, as befits a site this close to Central London, and partially suburban. The London Plan defines urban areas as having buildings with two to four storeys and terraced houses. Suburban areas are defined as featuring detached and semi-detached properties with small building footprints. The development site surroundings feature a mix of these qualities of urban grain.

6.3.15 The proposed development has a density of 347 habitable rooms per hectare, whilst the site has a relatively low public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of between 1 and 2. Noting the matrix in London Plan Table 3.2 the indicative capacity of this development site can be considered within a very wide range given its mixed urban/suburban location as well as split PTAL of 1/2.

6.3.16 Therefore, taking maximum PTAL for this site of 2 and noting the mixed urban/suburban nature of this site it is considered that the higher end of the indicative density range for this site would be 350 habitable rooms per hectare. The proposed development is within this limit.

6.3.17 It should be noted that the density calculation is only one indicative consideration of the acceptability of a development's scale. Given the proposal provides good quality units with a good quality living environment, and given that the majority of the height and bulk of the proposed development is similar to that of surrounding properties it is considered that the density proposed is acceptable as it would be unlikely to have a dominating on neighbouring occupiers and would also be in keeping with the scale and character of the surrounding area. Further amplification on these matters of amenity and design are provided in the relevant sections below.

6.4 Impact on Local Heritage

6.4.1 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires that a balanced and proportionate judgement is to be taken by the local planning authority in making planning decisions, having regard to the relative significance of an affected non-designated heritage asset and also the scale of harm or loss of that significance.

6.4.2 The key NPPF consideration as part of any balanced planning judgement is the wider public benefits that would flow from the proposed replacement development and how these weigh against the heritage harm. Public benefits are defined in NPPG as anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in paragraph 7 of the NPPF. It is also relevant to be reminded of some fundamental elements of the NPPF such as the requirement to promote sustainable development as well as encourage the redevelopment of previously developed land.

6.4.3 Policy SP12 of the Core Strategy states that the Council shall ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment.

6.4.4 It is relevant to note that none of the buildings on site are formally designated as being listed or locally listed. The site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area. Furthermore, many of the buildings on site are of a poor quality, or are in a poor state of repair. However, it is understood that the administration building facing onto Coppetts Road is held in some regard locally, and by virtue of its historic nature, high visibility in public views and elements of architectural merit, this is recognised by the Council as being a non-designated asset that could have some heritage significance. It is also noted that the mortuary building on site may also be of some architectural interest.

6.4.5 The proposed development requires the demolition of this non-designated asset and as such the impact of its loss on the local area needs to be fully considered.

6.4.6 Assessment of Heritage Significance

- 6.4.7 The application site has a long history that has been summarised in earlier sections of this report. It is relevant to note that the Hospital operations previously covered land as far south as the rear gardens of properties on the northern side of Marriott Road, and that this land has recently been developed into the residential properties of Osier Crescent.
- 6.4.8 The majority of buildings that formerly existed within the hospital grounds have been demolished and the existing buildings represent only a fraction of the once much larger number and type of buildings on site. As such, the buildings that remain have been removed from their original context. Notwithstanding this, the significance of the site has been independently assessed within a Heritage Statement provided by Turley Heritage, and the views of that report are discussed in this section.
- 6.4.9 Administration Building:
- 6.4.10 The following comments are taken from the Heritage Statement, and refer to the heritage consideration of the administration building:
- 6.4.11 *'The building has undergone a number of phases of development, as confirmed by map regression, which have involved extension of the original building to the south and to the west. The two storey building is of a domestic scale, reflecting its origins as apartments for staff members. It is constructed of yellow stock brick with red brick detailing and has slate pitched roofs. The front boundary of the building is enclosed by decorative iron railings. The overall character of the late 19th and early 20th century building is representative of the Queen Anne Revival style, first fashionable during The Queen Anne Movement from around 1860-1900.'*
- 6.4.12 *'Although the slightly later addition displays less elaborate detailing, the principal frontage still retains an overall cohesive design through the commonality of materials and repeated decorative elements, such as red brick arched lintels. The building retains sliding sash windows, with six lights to the upper sashes, and large chimney stacks. The central doorway displays rich red brick detailing which unifies the principal elevation.'*
- 6.4.13 *'As a comparatively plain building particularly careful, high-quality detailing, massing, scale and proportion are necessary in order to result in architectural value in a heritage context. In this case, it is only the eastern frontage which has any degree of architectural elaboration remaining in the form of the gables and red brick decoration and detailing, although the later south side is evident in the overall composition due to the less elaborate elevational treatment. The remainder of the building's exterior is much plainer in terms of its design and detailing, with no architectural flair or virtuosity.'*

6.4.14 The Statement continues to discuss changes to the building that I shall not repeat here for brevity. However, the impact of the alterations is discussed below:

6.4.15 *'The cumulative impact of these alterations on the integrity and quality of the property's original, architectural character is adverse. In addition, due to the building being vacant for a period of time, the fabric of the building has started to deteriorate.'*

6.4.16 *'The interior of the building retains some original features, most notably in the entrance foyer which includes tiling, woodwork and moulded ceiling. However, the majority of the interior spaces have been altered and updated for more modern usage, or other spaces largely functional or utilitarian in character.'*

6.4.17 Mortuary Building:

6.4.18 The following comments are also taken from the Heritage Statement, and refer to the heritage consideration of the mortuary building:

6.4.19 *'The early 20th century former mortuary is a simple building, characterised by a mixture of Domestic Revival and Picturesque Gothic styles, somewhat unrelated to the part contemporary main administration building nearby. Access to the exterior of the building is limited due to a fence along the eastern boundary of the Site and a number of overgrown shrubs, which have also had an adverse effect on the fabric of the building.'*

6.4.20 Significance:

6.4.21 In terms of age and rarity, the Heritage Statement comments on the administration building: "*hospital buildings of this age are common in London, including isolation wards, and there are numerous surviving examples of this type that are more intact and / or are of greater architectural interest. As such, this building is not considered to be an early or rare example of the type for the locale*", and in reference to the mortuary: "*Mortuaries would have typically been built on many hospitals sites, and therefore it is considered that the building is not an early or rare example of its type*".

6.4.22 In terms of aesthetic value the Statement comments about the administration building that: "*It displays a number of decorative features to its principal elevation fronting onto Coppetts Road. However, the remainder of the building's exterior is lacking in architectural quality and detailing in comparison. Furthermore, the building has experienced piecemeal additions and extensions which have diluted its historic character.*" In respect of the mortuary, the report considers that "*in comparison with the former administrative block, the building is much simpler in its design and detailing and is a typical example of an early 20th century building.*"

6.4.23 The Statement also continues to describe how the buildings on site demonstrate limited group, social/communal and evidential value. The administrative building is however noted to have some limited landmark status due to its visual prominence and relatively detailed architectural elements, although the Statement also warns against overstating this point.

6.4.24 The administration building is thus considered to be of some local heritage value though a tangible association with the former hospital, although its limited architectural interest is not considered to provide a significant positive contribution to local character. The mortuary building is considered to be of low heritage significance.

6.4.25 Alternative Development Options

6.4.26 The proposals would involve the demolition of existing buildings and a new replacement development for residential purposes featuring 80 dwellings including 43 affordable housing units. As referenced above, it is important that a balanced and proportionate judgement is made by officers in respect of the potential wider public benefits of the scheme from a social standpoint in contrast to the negative impact that would occur from the loss of the non-designated heritage asset.

6.4.27 The public benefits of the development are to be outlined in the remainder of this report, but to summarise include such benefits as: a significant number of new housing units (including a good proportion of family-sized properties) and a substantial degree of affordable housing that is over and above borough wide policy compliant levels.

6.4.28 In an attempt to fully respect these benefits the development needs to be considered in comparison to the type of proposal that could reasonably be brought forward should the non-designated asset be retained.

6.4.29 The applicant has completed an exercise, as part of their Design and Access Statement (DAS), which considers the development potential of the site if the street-fronting administration building were to be retained.

6.4.30 The DAS refers to structural constraints on development such as: poor quality of the existing building fabric including fractures, subsidence and water ingress; the large degree of internal remodelling that would be required due to the unsuitability of the existing building's rooms for contemporary residential properties; requirement for partial demolition of non-historic elements such as staircases to facilitate a conversion; and the failed nature of the building's foundations that would require significant repair.

6.4.31 Furthermore, the siting of the existing administration building would lead to layout inefficiencies with any new development such as: requiring a new vehicle access to be provided in a less appropriate location; reducing the potential size of an underground car park; and other inefficiencies in matters such as vehicle/ pedestrian movement, servicing and landscaping.

6.4.32 The applicant notes that in the context of a proposal that converts the existing administration building the development of the site would result in a reduced capacity of 59 dwellings compared to the 80 that are currently proposed. This would consequently have a negative impact on the amount of affordable housing that could be provided, as well as other detrimental impacts that are less easy to quantify such as loss of parking space availability, a less holistic design approach and a less efficient layout.

6.4.33 Furthermore, it is relevant to consider the previous application that was given a resolution to grant (although this was never formalised due to an unsigned legal agreement) in 2010. That development proposed an entirely residential development of 55 units with the administration building being retained. In terms of affordable housing 38% of the total was to be provided, which equates to 21 units.

6.4.34 Therefore, using the 2010 resolution to grant as a reference point, the demolition of all buildings on site can be reasonably equated to an additional provision of 22 affordable housing units – a provision of affordable housing more than 100% greater than was provided before in 2010 with the administration building retained. It is in this context that the current application is considered.

6.4.35 In addition, retaining the eastern façade of the administration building only, although desirable, would substantially restrict any future development by compromising any potential contemporary architectural approach through the complex challenge of marrying the current and new buildings. As with the retention option described above, this approach would be compromised by the limited floor to ceiling heights of the existing building, as well as significantly reducing the size of the basement car park. Consequently, it is considered that such an approach is also highly likely to lead to a significant loss in units in comparison to the proposed scheme, with a related proportional drop in affordable housing provision, notwithstanding the negative impact from utilising a forced and contrived design approach.

6.4.36 Conclusion

6.4.37 The Council's Conservation Officer has commented to state: "*The Heritage Statement draws out the significance of the existing buildings and I agree with the conclusions. Although the buildings are not listed or locally listed, neither in a conservation area, they do have some significance as non-designated assets. However, I agree with the conclusion that the significance is confined to local*

heritage value through its association with the historic use of the hospital. The architectural interest is limited as much of the fabric has been altered internally. As such, I am of the opinion that the demolition of the buildings would cause limited harm.”

6.4.38 The Conservation Officer’s comments above are noted. It is therefore considered that the loss of the administration building fronting Coppetts Road, and all other buildings on site, although regrettable, is a necessary requirement of the otherwise comprehensive redevelopment proposal for this site.

6.4.39 This view is taken in the context that 21 additional units can be provided on the site as part of the proposed development in comparison to a scheme that retains the administration building.

6.4.40 Furthermore, this proposal constitutes an increase in 22 affordable housing units compared to the application, which planned to retain the administration building, which was given a resolution to grant in 2010.

6.4.41 As well as the level of housing and high number of affordable housing units considered as major public benefits that outweigh the minimal harm / loss of the front facade of the buildings fronting Coppetts Wood Road, there are also many other public benefits of the proposed scheme, such as additional parking provision, and higher quality residential units, and a more desirable and comprehensive overall design.

6.4.42 However, despite the planned loss of the administration building, it is proposed that some elements of the original hospital development would be retained where achievable. For example, decorative elements such as the iron fencing fronting Coppetts Road would be retained in situ, whilst the main entrance arch of the administration building is proposed to be re-used as an entrance to the site from Osier Crescent.

6.4.43 Therefore, it is considered that demolishing all buildings on site, including an administration building of some heritage significance, to facilitate a comprehensive redevelopment of the site is acceptable in this case because, on balance, the loss of the non-designated heritage asset would be outweighed by the significant public benefits provided in the form of many good quality new housing units, including a high proportion of affordable properties.

6.4.44 However, this is also subject to all other aspects of the development, including the design quality of the proposal, also being acceptable.

6.5 Design, Appearance and Layout

6.5.1 Local Plan Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey’s built environment and create places and buildings that are high

quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. Development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context, character and historic significance, and contributes to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity which is supported by London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6. Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' of the Development Management DPD pre-submission version 2016 continues this approach and requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality.

6.5.2 The proposal seeks to demolish all existing buildings on site replacing them with 80 residential properties, split into 11 houses and 69 flats, in six distinct development blocks. These are as follows:

- Block A: a row of 3 three storey dwelling houses and a three storey block of flats (total 9 units);
- Block B: a row of 3 two storey dwelling houses and a three storey block of flats (total 9 units);
- Block C: a four storey block of flats (14 units);
- Block D: a four storey block of flats (15 units);
- Block E: a row of 5 part-three part-four storey town houses;
- Block F: a part-four part-six storey block of flats (28 units).

6.5.3 Blocks A-D constitute the 'courtyard' area, which is defined with a differing material palette to the street fronting properties and a shared surfacing parking, vehicle access and front garden area, as well as including the children's play area to the west of the site.

6.5.4 These blocks feature family dwelling houses at the far western end with front doors onto the courtyard area and a more traditional residential articulation in a contemporary style. The blocks of flats have both projecting and recessed balconies and projecting window openings at side, with flat roofs. Materials include grey stock and white glazed brick with reconstituted stone detailing and bronze-coloured metalwork. The family dwellings would feature grey zinc roofs and metal clad dormers, whilst all blocks would have brick planters at front.

6.5.5 Block E contains town house style family homes fronting onto Coppetts Road. The strong use of red brick is intended to reference the materials of nearby Muswell Hill and the administration building to be replaced, as well as the scale of development on Osier Crescent. A red, cream and grey palette has been chosen to provide contrast, with materials used in a contemporary manner. Materials proposed include red brick with reconstituted stone banding, concrete copings, bronze-coloured metalwork and a red zinc roof. Red brick walls are proposed to provide private defensible space from the road.

6.5.6 Block F is the largest block proposed and fronts onto Coppetts Road. It ranges from three to six storeys in height and is intended to provide a high quality 'way-marker' building that is prominent yet sensitive to the surrounding streetscape.

- 6.5.7 The iron railings that screen the existing administration building from both Coppetts Road and Osier Crescent are intended to remain in situ.
- 6.5.8 The detailed design of the buildings has been considered in detail by the Council's Design Officer.
- 6.5.9 The Officer states that 'the proposal, of mansion blocks and terraced housing, of heights rising from two to six storeys, fits into this mixed character whilst, not unreasonably, reinforcing its urban rather than suburban characteristics.' It is considered that this view is reasonable given the relatively high and dense scale of neighbouring developments such as Osier Crescent and Gilson Place.
- 6.5.10 The courtyard aspect of the development is considered to be a positive element of the scheme that contributes to connecting a currently isolated site into the surrounding streetscape including providing a pedestrian/cycle only entrance from Osier Crescent.
- 6.5.11 The development will be identifiable in many local views by way of a six storey tower element at the north-west corner of Block F. It has been set away from the street frontage on Coppetts Road and Osier Crescent intentionally so as not to be overly dominating at street level. This element also serves a useful purpose in indicating the entrance to the development from a distance.
- 6.5.12 Its design is quite slender given the scale of the remainder of the block of which it forms a part, and this aspect of its appearance is accentuated by the 'ribbed' nature of its exterior.
- 6.5.13 The Design Officer states that the overall storey height at: 'six storeys is not an excessive height that could create detrimental environmental effects and its shadow will mostly fall over the onsite street network rather than any neighbouring dwellings or amenity spaces'.
- 6.5.14 The remainder of Block F steps down considerably in comparison to the tower element reaching three storeys at street level. This is not excessive in respect of the height of the existing administration building (which is two storeys plus roof). The fourth floor element is set back far enough as to also have a minimal visual impact at street level adjacent to the block. Within the courtyard the four storey height is more apparent, although this height is also reflected in the scale of other blocks such as Blocks C and D.
- 6.5.15 The remainder of the development's bulk and massing is generally reflective of the surrounding plots with four storey heights of Blocks C and D responding to similar heights at adjacent properties within Osier Crescent, and the development scaling down towards the western end. In addition, the three storey plus roof

nature of the houses within Block E provide a natural step to the three storey height of the adjacent building at the end of Strawberry Terrace to the north.

- 6.5.16 It is therefore considered that the height, bulk and massing of the proposed development is acceptable as it is not significantly out of keeping with the scale of similar developments in the surrounding area.
- 6.5.17 It is noted that the surrounding area consists of a wide variety of building materials, architectural styles and patterns of development. As such, there is some degree of flexibility in considering whether the detailed design of the proposed development blocks is adequate.
- 6.5.18 The prominent Block F has a bold mansion-block style with a strong three-storey frontage onto Coppetts Road and at the corner with Osier Crescent. The frontage is detailed with strongly vertically proportioned fenestration arranged in pairs that effectively and distinctively mark the location of each town-house and the five 'bays' of the mansion block. The set back of the upper floor elements of Block F compared to the varied use of materials, increasing use of glazing/balconies and spine-like nature of the top two floors of the tower give the higher floors a progressively lighter appearance in views from a distance.
- 6.5.19 Furthermore, the materials used in Block E and F are considered to reflect local context as well as being durable materials that will weather appropriately. There is sufficient variety in the materials and their usage for the block to reasonably reference local character without being a contrived match.
- 6.5.20 In respect of Blocks A-D, these blocks have the appearance of a pair of opposing terraced rows with enough variation in the height to identify the differing unit types (i.e. houses and flats) without complicating the detailed design. Both front and rear elevations of these blocks appear, according to the Design Officer, to be: 'simple, elegant elevations with careful composition of predominantly vertically proportioned windows'. Finishing materials of predominantly 'light buff' grey brick provide an interesting contrast to both the proposed street-facing blocks and the surrounding character, helping to identify the courtyard area as contemporary and unique, yet elegant and homely.
- 6.5.21 It should be noted that in the elevation drawings provided the bricks for all blocks appear variegated and this character will be required to be maintained in the finished development, as will exact finishing materials by the imposition of pre-commencement conditions on any grant of planning consent.
- 6.5.22 As such, it is considered that the proposal would result in a high quality scheme of an excellent and bespoke contemporary design that would respect the character and appearance of the local area and the visual amenity of the area generally.

6.5.23 Therefore, the proposed development is acceptable in design terms.

6.6 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.6.1 The London Plan Policy 7.6 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, or sunlight, privacy overlooking, aspect noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance. Emerging DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours.

6.6.2 Impact on Sun/Daylight, Outlook and Privacy

6.6.3 The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight report by GIA in order to demonstrate that any loss of sunlight to properties surrounding the site is 'very minor', whilst retained levels of daylight to all windows/rooms within existing properties is noted to be 'good'. After considering the report, the Design Officer notes that the applicants' consultants' report has been; "prepared in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment's publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice" (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011) , known as 'The BRE Guide"; "no neighbouring windows to habitable rooms potentially affected by this proposed development would experience a loss of sunlight of a noticeable level as defined by the BRE Guide"; and "only a very small number of neighbouring habitable rooms would receive a noticeable loss of daylight as defined by the BRE Guide and in each case the loss would or not reduce the amount of daylight to an unacceptable level".

6.6.4 To the north of the site is a school and a church that would not be adversely affected by the siting of a residential development on the application site due to the substantial separation distance between the proposed development and those existing buildings. Furthermore, there is a large amount of tree planting on the northern side of the site that would screen any outlook towards the rear.

6.6.5 In terms of residential properties surrounding the site, there is a row of terraced properties (Strawberry Terrace) and a single detached residential building to the north of the site fronting Coppetts Road, with the latter separated from the proposed row of terraced buildings in the north of the hospital site by 2.7m. There are no windows of note on the southern elevation of the adjacent building to the north and the new buildings would replace the existing mortuary building and temporary office structure that are both located close to the northern site boundary.

- 6.6.6 The proposed house to the north of the site would have no windows in the northern elevation. Any outlook from rear windows of the nearest proposed houses to the gardens of properties on Strawberry Terrace would be of an angular nature. It is noted that mutual overlooking already occurs between properties on Strawberry Terrace. Any loss of amenity to gardens to the north would be very limited in nature due to the east-west movement of the sun, whilst overlooking towards gardens to the north from properties in Blocks A and C would be screened by retained trees and foliage in the north.
- 6.6.7 As such, it is considered that the properties to the north of the site facing onto Coppetts Road would not be adversely affected by the proposed development in terms of a material loss of sun/daylight, outlook or privacy.
- 6.6.8 There is a minimum separation distance of 25m between the proposed block of flats fronting Coppetts Road and the blocks of flats opposite (the Martins Walk estate), with this separation increasing to approximately 30m in many places. The proposed houses to the north of the site have an even greater separation from the existing properties across the road (minimum 32m). Noting that the elevations of properties on the eastern side of Coppetts Road are generally arranged so that views to/from the proposed properties are angled and therefore are non-direct, it is considered that overlooking towards and loss of outlook from those properties is minimal. The applicants' consultants' Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Report does find some of these properties to be of concern regarding loss of daylight caused by the development. Some rooms in some of these properties would experience a noticeable loss of one of the two criteria the BRE Guide recommends for assessing daylight (No Sky Line), but not of the other (Vertical Sky Component). The applicants' consultants report that "these impacts can be considered very minor and the retained levels of daylight for all windows and rooms can be considered good, and commensurate with the daylight amenity enjoyed by similar residential units in the surrounding area". The Design Officer notes in his comments that he is "satisfied that the loss of daylight to these properties is minor and acceptable in this well daylighted situation".
- 6.6.9 Separation between the proposed houses in the west of the hospital site and existing properties on Osier Crescent is 2.6m. Despite this, it is noted that the proposed houses to the west of the site do not feature windows in their western elevations. Furthermore, the existing house on Osier Crescent immediately to west of the application site (adjacent to Block B) also does not feature a window on its eastern elevation above ground floor level. The four storey block of flats on Osier Crescent immediately to the west of the application site (adjacent to Block A) have windows in their eastern elevation but these are noted not to be the only windows to the main habitable rooms of those flats and as such any loss of sun/daylight or outlook would not be significant enough to result in a refusal for this reason. Overlooking from upper floor windows of those proposed houses would be reflective of existing properties in the surrounding area and therefore no privacy would occur to properties to the west of the site on Osier Crescent. This

is the only neighbouring property in Osier Crescent to have been found in the applicants' consultants' Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Report to be of concern regarding loss of daylight caused by the development, but their full analysis shows these rooms would in fact be acceptable. The Design Officer notes that he is "satisfied that these rooms would not actually experience an unacceptable loss of daylight within the BRE Guide definitions".

- 6.6.10 The separation between the proposed development and properties to the south on Osier Crescent is not consistent due to the staggered nature of the proposed development blocks in that part of the site. However, separation distances range between 18m and 20m in most places. In most circumstances, a 20m separation distance is generally considered sufficient in planning terms to prevent excessive overlooking between properties.
- 6.6.11 Although the separation distances from the rear of Block D occasionally drop below 20m, it is noted that there are several mitigating circumstances that reduce the negative impact to properties on Osier Crescent. For example, outlook from and towards the ground floor windows of 303-315 Osier Crescent would be minimised by the location of boundary fencing and screening in the form of existing and new planting on the southern boundary of the application site. As well as screening outlook the foliage provides a positive and verdant contribution to residential amenity.
- 6.6.12 Furthermore, it is relevant to note that attempts have been made to minimise overlooking from the rear of Block D as all habitable rooms have been located on the northern side of the development block. Bedrooms provide the least potential for overlooking as they are utilised for the least amount of time during the day. In addition, the application that received a resolution to grant in 2010 permitted blocks of flats with residential units that had windows facing towards the properties to the south of Osier Crescent, so this precedent has already been set.
- 6.6.13 Although there would also be some additional overlooking towards the gardens of nearby properties, this would also not be significantly over and above that which currently already occurs between neighbouring properties on Osier Crescent, particularly given that the existing houses on Osier Crescent feature upper floor balconies that encourage sitting-out and overlooking of neighbouring gardens.
- 6.6.14 Therefore, although there would be an increased degree of overlooking from the bedrooms of properties within Block B and D towards properties on Osier Crescent, this is considered to be relatively limited given the development potential of the site, and would also not be to a degree that would constitute significant material harm to the living conditions of residents in those properties in terms of a loss of outlook or privacy.

6.6.15 Separation distances between the proposed flatted block facing Coppetts Road and the four storey block at the eastern end of Osier Crescent (by the junction with Coppetts Road) reduce to around 15m in one location. However, these provide only oblique angled outlook between windows and as such it is considered that any overlooking or loss of outlook to the properties in that existing block would be minimal in the circumstances.

6.6.16 Impact from Noise, Light and Dust

6.6.17 It is relevant to note that a 2008 planning application was given a resolution to grant planning permission for a development of 59 properties on the current application site. Furthermore, opinions on noise, light and dust pollution should be considered against the development potential of the site in light of this earlier approval, rather than against the existing site which is currently vacant.

6.6.18 It is considered that the increase in noise from occupants and light from internal rooms that would occur from this proposed development, particularly compared to the previous application that received a resolution to grant, is not significant, particularly given that the surrounding area, including Osier Crescent, is already substantially inhabited.

6.6.19 Disturbances from dust and noise relating to demolition and construction on site are considered to be temporary nuisances that are typically controlled by other non-planning legislation. Nevertheless, the demolition and construction methodology for the development will be controlled by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission should the development be acceptable for all other reasons.

6.6.20 Impact on Foundations

6.6.21 A Basement Impact Assessment by Webb Yates Engineers was submitted with the application and found that the digging of a basement to provide a subterranean car park for the proposed development would have no adverse impact on surrounding properties, including from surface and sub-surface water displacement or from ground movement. Deep piled foundations would be used to help minimise impact from the proposed basement. A Piling Method Statement will be required to demonstrate there is no significant impact on sewerage infrastructure.

6.6.22 As such, it is considered that there would be no damage caused to existing retaining walls or to neighbouring properties from the construction of a basement on site.

6.7 Living Conditions for Future Occupants

- 6.7.1 The Mayor of London's Housing SPG sets out detailed design requirements for new dwellings. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan states that development proposals should make provision for play and informal recreation. Policy 3.8 of the same document states that 90% of units should be 'accessible and adaptable', with 10% 'wheelchair user dwellings' according to the building regulations (Parts M4 (2) and (3)). Emerging Policy DM12 states that family housing should have access to private gardens.
- 6.7.2 All properties within the development have been designed in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standards document and thus also meet the requirements of the Mayor's Housing SPG.
- 6.7.3 Internal separation distances between the habitable rooms and balconies of Blocks C and D, and also for Blocks E and C, are a minimum of 18m apart, which is considered acceptable for new build properties in a semi-urban area as the level of overlooking is mutual and not excessive. This orientation of the proposed flats in these blocks also provides additional passive security to the internal courtyard and parking areas.
- 6.7.4 The habitable rooms and balconies on the eastern side of Block F are not overlooked by existing properties due to the large separation distance and the obliqueness of the elevations of existing properties on Coppetts Road. However, the windows on the western side of that block are located only 12m from the eastern side of Block D. Despite this, the units in Block D remain unaffected in terms of overlooking as there are no windows in the eastern side of that block, whilst the garden to the rear is not a private space. Outlook towards the balconies of Block D from Block F flats would be partially screened by that development block's supporting pillars and therefore is not considered to be excessive.
- 6.7.5 As described above, the outlook from the four storey block close to Block F would not result in a low standard of amenity for the occupiers of the flats in the south-western corner of that block, despite the relatively low 15m separation, due to the oblique nature of the outlook.
- 6.7.6 86% of the units are dual aspect or better, including all of the houses. The 11 single aspect properties are mostly one bedroom flats, although a couple of two bedroom single aspect flats are also single aspect. Of the single aspect units most have a south-facing window, or an amenity space in the form of a garden or balcony that would have access to direct sunlight for part of the day. Only one property fails all of these criteria (north-facing in Block D) but this property has direct access onto the courtyard which can be used for sitting out or play if necessary. Given only a single unit in the 80 unit development features this level of aspect and access to light and that changing the scheme to improve aspect would have a negative impact on the overall design, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of aspect in the circumstances.

- 6.7.7 A detailed Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report by Hann Tucker Associates has been submitted with the application. The Report confirms that an environmental noise survey has been undertaken and the potential impact on the proposed dwellings assessed. It is noted that the noise impact on the proposed dwellings can be reduced to acceptable levels. As such, this matter will be dealt with by condition.
- 6.7.8 Each house benefits from a private garden of at least 50sqm. The houses facing Coppetts Road (Block E) also benefit from upper level balconies. Each flat has a balcony of 5sqm or larger which is in line with the Mayor's requirements. 3 bed apartments have been designed with larger private terrace areas that would benefit families. The site also includes a communal garden to the rear of Block D for the exclusive use of that block's occupants, whilst the internal 'courtyard' area of the site (between Blocks A-C and B-D) is a designated communal 'Homezone' identified by shared surfacing.
- 6.7.9 A dedicated area is available on site for play space for children of less than five years of age. Additional space for play is available within the 'pocket green' communal amenity area. In total these areas provide 191sqm of play space for young children.
- 6.7.10 Muswell Hill playing fields and Halliwick Recreation Ground are located within a few minutes walk of the application site and these large public green spaces currently include dedicated play and sporting facilities for older children. This level of provision means a financial contribution in respect of play space is not required.
- 6.7.11 All flats have been designed to be adaptable for people with disabilities with 10% of the total number of flats also adaptable to be wheelchair accessible. All houses benefit from a ground floor bathroom. Level access is provided to gardens. Lift access is available to all the wheelchair accessible flats. Accessible car parking is also provided.
- 6.7.12 Refuse stores for houses and flats are provided and are accessible from the outside of the buildings but from inside the site. Adequate turning space for waste vehicles is available and the Council's refuse storage requirements have been met. As such, the Council's Cleansing team have raised no objections to the proposal.
- 6.7.13 The development would have a high degree of natural surveillance and ground floor level activity which contributes to a safe and secure place. Private and public spaces are clearly defined. Electronic fob and intercom access would be used where appropriate. The Metropolitan Police is satisfied that the development would be able to gain Secured by Design accreditation.

6.7.14 As such, it is considered that the application is acceptable in terms of its layout and provision of adequate living conditions for the proposed occupiers.

6.7.15 Daylight

6.7.16 The BRE Guide recommendation is that minimum adequate daylight to habitable rooms of new dwellings, expressed as Average Daylight Factor (ADF) is 1% in bedrooms, 1.5% in Living Rooms and 2% in Kitchens. The Guide does not mention open plan Living / Dining / Kitchens, and officers consider it is reasonable to treat them as Living Rooms rather than Kitchens. An alternative approach sometimes followed when an open plan kitchen doesn't have its own window, is to remove the kitchen from the room plan; this would probably give better daylight figures than those supplied, but it would appear from the applicants' consultants' report that kitchen areas *are* included in their living/dining/kitchen daylight figures.

6.7.17 The following habitable rooms in the proposed development fall slightly short of minimum daylight recommendation from the BRE Guide:

6.7.18 Block C

- Flat 1 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; 2no rear north facing bedrooms OK, front south facing l/d/k with only window under balcony above & beside projecting bay) – 1.2%
- Flat 2 Bedroom (single aspect south facing ground floor 1 bed flat; tall but narrow window with balcony over & beside projecting bay) – 0.8%
- Flat 3 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; 2no rear north facing bedrooms OK, front south facing l/d/k with only window under ; small side clerestory onto car park to side improves daylight distribution but not big enough to provide enough daylight) – 1.1%
- Flat 5 Bedroom (single aspect south facing 1st floor 1 bed flat; tall but narrow window with balcony over & beside projecting bay) – 0.9%

6.7.19 Block D

- Flat 1 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; 2no rear south facing bedrooms OK, front north facing l/d/k with only window under balcony above & beside projecting bay) – 1.0%
- Flat 2 Bedroom (single aspect north facing ground floor 1 bed flat; tall but narrow window with balcony over & beside projecting bay) – 0.7%
- Flat 3 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; 2no rear south facing bedrooms OK, front north facing l/d/k with only window under ; small side clerestory onto park to side improves daylight distribution but not big enough to provide enough daylight) – 1.2%

6.7.20 Block F

- Flat 6 Living / Dining / Kitchen (single aspect east facing 1st floor flat; only l/d/k window onto recessed balcony, with another balcony above) – 1.4%

- Flat 10 Living / Dining / Kitchen (single aspect west facing 1st floor flat; only l/d/k window beside a projecting bay) – 1.4%

6.7.21 The Design Officer considers many of these to be marginally below; within 0.2-0.3% of the guidance. Ideally the applicants would seek to mitigate these by enlarging windows but it is considered that such a measure would disturb the composition and the appearance of the street frontages. However, on balance, given that the overwhelming majority of rooms have adequate daylight or better, and most of those only fall marginally short of BRE recommendations officers are satisfied with daylight to the proposal.

6.7.22 Sunlight to flats

6.7.23 The BRE Guide recommends Living Rooms facing within 90° due south should receive 25% Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) & 5% winter APSH. The following Living Room windows fall marginally short of BRE guidance:

6.7.24 Block C

- Flat 1 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; front south facing l/d/k with only window under balcony above & beside projecting bay) – annual not winter
- Flat 3 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect ground floor flat; front south facing l/d/k with main window under balcony) – annual not winter, small side clerestory also same
- Flat 7 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect 1st floor flat; front south facing l/d/k with south window under balcony) – annual not winter, smaller side oriel window passes
- Flat 11 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect 2nd floor flat; front south facing l/d/k with south window under balcony) – annual not winter, smaller side oriel window passes

6.7.25 Block F

- Flat 6 Living / Dining / Kitchen (single aspect east facing 1st floor; only l/d/k window onto recessed balcony, with another balcony above) – both annual & winter
- Flat 14 Living / Dining / Kitchen (single aspect east facing 2nd floor; only l/d/k window onto recessed balcony) – winter only
- Flat 26 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect east/north facing 4th floor; east facing l/d/k window onto recessed balcony, with another balcony above – north facing windows not counted) – both annual & winter
- Flat 28 Living / Dining / Kitchen (dual aspect east/north facing 5th floor; only l/d/k window onto recessed balcony – north facing windows not counted) – both annual & winter

6.7.26 Many of the places above are the same as those regarding daylight, and many of the remedies would also work for sunlight. To explain, some rooms above also

have smaller windows in side elevations that have sufficient sunlight (Block C), or large north facing windows (Block F) that would give a better balance of light and spectacular views. As for the daylight, officers would not consider the shortfall in BRE guidance as significant.

6.7.27 Sunlight to Amenity Space (Overshadowing)

6.7.28 The BRE Guide recommends for an amenity space to be considered well sun lit, at least 50% of its area should receive at least 2hours sunlight at the equinoxes.

6.7.29 The applicants' consultants appear to have divided the site into four areas; 1) a small section in the south west corner of the "Pocket Green" new pocket park as part of the development; 2) the rest of the Pocket Green; 3) the "Play Green" sitting area & playspace at the western end of the east-west street; and 4) all the rest of the site that's not built upon (including roads, parking spaces & all the private gardens). All four areas are assessed to pass.

6.7.30 Officers consider that the applicant's analysis of the sunlighting of amenity space in the development (overshadowing) shows, on the whole, adequate levels of sunlight.

6.8 Parking and highway safety

6.8.1 Local Plan 2013 Policy SP7 states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, and improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This approach is continued in emerging DM Policies DM31 and DM32.

6.8.2 London Plan Policy 6.13 states that new development should demonstrate a balance between providing parking and preventing excessive amounts that would undermine cycling, walking and public transport use. It also states that electric vehicle charging points, disabled parking spaces, cycle parking should be provided at appropriate levels.

6.8.3 The Council's Transportation team have considered parking and highway impact matters in detail. Their comments are described in the section below:

6.8.4 *'Coppetts Road is a 20mph Road with some traffic calming measure which has been implemented to restrict vehicular speeds.'*

6.8.5 *'The most recent accident data concluded that there have been 4 recorded accidents in the last 3 years. All the accidents have been recorded as been slight accidents; none of the accidents involved pedestrian and were all vehicular/ vehicular accidents, with a range of factors contributing towards the accidents.'*

- 6.8.6 *'The site is located within walking distance of 4 bus routes: 1 bus route (234) located 188 metres from the site on Coppetts Road and 3 bus routes (134, 43, and 232) located some 547 metres from the site on Colney Hatch Road; these routes when combined offers some 32 buses per hour for frequent connection to and from the site.'*
- 6.8.7 *'The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building and redevelop the site to provide 80 residential units containing 69 flats comprising (22x1 bed, 39x 2 bed, 8x3 bed) and 11 family size house, construction of a new vehicular access to the development on Coppetts Road north of the existing roundabout at the junction of Coppetts Road with Osier Crescent. The applicant is also proposing to provide a total of 80 off street car parking spaces (75 car parking space including 8 wheel chair accessible car parking spaces, 3 visitor car parking spaces and 2 car club spaces). Of the car parking spaces proposed 27 of the proposed 80 car parking spaces are at surface level the remainder of the car parking spaces, 53 car parking spaces including 4 wheel chair accessible car parking spaces will be provided in an underground car park. The applicant is proposing to provide 14 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces in each of the 5 residential blocks, the house will have cycle parking in the rear gardens.'*
- 6.8.8 *'The 2011 census data identifies this ward (Fortis Green Ward) has have a car ownership levels with a car ownership of 0.90 cars per dwelling. The area surrounding the site also suffers from high car parking pressures as a result of parking demand generated by the nearby Muswell Hill playing fields; there are no proposals to consult on a control parking zone (CPZ) for the area surrounding the site.'*
- 6.8.9 *'The number of car parking spaces proposed is slightly high than that recommended by the Council's parking standard as per Saved UDP Policy M10. However we have considered that as the site is located in an area with a low public transport accessibility level, with moderate public transport connectivity, any under provision in car parking to support the development would result in displaced parking on the local highways network. Considering that the area surrounding the site is suffering from high car parking pressures, any displaced parking would impact on residents on Osier Crescent and local highways safety.'*
- 6.8.10 *'Based on the modal split from the 2011 census data, the proposed development would generate 32 in/out vehicular trips during the AM peak periods and 24 in/out vehicular trips during the PM peak periods. The impact of the additional traffic generated by the proposed development has been modelled at the key junctions which includes: Coppetts Road/ new site access and Coppetts Road junction with Osier Crescent, we have reviewed the model outputs and have concluded that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would not impact on the operation of the transport and highways network.'*

- 6.8.11 As such, it is considered that the level of parking proposed for this development is acceptable. This view is also supported by Transport for London. However, a Travel Plan is recommended in order to promote sustainable transport modes and minimise use of private vehicles by the development's occupants. This matter will be dealt with by condition and the Travel Plan will be monitored by the Council for which a financial contribution of £3,000 will be secured by legal agreement in the event of an approval. The Travel Plan will need to include a cycle strategy and at least two car club parking spaces. The car club vehicles will need to be of a low-emissions category.
- 6.8.12 Transport for London has recommended that electric vehicle charging points are provided on site. The applicant has agreed to this and it will be secured by condition.
- 6.8.13 The Transportation Officer also raised no objection to the construction of the new access although noting that this will require amendments to the existing highways network. This will need to be secured by way of a s.278 legal agreement.
- 6.8.14 The use of shared surfacing and the proposed service vehicle access arrangements are considered to be acceptable from a highway perspective.
- 6.8.15 Construction management, and servicing and delivery arrangements, are acceptable in principle but the detailed management of these will need to be secured by condition with exact details agreed at a later date.
- 6.8.16 Therefore, there are no objections to the proposed development in parking and highway terms.

6.9 Trees

- 6.9.1 Local Plan Policy SP13 seeks the protection, management and maintenance of existing trees and the planting of additional trees where appropriate. London Plan Policy 7.21 requires existing trees of value to be retained and the planting of additional trees where appropriate.
- 6.9.2 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has commented on the application to state: *'Tree cover at this site consists of a variety of species, the most important of which is a group of trees on the northern boundary consisting of mature Oak and Horse chestnuts. The trees are a significant amenity feature and as a group are of high biodiversity value. It is proposed to retain the majority of the trees categorized as A and B trees, which are of high or moderate quality and value. There are other trees on the site which are categorized as C and U trees and are specified for removal.'*

- 6.9.3 The high quality trees on the north and south site boundaries would be retained. Category C and U trees are not normally considered to be of a high enough quality to retain in instances where new development necessitates their removal. However, it is reasonable to insist that such specimens are re-provided elsewhere on site to ensure there is no overall loss of tree cover as a result of the development. Re-planting of this nature is proposed by way of 60 new trees of various species and sizes. Many of these are proposed to be planted to the south of the development site, and also to the front of Blocks E and F, in order to provide additional screening for the development to and from properties on Osier Crescent and Coppetts Road respectively.
- 6.9.4 The Arboricultural Officer has confirmed that the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement by Arborhelp demonstrates that all retained trees would be adequately protected during construction, and as such that Officer states that: *'In my opinion, re-development of the site would have minimal impact on the important trees on site, if protective measures are installed in accordance with the recommendations of the Arboricultural method statement.'*
- 6.9.5 Conditions are recommended to ensure that the described tree protection measures are followed, should the application be approved.
- 6.9.6 Therefore it is considered that the tree protection and planting measures proposed are acceptable.

6.10 Sustainability and Biodiversity

- 6.10.1 The NPPF and London Plan Policies 5.1 (Climate change mitigation), 5.2 (Minimising carbon dioxide emissions), 5.3 (Sustainable design & construction), 5.5 (Decentralised Energy Networks), 5.6 (Decentralised energy in development proposals), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 5.8 (Innovative energy technologies) and 5.9 (Overheating and cooling) and Local Plan Policy SP4 set out the approach to climate change and require developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design, including ensuring designs make the most of natural systems and the conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
- 6.10.2 The applicant has submitted an Energy Strategy in support of this application, put together by CalfordSeaden, as well as a Thermal Comfort Assessment by the same company.
- 6.10.3 The development cannot connect to local heating networks as there are none close to the site and as such individual boilers are proposed for the new houses. There would be an energy centre to serve all flats, which is to be located in the basement of Block F. The boilers will be of a very high energy efficiency which is supported. However, further information is required to ensure that the proposed

on-site energy centre could potentially be connected to any future energy networks. Further information is therefore required in respect of these matters. It is considered that this matter can be adequately dealt with by imposition of condition on any grant of planning consent.

6.10.4 Solar (photovoltaic) panels would be provided on all flat roofs of the development whilst living green and brown roofs are also proposed. However, further details are required in respect of the make-up living roofs and the quality of the panels also needs to be monitored by the Council. These matters can be dealt with by condition if planning approval is granted.

6.10.5 The development proposes to meet Homes Quality Mark 3 (for all units) and this aim is supported. It is noted that some units are at risk from overheating, particularly those facing towards the south and east. However, passive measures are able to be installed to counter the risk of overheating. Further information is required to ensure that appropriate measures are installed in the most appropriate locations, and this can be secured by condition in the event of an approval.

6.10.6 The Council's Carbon Management team has commented on this application and has raised no objections, recommending a suite of conditions as per the comments above to ensure that relevant aspects of the scheme are monitored, or requiring the provision of further detailed information.

6.10.7 Local Plan Policy SP13 states that all development must protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation. Emerging Policy DM19 and London Plan Policy 7.19 make clear that wherever possible, development should make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity.

6.10.8 In addition, the application is also supported by an Ecological Assessment by ASW Ecology and a Biodiversity Strategy by Ireland Albrecht. Bat and bird boxes are proposed within the site and are to be fitted to the proposed buildings during construction. At least 30 bird and 16 bat boxes must be provided, with a minimum of half of these installed on the northern side of the development. This matter can be secured by condition in the event of an approval. Natural England has not objected to the proposal.

6.10.9 As such, the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of its sustainability and biodiversity provision, subject to the appropriate conditions.

6.11 Flood Risk and Water Management

6.11.1 Local Plan Policy SP5 makes clear that (amongst other things) development shall reduce forms of flooding and implement Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity. Emerging

Policies DM24 and DM25 call for measures to reduce and manage flood risk, and incorporate SUDS. London Plan Policies 5.12 (Flood risk management) and 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) also call for measures to reduce and manage flood risk.

6.11.2 The application site is noted to have a very low or low risk of flooding.

6.11.3 A Water Management Statement by Calford Seaden has been provided with the application. Thames Water has raised no objections to the proposal in terms of either sewerage infrastructure capacity or water infrastructure capacity. However, any piling of foundations would need to be agreed with Thames Water and the Council in advance before commencement of such works. This matter can be secured by condition.

6.11.4 Sustainable drainage systems are proposed as part of the development including the use of below ground geocellular storm water tanks, permeable paving, gullies, rain gardens, both green and brown roofs and other planters, in order to attenuate water.

6.11.5 The Council's Drainage Officer has commented on the application including the submitted Site Wide Sustainable Drainage Systems Strategy by Webb Yates Engineers and confirms that rain water run-off and storage calculations are acceptable. The utilising of a variety of sustainable drainage techniques is also supported.

6.11.6 As such, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable as it would not lead to an increase in local flood risk or any other water management issues.

6.12 Pollution and Land Contamination

6.12.1 London Plan Policy 7.14 states that developments shall minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality and promote sustainable design and construction.

6.12.2 An Air Quality Assessment by SLR has been submitted. It is proposed that space heating and hot water will use a mixture of the proposed site wide heat network and individual boilers.

6.12.3 After considering the calculations provided, the Pollution Officer states that: *'the development is not only [not] AQ [air quality] neutral, but emissions are considerably in excess of AQ neutral standards set by the GLA Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Sustainable design and construction' [and] are almost 4 times greater. However no specific additional mitigation has been proposed to reduce these transport emissions.'* As such, the Officer recommends a suite of measures to reduce air pollution from vehicles, in order for the development to be considered acceptable. These measures include a number of sustainable transport initiatives that also been requested by the Council's Transportation and

Carbon Management teams, and Transport for London. These measures will continue to be dealt with by condition.

- 6.12.4 The Pollution Officer has also recommended that the number of parking spaces be reduced. However, this aim conflicts with the requirements of the Transportation who indicate that, due to the relatively low public transport accessibility of the application site, a reduced parking provision could lead to on-street parking problems and a reduction in highway safety. Furthermore, the take up of the proposed parking spaces for this development is intended to be minimised through the use of Travel Plan monitoring, to be secured by legal agreement, and a suite of other measures described already in this report that aim to maximise use of sustainable modes of transport by occupiers of the development.
- 6.12.5 Therefore, although it is understood that air pollution may increase as the result of this development, it is considered that the maximum reasonable degree of air quality mitigation that is able to be provided would also be included within the development.
- 6.12.6 As such, on balance, it is considered the application is acceptable in terms of its impact on air quality, given the limited negative impact from increased air pollution would be significantly outweighed by the other public benefits of the scheme, as described in the sections above, such as making the best use of a currently vacant brownfield site, providing new high quality housing that meets a defined need and providing policy compliant levels of affordable housing, amongst other benefits.
- 6.12.7 Saved UDP Policy ENV11 and emerging Policy DM23 require development proposals on potentially contaminated land to follow a risk management based protocol to ensure contamination is properly addressed and to carry out investigations to remove or mitigate any risks to local receptors. London Plan Policy 5.21 supports the remediation of contaminated sites and to bringing contaminated land back in to beneficial use.
- 6.12.8 A Phase II Site Investigation Report by Leap Environmental Ltd has been submitted. This includes a summary of a Phase 1 Desk Study and details of an Environmental Risk Assessment undertaken in 2007. The assessment identified a number of contaminants including oils, hydrocarbons and asbestos. However, the Pollution Officer has stated that *'no discussion or consideration of the hospital's past use as an infectious disease control hospital has been addressed. Therefore radioactive substances and bacteriological materials/spores have not been considered. Therefore a revision of the Phase I and Phase II investigations taking into account potential radiological and microbiological contamination must be undertaken.'*

6.12.9 This outstanding matter can be dealt with by condition in the event of an approval. No other issues with the submitted documentation have been raised. Other than the above, no objections are raised by the Council's Pollution Officer in respect of land contamination matters. As such, the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on pollution and land contamination.

6.13 Emergency Planning and Security

6.13.1 The London Fire Service and the Council's Emergency Planning sections have no objections to the proposal.

6.13.2 Local Plan policy SP11 requires proposals to incorporate solutions to reduce crime and fear of crime. Emerging Policy DM2 makes clear that development should comply with the principles of 'Secured by Design'.

6.13.3 The Metropolitan Police have also provided comments to state that the development is likely to achieve Secured by Design accreditation as currently proposed. This will be secured by condition.

6.13.4 As such, the development is acceptable from an emergency planning and security perspective.

6.14 Employment

6.14.1 Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9 aim to support local employment, improve skills and training, and support access to jobs.

6.14.2 The applicant has agreed to provide employment and training opportunities during the construction of the development and this will be secured by legal agreement.

6.14.3 As such, the development is acceptable in terms of employment provision.

6.15 Conclusion

6.15.1 This application is a major development that has generated a significant amount of comment from local residents. Having assessed all relevant material planning considerations, officers consider that:

- The development is acceptable in principle, given the derelict and vacant nature of the existing buildings on site, given that the site allocation SA55 promotes residential use at the site and given the housing need in the Borough;

- The development provides a high proportion of affordable housing at an acceptable density and with an appropriate mix of dwelling types;
- The demolition of a non-designated heritage asset of limited significance is acceptable in the context of this application, as any negative impact on local heritage considerations is outweighed, , by the very high quality of the design of the proposed scheme and also given the substantial public benefit from the development in the form of 54% affordable housing;
- The development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of a loss of sunlight or daylight, outlook, or privacy, or in terms of a negative impact from excessive noise, light or air pollution;
- The development would provide high quality living accommodation for residents, including accessible and adaptable units, 10% wheelchair accessible units, sufficient private and communal amenity space provision and dedicated play space for under-5s;
- The development would provide a high proportion of parking spaces which is acceptable given the site's relatively low access to public transport, a proposed Travel Plan, and other sustainable transport initiatives which will be secured by condition and legal agreement;
- The development would protect a significant number of high quality trees within the existing site and plant an additional 60 trees of varying species, and would also provide bat and bird boxes;
- The development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on carbon reduction and sustainability through mitigation methods such as green/brown roofs and solar panels, as well as providing sustainable drainage systems to minimise surface water run-off;
- The development would not lead to excessive increases in air pollution and land contamination matters would be adequately dealt with by condition;
- The application is acceptable for all other reasons as described below.

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

6.16 Community Infrastructure Levy

6.16.1 Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £173,767 (4,039.7 sqm x £35 x 1.229) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,128,328.61 (4.39.7sqm x £265 x 1.054).

6.16.2 This is based on the following figures. Social housing is CIL exempt and therefore removed from the final calculation:

- Total new floor space – 7878sqm;
- Market housing – 4039.7sqm;
- Social housing – 3838.3sqm.

6.16.3 This will be collected by Haringey after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to s.106 and s.278 Legal Agreements.

Applicant's drawing No.(s):

2702_20_001 Rev. 1, 002, 004 Rev. 1, 101, 102 Rev. 2, 103 Rev. 2, 104 Rev. 2, 105 Rev. 2, 106 Rev. 2, 107 Rev. 2, 108 Rev. 2, 109 Rev. 2;
2702_20_300 Rev. 1, 301, 302 Rev. 1, 303 Rev. 2, 304 Rev. 2, 305 Rev. 2 (October 2016 – to be checked), 306 Rev. 1, 307 Rev. 1, 308 Rev. 1, 309;
2702_20_500 to 510, all Rev. 3;
AQ1;
IA-395-LGA-P-01, 02;
IA-395-TP-P-01;
S15-289-200, 201;
16008/07.

Supporting documents also approved:

Design and Access Statement dated July 2016, Planning Statement (by Savills), Statement of Community Involvement dated July 2016, Bat Emergence Survey dated June 2016, Bird Breeding Survey dated June 2016, Reptile Survey dated May 2016, Site Wide Sustainable Drainage Strategy (Revision: X2 – Ref. J2393-Doc-06), Daylight and Sunlight report dated August 2016, Basement Impact Assessment (Including Site Investigation) (Revision: X1 – J2393-Doc-07), Air Quality Assessment dated September 2016, Transport Assessment dated September 2016, Travel Plan dated September 2016, Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report dated October 2016, Water Management Statement dated October 2016; Phase II Site Investigation Report dated July 2016; Heritage Statement dated September 2016; Biodiversity Strategy dated September 2016, Landscape Design Statement dated September 2016, Ecological Assessment dated June 2016, Arboricultural Implications Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement dated July 2016, Thermal Comfort Assessment dated September 2016, Energy Report dated September 2016, Block E South Elevation / Site Entrance Sketch (dated December 2016), Surface Water Exceedence Flow Path mark-up drawing dated 22nd November 2016.

Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

2702_20_001 Rev. 1, 002, 004 Rev. 1, 101, 102 Rev. 2, 103 Rev. 2, 104 Rev. 2, 105 Rev. 2, 106 Rev. 2, 107 Rev. 2, 108 Rev. 2, 109 Rev. 2;
2702_20_300 Rev. 1, 301, 302 Rev. 1, 303 Rev. 2, 304 Rev. 2, 305 Rev. 2 (October 2016 – to be checked), 306 Rev. 1, 307 Rev. 1, 308 Rev. 1, 309;
2702_20_500 to 510, all Rev. 3;
AQ1;
IA-395-LGA-P-01, 02;
IA-395-TP-P-01;
S15-289-200, 201;
16008/07.

Supporting documents also approved:

Design and Access Statement dated July 2016, Planning Statement (by Savills), Statement of Community Involvement dated July 2016, Bat Emergence Survey dated June 2016, Bird Breeding Survey dated June 2016, Reptile Survey dated May 2016, Site Wide Sustainable Drainage Strategy (Revision: X2 – Ref. J2393-Doc-06), Daylight and Sunlight report dated August 2016, Basement Impact Assessment (Including Site Investigation) (Revision: X1 – J2393-Doc-07), Air Quality Assessment dated September 2016, Transport Assessment dated September 2016, Travel Plan dated September 2016, Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report dated October 2016, Water Management Statement dated October 2016; Phase II Site Investigation Report dated July 2016; Heritage Statement dated September 2016; Biodiversity Strategy dated September 2016, Landscape Design Statement dated September 2016, Ecological Assessment dated June 2016, Arboricultural Implications Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement dated July 2016, Thermal Comfort Assessment dated September 2016, Energy Report dated September 2016, Block E South Elevation / Site Entrance Sketch (dated December 2016), Surface Water Exceedence Flow Path mark-up drawing dated 22nd November 2016.

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

3. Details of finishing materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development (including samples) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Brick treatments shall be demonstrated to be appropriately variegated. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references. Details of the finishing treatments for site boundaries and amenity screens shall also be provided as appropriate.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the applicant shall submit a heritage management strategy to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval that describes, with reference to the submitted Heritage Statement, how the historic elements of the existing site will be retained, restored and reused in the approved development as appropriate. In particular, the strategy shall:
 - describe how the iron railings to the east of the site are to be retained and restored;
 - consider the restoration and relocation within the application site of the main entrance doorway surround of the administration building;
 - describe how, and to what degree, tiles within the administration building will be reused in building entrance lobbys;
 - consider all other reasonable heritage retention/reused possibilities and describe how and to what degree they will be implemented.

Once approved the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to respect local heritage and therefore to comply with Paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policy SP12 of the Core Strategy.

5. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval three months prior to construction work commencing on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work (inc. demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Coppetts Road, Osier Crescent and the

roads surrounding the site is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation network.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the applicant is required to submit to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval Delivery and Service Plan (DSP), details of which must include servicing of the residential units including facilities to collect deliveries for residents when they are out via concierge or parcel drop.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation

7. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, 20% of car parking shall be provided with electric vehicle charging infrastructure, with a further 20% allocated for passive provision.

Reason: To provide residential charging facilities for Electric Vehicles and to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles consistent with Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies SP0 and SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.

8. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the type of cycle parking to be provided shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in discussion with Transport for London. A minimum 5% of cycle spaces should be suitable for enlarged cycles and the type of stand proposed must be clarified. The recommendations and requirements of the London Cycle Design Standards document should be followed.

Reason: In accordance with Policy 6.3 of the London Plan.

9. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water

Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

10. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 hours or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 hours or after 1300 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties consistent with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

11. No development shall take place on site until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall thereafter be carried out as approved. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; implementation programme]. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed drawings of:

- a. those existing trees to be retained.
- b. those existing trees to be removed.
- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are

removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Local Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

12. Prior to the commencement of works on site a meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (e.g. Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturist, Council Arboriculturist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees and discuss any construction works that may impact on the trees. Robust protective fencing / ground protection must be installed under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition and retained until the completion of construction activities. It must be designed and installed as recommended in the Arboricultural method statement. The tree protective measures must be inspected or approved by the Council Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition. The tree protective measures must be periodically checked the Consultant Arboriculturist and reports made available to the Council Arboriculturist. All construction works within root protection areas (RPA) or that may impact on them, must be carried out under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

13. No development shall proceed until details of all existing and proposed levels on the site in relation to the adjoining properties be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that any works in conjunction with the permission hereby granted respects the height of adjacent properties through suitable levels on the site.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no development with Classes A-G of Schedule 2 Part 1 of that Order shall

be carried out without the grant of planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to prevent overdevelopment of the site by controlling proposed extensions and alterations consistent with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

15. The development hereby approved shall be designed to Secured by Design Sections 2 and 3 Compliance.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets the Police standards for the physical protection of the building and its occupants. and to comply with Haringey Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11.

16. The development must be constructed in accordance with the energy efficiency standards as set out in the approved Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016.

Building Element	Proposed specification for the development (u-values)
External walls	0.15 (flats) 0.14 (houses)
Roof	0.18 (flats) 0.13 (houses)
Ground floor	0.13
Windows	1.2
Air tightness	4 m ³ /hr/m ² for houses 5 m ³ /hr/m ² in the flats

The development shall then be constructed and deliver the U-values set out in this document, thereby achieving the agreed carbon reduction of 3.3% beyond Building Regulations 2013 with a carbon saving of 3.3 tonnes. Confirmation that these energy efficiency standards and carbon reduction targets have been achieved must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority within 6 months from completion of works on site. This report will show emissions figures at design stage to demonstrate building regulations

compliance, and then report against the constructed building. The applicant must allow for site access if required to verify measures have been installed.

Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.

Reason: To comply with London Plan Policy 5.2 and local plan policy SP:04

17. All combination gas boilers that are to be installed in the 11 houses on the site are to have a minimum SEDBUK rating of 91%. The boilers shall also have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 20 mg/kWh @0% O₂. The applicant will demonstrate compliance by supplying installation specification documents within 3 months of completion of works on site. Once installed they shall be operated and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To comply with London Plan Policies 5.2 and 7.14, Local Plan Policy SP:04 and GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction.

18. Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority at least 6 months prior to any works commencing on site in respect of the site boiler facility and associated infrastructure, which will serve heat and hot water loads for all the flats on the site. The details shall include:
- a) a review of the feasibility of connection to neighbouring sites (specifically the school to the north)
 - b) location of the single energy centre which will contain all required plant;
 - c) specification of equipment (including thermal storage, number of boilers and floor plan of the plant room);
 - d) flue arrangement;
 - e) operation/management strategy;
 - f) the route and connections from the energy centre into all other blocks (from the basement of Block F into all units of blocks A, B, C, D and F; and
 - g) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any neighbouring heating network (including the proposed connectivity location, punch points through structure and route of the link)

The installation of the boiler facility and associated infrastructure shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, and shall be fully installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development. The facility/infrastructure shall be maintained as installed thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided and so that it is designed in a manner which allows for the future connection to a district system in line with London Plan policy 5.7 and Local Plan Policies SP:04 and DM 22.

19. Prior to commencement of the development details of the communal boiler must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority including evidence to show that the chimney stack/flue will be at a sufficient height and discharge velocity etc to disperse the exhaust emissions. The communal boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NO_x emissions not exceeding 40mg/kWh of dry NO_x (at 0% O₂). An Air Quality Neutral calculation for 'building emissions' shall also be provided.

Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan, the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction, and to protect local air quality.

20. The applicant will install the renewable energy technology (PV Solar Panels) as set out in the document Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016. This renewable technology will deliver a carbon saving of through the generation of 75.9kWp of electricity to the development site. Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.

Reason: To comply with London Plan Policy 5.7. and Local Plan Policy SP:04

21. The applicant must deliver the sustainability assessment as set out in the Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016. The development shall be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and shall achieve the rating of Home Quality Mark Level 3 for all units on the site, and shall be maintained as such thereafter. A post construction certificate shall be issued by an independent certification body, confirming this standard has been achieved. This must be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval within 6 months of completion on site.

In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the whole development, a full schedule and costs of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authority's approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.

Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2011) policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan.

22. Prior to the commencement of development on site details of the living roof shall submitted to and approved in writing by the local authority. The submitted details will include the following:

- a. A roof(s) plan identifying where the living roofs will be located (Blocks A, B, C, D, and F);
- b. Confirmation that the substrates depth range of between 100mm and 150mm across all the roof(s);
- c. Details on the diversity of substrate depths across the roof to provide contours of substrate. This could include substrate mounds in areas with the greatest structural support to provide a variation in habitat;
- d. Details on the diversity of substrate types and sizes;
- e. Details on bare areas of substrate to allow for self colonisation of local windblown seeds and invertebrates;
- f. Details on the range of native species of wildflowers and herbs planted to benefit native wildlife. The living roof will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native);
- g. Details of the location of log piles / flat stones for invertebrates;

Confirmation that the living roof will not be used for amenity or sitting out space of any kind will be required. Access will only be permitted for maintenance, repair or escape in an emergency.

The installation of the living roof(s) shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved by the Council, and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and supports the water retention on site during rainfall. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13.

23. Prior to commencement of works on site details of the living wall on Block F facing the Pocket Green, shall submitted to and approved in writing by the local authority. The submitted details will include the following:

- a. Plan(s) identifying where the living walls will be located and what surface area they will cover;
- b. Details on the substrate depths across the walls;
- c. Details on the diversity of substrate types and sizes;
- d. Details on the range of native plant species to benefit native wildlife. The living wall will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native);

- e. Details of the watering regime and commentary on how this will be sustainably watered in the future.

The living wall(s) shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved by the Council, and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and screening for the development. In accordance with Policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local plan policy SP:05 and SP:13.

24. The Biodiversity features as set out in Coppetts Wood Biodiversity Strategy dated 16th September 2016, by Ireland Albrecht, must be delivered as part of the development hereby approved. This will include:

- The incorporation of at least 15 bird boxes into the northern side of the development buildings and neighbouring trees;
- The incorporation of at least 8 bat boxes into the northern side of the development buildings and neighbouring trees.

The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance with these details, and the developer shall provide evidence of these measures being installed to the local planning authority no later than 3 months after construction works have completed. Once installed these measures shall be maintained in perpetuity and if necessary replaced as approved.

In the event that these measures are not installed a full schedule and costs of remedial works required to achieve a similar level of biodiversity improvements on site shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority within 4 months of the completion of works on site. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authority's approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13.

25. To demonstrate that there is minimal risk of overheating, the results of dynamic thermal modelling (in respect of London's future temperature projections) for internal spaces will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 6 months prior to any works commencing on site. Any measures required to mitigate overheating shall be operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. The model and report should include

details of the design measures incorporated within the scheme (including details of the feasibility of using external solar shading and passive ventilation) to ensure adaptation to higher temperatures are addressed and the units do not overheat. Air Conditioning will not be supported unless exceptional justification is given.

Once approved the development shall be constructed in accordance with the details so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: London Plan Policy 5.9 and Local Plan Policy SP:04 and in the interest of adapting to climate change and to secure sustainable development.

26. Before development commences other than for investigative work:

- a. A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- b. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:-
 - a risk assessment to be undertaken,
 - refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
 - the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.
- c. The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.
- d. If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.

Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: London Plan Policy 5.9 and Local Plan Policy SP:04 and in the interest of adapting to climate change and to secure sustainable development.

27. To demonstrate that there is minimal noise disturbance to future residents of the proposed properties, the applicant shall submit a report to be approved in writing the Local Planning Authority that considers the installation of noise mitigation measures identified in the detailed Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report by Hann Tucker Associates and provides them where possible.

Once approved the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with emerging Policy DM1 of the Local Plan.

28. No works shall be carried out on site until a detailed Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP), detailing the management of demolition and construction dust, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall be in accordance with the GLA Dust and Emissions Control SPG and shall also include a Dust Risk Assessment.

Reason: To comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan.

29. No works shall commence on site until all plant and machinery to be used at the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Evidence is required to meet Stage IIIA of EU Directive 97/68/ EC for both NO_x and PM. No works shall be carried out on site until all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant to be used on the site of net power between 37kW and 560 kW has been registered at <http://nrmm.london/>. Proof of registration must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works on site. An inventory of all NRMM must be kept on site during the course of the demolitions, site preparation and construction phases. All machinery should be regularly serviced and service logs kept on site for inspection. Records should be kept on site which details

proof of emission limits for all equipment. This documentation should be made available to local authority officers as required until development completion.

Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE : In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

INFORMATIVE : Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £173,767 (4,039.7 sqm x £35 x 1.229) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,128,328.61 (4.39.7sqm x £265 x 1.054).

INFORMATIVE : Party Wall Act: The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE : The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE : The London Fire Brigade strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposals relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to businesses and housing providers, and can reduce the risk to life. The Brigade opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems in order to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupier. .

INFORMATIVE : With regards to surface water drainage, it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water course, or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water, it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer

Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921.

INFORMATIVE : Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you email us a scaled ground floor plan of your property showing the proposed work and the complete sewer layout to developer.services@thameswater.co.uk to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required.

INFORMATIVE : Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.

INFORMATIVE : A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality

INFORMATIVE : Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

INFORMATIVE: The development hereby approved shall be completed in accordance with the associated Section 106 & Section 278 agreements.

Appendix 1: Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies