

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

**Monday, 7th March, 2016, 7.00 pm - Civic Centre, High Road, Wood Green, N22 8LE**

**Members:** Councillors Peray Ahmet (Chair), Vincent Carroll (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, David Beacham, John Bevan, Clive Carter, Natan Doron, Toni Mallett, James Patterson, James Ryan and Elin Weston

**7. ST LUKES WOODSIDE HOSPITAL WOODSIDE AVENUE N10 3JA (PAGES 1 - 8)**

A s73 planning application for the variation of Condition 2 (plans and specifications) and Condition 41 (occupancy) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2379 and an application for a Deed of Variation to the s106 Legal Agreement.

**RECOMMENDATION:** grant permission subject to conditions and subject to the variation of the terms of the original s106 Legal Agreement

**Additional letter from the applicant, Hanover Housing Ltd.**

Maria Fletcher  
Tel – 020 8489 1512  
Fax – 020 8881 5218  
Email:maria.fletcher@haringey.gov.uk

Bernie Ryan  
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer  
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

4 March 2016

This page is intentionally left blank



2<sup>nd</sup> March 2016

London Borough of Haringey  
Planning, Regeneration & Economy  
Level 6  
River Park House  
Wood Green  
N22 8HQ

Nelson House  
Alington Road,  
Eynesbury  
St Neots  
Cambridgeshire  
PE19 6RE

07714973093  
www.hanover.org.uk

**Re: Section 73 application - St Luke's Woodside Hospital,  
Woodside Avenue, N10 3JA**

**Planning Application Reference: HGY/2016/0242**

Dear Councillor

I am writing to you as the Deputy Director of Development at Hanover to provide some background on why we are requesting the changes in the application to be heard at the Committee Meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> March.

After being granted planning consent in April 2014, the development at the former St Luke's Hospital is well under way on site, with the first homes due for completion by the end of the year.

As you may recall, the development is for 161 homes, 70% of which is age restricted with 30% affordable housing being delivered. It is being developed by Hanover, in partnership with Hill Residential.

We have submitted a Section 73 application to vary Condition 2 (plans and specifications) and Condition 41 (occupancy) attached to the planning permission HGY/2013/2379 and an application for a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 legal agreement.

The amendments that we are proposing, and the reasons for why we feel these are crucial for the success of the project are as follows:

**1. To omit the age restriction on four of the Co-housing houses, to be reclassified as family homes.**

These houses are located in the Cohousing area of the development. We have found, since marketing the houses to cohousing members since early January that the age restriction applied to these four units is detracting potential purchasers. The design of

the dwellings, as three storey town houses is more appropriate to families than to those over 55.

Furthermore, the age restriction would also limit marketing potential and demand for the houses should the houses not be sold to Cohousing purchasers and they revert to sale on the open market.

Therefore this amendment is requested in order to enable these four houses to be sold to any purchaser, whether Cohousing or on the open market. This would also regularize these dwellings with the remaining three storey town houses on the development which are family dwellings, not age restricted.

An additional education contribution has been agreed with the Council to address the impact of the increase in family units on the local schools.

### **2. Amendment to Roseneath and Norton Lees buildings basements**

For the Roseneath building the changes involve demolition of existing walls to be rebuilt to match the existing, internal remodelling including new basement staircase.

For the Norton Lees building, the changes requested are internal remodelling, external works/landscaping amendments and rebuilding and enlargement of existing basement lightwells.

These changes are required in order to address some improvements in the scheme which have been identified as needed since detailed design work has been undertaken. We are proposing to rebuild to match the existing; using a combination of existing salvaged bricks and bricks 'to match the existing'. Our plans are in keeping with the nature of the buildings and have been drawn up in consultation with the Planning Officer Aaron Lau and Haringey's Principal Conservation Officer Nairita Chakraborty. Our architects PTE have produced a Letter of Justification providing further detail on the reasons for the requested changes to these two buildings which we enclose with this letter.

### **3. Deed of Variation of S106 Agreement - Amendment to restriction of occupation of market units.**

At present the restriction prevents the occupation of any Market housing until all the affordable housing units are ready for occupation.

We are requesting that this is amended to allow for the occupation of Market housing once blocks WB1, WB2 and WB3 are complete and ready for occupation. This means 23 of the 48 affordable units will be ready for occupation before any market housing can be occupied. This equates to almost 50% of the affordable.

Planning officers have advised that the 30 cohousing dwellings can be classed as affordable housing, as they are offered for discounted market sale. If including these in



the figures, the proposed amendment would equate to 44 of the 78 affordable properties (56%) being completed before any market sale will be occupied.

This amendment is required because the current drafting of the s.106 means that we will be unable to sell 62 homes, the majority of which will be ready for occupation some eight months before the completion of the final affordable housing property. This would involve properties sitting empty for several months, and cause a great inconvenience to purchasers who will have reserved or exchanged on properties which they cannot complete on. As the affordable housing is pepper-potted through the development, it is not possible to accelerate the construction of the remaining affordable housing to mitigate the issue. However, an amendment to the restriction will allow for the earlier delivery of much needed homes in the Borough.

I hope this provides some useful background into the reasons why the proposed amendments have been requested and I hope they will be considered acceptable to the Council.

I will be available to answer any questions you may have at the Committee Meeting next Monday.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tracy Baker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line above the first name.

p.p. Claire Anderson  
Deputy to the Executive Director of Development



London Borough Of Haringey  
Planning, Regeneration & Economy  
Level 6  
River Park House  
Wood Green  
N22 8HQ

15 January 2016  
Letter Of Justification  
11-463

Dear Sirs/ Madams,

ST LUKE'S HOSPITAL, London N10  
Norton Lees & Roseneath Section 73 Application  
Letter Of Justification

Subsequent to the Planning & Listed Building Approvals of April 2014 for this site, a process of design development has taken place where the intent has been to – where possible – improve on the existing approved proposals to the benefit of the building and those who will occupy it. This process has included a rigorous re-examination of all aspects of the scheme, internally and externally, to confirm, before the actual conversion and restoration work begins, that we are pursuing the best possible outcome.

This process has included:

#### ROSENEATH

##### Existing East Extension – Proposal to Demolish & Rebuild 'To Match Existing'

The original Planning Consent drawing PL050B intends (but does not actually identify) the retention of the north and east elevations of the existing East Extension as part of the works. However, the same drawing also shows a Basement footprint which does not match that of the actual existing Basement, as may be seen from the EDI survey drawing 13006/RO/F/01-04. This mismatch makes it, in practice, extremely difficult to retain the existing north and east external walls as digging out the basement to the footprint shown would undermine them.

In discussion with Nairita Chakraborty and Aaron Lau, we have proposed that these existing north and east walls be demolished because:

- a) Demolition would eliminate the requirement for complex temporary works to support the existing north and east walls during demolition of the existing extension, basement excavation, piling, pouring of concrete etc
- b) Demolition would avoid the necessity to implement challenging foundation strategies to successfully incorporate the existing extension footings into the new piled foundations
- c) Demolition would remove the health & safety risks associated with façade retention works
- d) Demolition would eliminate the risk of differential movement between the two retained walls and new adjoining construction

There is an additional issue that requires consideration. The footprint of the new East Addition is more than double that of the existing extension. If the north and east walls

#### Senior Partners

Andrew Beharrell  
Teresa Borsuk  
Stephen Fisher

#### Partners

Patrick Devlin  
Roger Holdsworth  
Dominique Oliver  
Tricia Patel  
Kaye Stout  
Carl Vann

were to be retained, the question arises of how to relate these walls to the new external walls forming the east and south sides of the new East Addition as there will not, from the demolition of the remainder of the east extension, be sufficient salvaged bricks to complete the New Addition without providing either additional new bricks 'to match existing' or salvaged bricks of similar appearance from a salvage company.

We consider it will be next to impossible to match the existing brickwork with the old.

There would really only be one way to address this and that is to accept the differences between the two wall types, old and new, by providing a clear defining line between them in the form of a vertical movement joint. This will look most odd in the context of the new Additions that are to be built adjoining both Roseneath and Norton Lees, especially when viewed against the existing buildings which will present no such anomaly.

On the other hand, demolition of the existing walls would permit the building of the new East Addition 'in keeping' with the clear design intent of the new respecting the old and yet not being compromised by it. Here we mean that the Addition external walls would be constructed using the salvaged bricks from demolition together with new or salvaged to match existing bricks, carefully sorted such that the overall appearance of the Extension would be uniform rather than divided. Better still, in our view, the Extension would be subtly different from all the other buildings yet still very much 'in keeping'. And the requirement for movement joints at the junction of the new walls where they abut the existing building will further assist in defining the Extension's identity.

To summarize, we recommend demolition of the existing extension north and east walls and rebuilding 'to match existing' as shown on our drawings, using a combination of existing salvaged bricks and bricks 'to match existing' for all three elevations.

## Dwelling Internal Layouts

Unit RN1: adjustment of Bedroom and Kitchen/Living/Dining to permit double bedroom minimum area of 12.0m<sup>2</sup>

Unit RN2: provision of more storage to Basement & services cupboard to Ground Floor

Unit RN3: existing living room retained in its entirety apart from new partitions & kitchen area; retention with relocation of existing double doors & frame between Bedroom & Kitchen/Living/Dining (fire & acoustic lining on one side); introduction of building services cupboard

Unit RN4: reconfiguration of dwelling to provide sleeping accommodation on the First Floor with Living & Dining accommodation on Ground & Basement floors

Unit RN5: Ground Floor Shower omitted for WC & Utility area

Unit RN6: First Floor Bathroom converted to Shower to permit better Bedroom 2 plan; Second Floor Shower omitted for Bathroom

Unit RN7: dwelling replanned to permit existing window to be retained (Bathroom relocated & Bedrooms reconfigured with new Ensuite to Bedroom 1)

Unit RN8: First Floor Bathroom revised to WC & Utility area; Second Floor Bedroom 1 Shower revised to Bathroom; additional storage provided

Unit RN9: dwelling replanned to match Unit RN7 under; two existing dormer windows omitted for three new dormer windows to match existing but wider so as to permit better use of space due to raking ceilings



## Fireplaces

All existing fireplaces are to be retained where the conversion plans permit

## NORTON LEES

### Dwelling Internal Layouts

Ground Floor Common Entrance Hall: existing lobby and entrance hall (the first two spaces) retained in their entirety

Unit NL1: Bedroom 2 Ensuite relocated within bedroom area; Shower given over to Store & new Bathroom located adjacent stair; Home Cinema area reconfigured with additional storage; existing original door & frame to Living/Dining retained fixed-closed with fire & acoustic lining within opening; Living/Dining room retained in its entirety except for new opening to new kitchen area

Unit NL2: Basement storage reconfigured to permit retention of existing door opening; Living/Dining area retained in its entirety

Unit NL3: double-height living space omitted; dwelling replanned to provide sleeping accommodation on Mezzanine level with living accommodation on Ground Floor

Unit NL4: revised to a 3 Bedroom 5 Person dwelling (was 3 Bedroom 4 Person) by omitting the double-height living space; dwelling replanned to provide sleeping accommodation on Mezzanine level with living accommodation on Ground Floor

Unit NL8: Hall & Store reconfigured; originally separate Living/Dining & Kitchen combined

Unit NL9: storage reconfigured

Unit NL10: Utility/Store enlarged

Unit NL11: Bathroom relocated to permit new Utility/Store

Unit NL15: Kitchen/Living/Dining rearranged & 2 no. existing later windows bricked up; Bedroom 1 Ensuite reduced in size & storage increased; Bedroom 3 Ensuite omitted for general use Bathroom; Bedroom 1 & Ensuite omitted for new Study; Sun Room fenestration revised

Unit NL16: storage reconfigured

Unit NL17: Utility/Store enlarged

## Fireplaces

All existing fireplaces are to be retained where the conversion plans permit

### East Addition External Works/Landscaping

When reviewing this area to the immediate east of the new East Addition, we considered the original arrangement of a large terrace for each dwelling, contained within surrounding retaining walls, to be somewhat less than attractive as an external space because it is confined to the lower ground level of the new Addition.

We are therefore now proposing a three-tier approach of a perimeter path around the new Addition at lower ground floor level, from which access is gained to a raised terrace from which, via a staircase, the upper garden level is reached which retains existing ground levels.

Finally, you will see, by direct comparison with the existing Consent drawings and those we have now submitted for a new Consent, that considerably more information is appended to the new drawings than was previously the case, with clear delineation of existing to-be-retained construction, that to be demolished, new partitions etc accompanied by concise notes on intended works, materials and construction; much architectural detail (e.g. the area railings, the window surrounds etc) has been added.

We trust the above will satisfy your requirements but should you require anything further from us, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AB', written over a thin, curved line that suggests a signature line.

Adrian Bagley  
Senior Technician

Pollard Thomas Edwards