

**Addendum
20 March 2018
Planning Sub Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 20 March 2018**ADDENDUM REPORTS FOR ITEM 8, 9 and 10****UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8**

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Reference No: HGY/2017 / 2886 | Ward: Noel Park |
| Address: Iceland, Land off Brook Road and Mayes Road, N22 | |
| Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of a 6-9 storey building providing 161 residential flats (Use Class C3), medical centre (Use Class D1), retail (Use Classes A1-A4) and a flexible retail / office unit (Use Classes A1-A4 and B1), plus associated infrastructure and landscaping works. | |
| Applicant: Austringer Ltd. | |
| Ownership: Private / Public | |

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

The following matters are points of clarification or correction and also respond to representations received following publication of the committee report.

PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

The proposal has been amended from the 160 units detailed in the Committee report to 161 units. There is no change to the number of units shown on plan but the schedule of accommodation has been amended. The unit mix would 29% one bed, 65% two beds and 6% three (3) beds, instead of the mix of 29% one bed, 66% two bed and 5% three bed detailed in the published report.

POINT OF CLARIFICATION

Section 6.15.12 should read '4 x 3 bed London Affordable Rent', instead of the "3 x 4 bed London Affordable Rent" detailed in the report.

HEADS OF TERMS

Alternative use of medical centre as private medical centre used by NHS GPs

Amended bus route contribution to £80,000

CONDITION AMENDMENT

Condition no.28 has been amended following review of the comments from the Council's Tree Officer insofar as the size and siting of the replacement trees has been accepted and that only a greater variety of native species is requested. The amended condition is detailed below:

28. Tree replacement

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed native species of replacement trees shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall be planted in accordance with the tree planting plans hereby approved. Any tree or plant on the development (including roof top amenity areas) which, within a period of five years of occupation of the approved development 1) dies 2) is removed 3) becomes damaged or 4) becomes diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species of tree or plant.

Reason: To retain the character and appearance of the site and to protect the amenity of local residents in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

Additional condition, required in order to satisfy EA comments.

40. Notwithstanding the approved plans, a revised parking layout demonstrating how access for maintenance / works to the Moselle River will be maintained, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall thereafter be built only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the Moselle River and its potential for future de-culverting in accordance with Policy SP5 of the Haringey Local Plan, DM28 of the Haringey DM DPD.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION COMMENT:

Additional consultation responses following 14 days re-consultation on revised plans

4 written responses received, as follows:

| Stakeholder | Comment | Response |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Neighbour | Committee report published before the consultation expires | Comments included in this addendum form part of the formal consideration. |
| | Development of Bittern Place should not be compromised | The indicative Masterplan represents a reasonable approach to these neighbouring sites. |
| | Speculative Masterplan | As above and detailed in the published report, this is an indicative Masterplan and only seeks to show that development can reasonably be developed. |
| | No details of height or density | Site elevations in context show a building of 8 – 9 storeys depicted in parts of Bittern Place and lower height in the northern corner of the site. No density or internal layouts would be required at this stage. |
| | Relative public realm of Bittern Place to application site | The Bittern Place public realm quantum would not be dependent |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | on what is provided in this site and the footprint of the buildings is considered to be a reasonable rather than required layout. |
| | No details of how infrastructure such as cycle / pedestrian routes will be achieved | The S106 requires contribution to this. Public realm design and hard landscaping conditions shall ensure a coherent approach between the sites. |
| | Shortcomings of the scoping daylight/sunlight studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omission of the northern most block – may have the lowest VSC scores | Officers were aware of the omission of the northern most corner of the Bittern Place site and informed the applicant of this. However, the VLC daylight and sunlight scoping study had already been undertaken on the draft submission. It is considered that the smaller block in that submission could still be achieved and receive sufficient levels that this would not be a significant design constraint for that site. That part of the site would be comparable with the other blocks shown on plan. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on 3 of the windows | As detailed in the published report, the worst affected could be mitigated by use, design and layout consideration and would not be a significant constraint on future development of that site. It is noted that emerging WGAAP SA18 requires a mixed use on this site, so non-residential in ground floor at least would be likely to be incorporated into design. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No study of the impact on the internal living of the application site if Bittern Place was to be developed in this manner | The first floor windows immediately opposite Bittern Place will serve the medical centre. Of the residential windows above, a number of units are dual aspect and/or have a sufficient VLC range, high number of windows and open plan design that would be unlikely to significantly restrict development of Bittern Place. It should be noted that the published report refers to low teen VLC levels as acceptable in this urban context and that figure would reasonably be applied to these windows in |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | future. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient detail to ensure that development not compromised in other parts of the site allocation, contrary to policy. Full assessment should be undertaken prior to approval of either of the sites | As detailed above, there are some ambiguities, which are to be expected in a Masterplan sketch. These are not considered to be significant to suggest that the proposed scale and massing on this site would significantly prejudice that of any future submission on the other parts of the site allocation. |
| | Air quality deficiencies | Additional Air Quality assessments have been submitted but have not been reviewed by the Environmental Health Officers. Regardless, these are conditioned and can be dealt with at a later date. |
| | Lack of a 7m buffer between the site boundary. Agreed on St William site to ensure privacy and ensure sufficient outlook | The Iceland site is a narrower strip and smaller site than that of St William and each footprint was considered on individual merits. The angled flank wall of the closest part of the proposed building is considered to provide sufficient space between this and the northern block of the St William development. Furthermore, the allowance for the space on that site was also to provide an ecological corridor as part of that Masterplan. |
| | Side windows facing onto the approved northern block at St William | Covered in the published report. Top floor balcony has been removed and side windows would be obscure glazed. |
| | Height out of keeping with area | Covered in report with regards to the site allocations, adopted and emerging aspirations for the area. Also notes the height of The Mall on the other side of Mayes Road. |
| | Tunneling effect | The active frontages and broken up frontage are considered to avoid this. As above, the aspiration for the area is for higher development than existing. |
| | Retail should be focused in the High Street | The retail units are focused in the northern end and act as an end of town form, as detailed in the published report and in accordance with adopted and emerging site allocations. |
| | Heights should respect the maximum height relationship with Hornsey Park | The Heartlands site has a buffer in the form of the ecological |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Road, as per Heartlands approval | corridor. That site is also not a comparable size / shape to this site. Broadly the application site has a greater separation from the rear gardens of Hornsey Park Road and for the most part retains the seven storey height of Heartlands. |
| | AAP concerns | This is not a consultation for AAP document, which has its own separate consultation. |
| | Nine storeys too high, impact on amenity and design out of keeping. Non-compliance with affordable housing policy. | These are all covered in the published report. |
| | Density too high and no family provision. | As above. |
| | Certificate B not issued / ownership | The applicant confirmed that Iceland had been informed prior to submission and subsequently re-issued the application with certificate B signed. |
| | Loss of the established Iceland store. Loss would be to the detriment of the vitality and viability of the area. | Retail provision is proposed within the site and loss of the larger retail floorspace is acceptable. The mixed uses are compatible with the town centre siting and will contribute positively to the site allocation. |
| 64 template letters of support also submitted | Support of medical centre use, high quality development, affordable housing, employment and improved infrastructures. | Noted. |

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM 9

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 9

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Reference No: HGY/2017/3020 | Ward: Noel Park |
| Address: Land at the Chocolate Factory and Parma House, 5 Clarendon Road N22 6XJ | |
| Proposal: Partial demolition, change of use and extension of the Chocolate Factory buildings. Demolition of the remaining buildings and redevelopment to create four new build blocks ranging in height from three up to 18 storeys. Mixed use development comprising 10,657 sq.m (GIA) of commercial floorspace (flexible Use Classes A1, A3, B1, D1 and D2), 230 Class C3 residential units together with associated residential and commercial car parking, public realm works and access. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. | |

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

WG042 Chocolate Factory Methodology and WG044 Final Images prepared by Hayes Davidson and dated March 2018 containing fully rendered views imagery and St William’s Haringey Heartland scheme in line form.

PL-BE-BD-100 Rev C, PL-BE—201 Rev C, L33-03 Rev C, and L33-06 Rev C to amend south facing duplex units in Block E so kitchen/dining room will have a window and integral garage will be accessed from ground floor parking area.

Computer generated images 1415_010_71_00-W, 1415_040_71_00, 1415_060_71_00-W, and 1415_020_71_00 received.

Letter communication from GL Hearn to Barton Willmore dated 15/03/18 with daylight / sunlight testing. Statement of conformity from RDWI dated 13/03/18 and RWDI response to wind and microclimate review dated 09/03/18.

AMENDMENT OF S106 HEADS OF TERMS

Affordable housing review is to be amended so any additional affordable housing uplift is provided as a financial contribution and not on site.

Carbon offsetting was published at a rate of £1,600 but should actually be £1,800. Therefore the contribution towards addressing the unachieved carbon reduction targets, is £309,060 to be paid upon the implementation of the planning permission. The associated paragraph in the Committee Report should be amended to reflect this also.

AMENDMENT / REMOVAL OF CONDITIONS

A number of conditions have been amended following discussion with the applicant's planning consultant and additional comments received.

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with revised plans **amended to reflect additional plans**
- 3) Minimum B1 Employment floorspace **amended to reflect use class is defined as 'Business' not 'Employment'**
- 4) Use class restrictions
- 5) Use hours
- 6) Materials to be approved **amended and split into three conditions for ease of discharge**
- 7) Site parking management plan
- 8) Cycle parking design **removal of this condition as already in accordance with**
- 9) Electric charging facilities
- 10) Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management Plan
- 11) Network Rail Glare Study **amended to be required prior to the commencement of any above ground works**
- 12) External lighting
- 13) Crossrail 2 operations protection
- 14) Pilling method statement
- 15) Construction hours
- 16) Hard/soft landscaping
- 17) Sustainable drainage details **amended to be required prior to the commencement of any above ground works**
- 18) Drainage Management Maintenance Schedule
- 19) Revised air quality assessment
- 20) Chimneys
- 21) Combustion and energy plan
- 22) Contamination 1
- 23) Contamination 2
- 24) Management and control of dust **amended to allow this to be provided after any contaminated land investigation works occur**
- 25) Non-road mobile machinery **amended to allow this to be provided after any contaminated land investigation works occur**
- 26) Non-road mobile machinery inventory
- 27) Decommissioning of abstraction well(s)
- 28) Secured by Design accreditation/certification
- 29) Wind and micro-climate clarification strategy **removal of this condition to account for the required clarification being provided and deemed acceptable**
- 30) Internal noise levels **amend to remove external amenity and new condition recommended to ensure external balconies achieve acceptable levels of noise (wording to be amended in consultation with GLA).**
- 31) Sound insulation – residential **amended to be required prior to the commencement of any above ground works**
- 32) Sound insulation – commercial **amended to be required prior to the commencement of any above ground works**
- 33) Plant noise restriction
- 34) Boiler facility **amended so connection to DEN to be subject to final heat price to the users**
- 35) Construction standard of energy network
- 36) Confirmation of achieving energy efficiency standards and carbon reduction targets
- 37) BREEAM and home quality **amended to remove code for sustainable homes and contribution towards offsite remedial action**
- 38) Overheating **amended to be required prior to the commencement of any above ground works**

- 39) Accessible dwellings
- 40) Wheelchair unit provision
- 41) Central satellite dish
- 42) Broadband **amended to remove requirement for written approval**
- 43) Business and Community Liaison Construction Group
- 44) Residential Design Standards
- 45) Residential Access

GREAT LONDON AUTHORITY STAGE ONE

The Mayor considers that whilst the application is broadly supported in strategic planning terms it does not fully comply with the London Plan and draft London Plan.

- No detailed assessment of residential design standards compliance [*Officer comment: condition recommended below*]
- Noise mitigation measures required [*Officer Note: condition 30 deals with this*].
- Some family units do not have direct access to amenity deck [*Officer note: Family duplex units in Block E will be given fobs to gain access to communal amenity space – condition recommended below*].
- Access to open space at Alexandra Palace Park is significantly impeded by Railway Line [*Officer Note: Improvements to Penstock Tunnel are programmed outside the scope of this planning application*].
- Further clarification of over-heating study, energy efficiency modelling and heat network required [*Officer Note: Condition 38 seeks further information and revisions to condition 34 will seek single energy centre*].

Amended condition 34:

Boiler facility

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, details of the boiler facility and associated infrastructure shall be submitted which will serve heat and hot water loads for all for all residential units and commercial units on the site.

This shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority six months prior to any works commencing on site. The details shall include:

- a) Location of a single energy centre to serve the site;
- b) Specification of equipment and operational standards of the site wide network (advice and expected standards can be provided by the Council);
- c) Flue arrangement and air quality mitigation measures;
- d) Operation/management strategy;
- e) The method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed and funded to connect to the Wood Green heating network (including the proposed connectivity locations, punch points through structure and route of the link) ;and
- f) Agreement to connect to the Wood Green DEN within a 5 year period of competition on site.

These boiler facilities and infrastructure shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

No change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Additional conditions:

43. For the duration of the construction phase of development the Applicant will establish and maintain a Liaison Group having the purpose of:

- a) informing local residents and businesses of the design and development proposals;
- b) informing local residents and businesses of progress of preconstruction and construction activities;
- c) considering methods of working such as hours and site traffic;
- d) providing local residents and businesses with an initial contact for information relating to the development and for comments or complaints regarding the development with the view of resolving any concerns that might arise;
- e) producing a leaflet prior to commencement of demolition for distribution to local residents and businesses identifying progress of the Development and which shall include an invitation to register an interest in the Liaison Group;
- f) providing advanced notice of exceptional works or deliveries;
- g) providing telephone contacts for resident's advice and concerns.

The terms of reference for the Liaison Group should be submitted to the Council for approval prior to commencement of the development. The Liaison Group will meet at least once every month with the first meeting taking place one month prior to the commencement of development and the meetings shall become bimonthly after the expiry of a period of four (4) months thereafter or at such longer period as the Liaison Group shall agree.

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory communication with residents, businesses and local stakeholders throughout the construction of the development.

44. Residential Design Standards

Prior to any above ground works, full details of how the residential units meet the residential design standards as set out in part D of Policy D4 of the draft London Plan and thereafter shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to ensure acceptable living standards for future occupiers of the residential premises.

45. Residential Access

Fobs shall be provided for occupants of the family units in order to obtain access to the communal amenity space of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In order to ensure an acceptable living environment for future occupiers of the residential premises.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION / REPRESENTATION RESPONSES

| Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
|----------------|--|----------------|
| INTERNAL | | |
| Design Officer | <p><u>Sensitivity Testing Results</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant has submitted sensitivity tests, assessing daylight and wind microclimate testing on potential development of neighbouring sites following construction of this application proposals (as amended late in the application process), the neighbouring Clarendon Square development as approved recently and these other neighbouring sites. The sites tested are immediately neighbouring sites that are likely to be developed, and the form of development shown has been agreed in consultation with Haringey Council officers. They show taller buildings at one corner of each block along Coburg Road, and the maximum possible extent of medium rise development across the rest of the relevant blocks, stepping down considerably to lower rise development adjacent to the Wood Green Common Conservation Area. 2. The daylight achieved to the notional neighbouring sites show that this application proposals, as amended, the approved scheme and maximal development of all these neighbouring sites would still enable good levels of daylight to these neighbouring sites. The places that would not get such good daylight levels are the lower floors and are very close to blank flank walls. Lower floors will be less likely to be in residential use; lively, active frontage and a proportion of employment use are required in site allocations to these sites. To achieve a strong definition of streets and spaces, that are comfortable and safe to use, and to achieve a clear distinction between public and private space, it is preferable for blank flank walls to be built up-to or very close-to. The applicants' consultants demonstrate that in the rest of these potential neighbouring developments, adequate daylight is easily achievable. 3. The wind microclimate analysis is a qualitative assessment, from the experienced wind assessors responsible for the quantitative analysis (derived by wind tunnel testing) in the original proposals. In this, as in the revisions to their original assessment to incorporate changes to the application proposed scheme, the assessment is an expert interpretation of the likely changes to the effects | Comments noted |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | <p>originally modelled after adding these neighbouring sites. They did not carry out new wind tunnel or Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling of either their revised proposals or of potential development on neighbouring sites. Their professional judgement of the amendments to their scheme in February was that the changes, including the addition of a taller element to the north-western corner of Block D, would not have a significant effect on their original assessment. This was that with their suggested landscaping refinements, acceptable and good wind conditions would prevail in the public and private amenity spaces within and close to the proposed development. Their latest professional judgement, of the cumulative effects of their amended proposed development and approved and potential neighbouring developments, is that the cumulative developments would not significantly change wind conditions within the spaces around this development. They do warn that the effect of all the cumulative development may lead to fairly windy conditions along Coburg Road, suitable for leisure walking and standing, but not for sitting, but officers consider it would be reasonable to expect developments actually along Coburg Road, rather than The Chocolate Factory, to be those that mitigate this.</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p>4. The applicants' consultants' sensitivity testing assessed the cumulative effect of this development, the other nearby approved development at Clarendon Square, and other likely or possible developments on other sites surrounding Chocolate Factory on daylight and wind microclimate conditions. They demonstrate to officers that the effects on both daylight and wind would be within the range that the design of those developments could make satisfactory.</p> | |
| EXTERNAL | | |
| Design out Crime | <p>I can confirm our office has met with the project architects or agents to discuss the intention around Secured by Design (SbD) as laid out in L.B. Haringey' SP11 policy, The London Plan.</p> <p>I have not met with the Architects in person and have only recently been privy to the notes from the meeting between my colleague and the Architect.</p> <p>I have reviewed the planning application, Architects notes and my previous colleague's comments and whilst I accept that efforts have been made by the Architect to address some of the issues and concerns, a development of this size and location within the London Borough of Haringey requires accreditation to provide evidence that crime, disorder and security have been given serious consideration.</p> <p>Therefore, I request that the project design team complete the relevant SbD application</p> | Condition recommended |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | forms to achieve accreditation at the earliest opportunity as requested in the previous representation by my colleague. | |
| NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES | | |
| | Application does not address key issues with relocation of Collage Arts. Expensive studios and housing threaten to sweep local community needs away. | Affordable workspace and housing has been proposed. |
| | 18 storeys is too high and would dominate the area. Tower blocks have proved to be a problem for future generations. | Tall buildings are accepted by policy in this area and harm to views/heritage assets have been outweighed by design and public benefit. |
| | Proximity of Block B to Safestore building could prejudice the development potential of Safestore by expecting future development to accommodate the appropriate offset distance instead of sharing the burden. Could also prejudice amenity and received light levels in properties on either side | Sensitivity testing has been undertaken on surrounding properties which will be developed as identified in the site allocations. Accepted that this intensified urban development will result in some limitations but that careful design and placement of mixed use development can overcome. |
| | <p>Wider masterplan does not demonstrate a coordinated approach to delivery of wider area and therefore undermines the development viability and deliverability of Guillemot Place. Significant separation between Chocolate Factory and indicative building as well as a wide road continuing Clarendon Rd is unrealistic and would be unviable to develop.</p> <p>Acknowledge that masterplan is indicative only but believe applicant should demonstrate coordinated approach and should therefore show a reasonable scheme.</p> <p>Committee report states that wider masterplan is 'broadly acceptable' but does not explain on what basis this is found.</p> <p>The necessary redevelopment to secure the north south route may never come forward, unless the detailed vision for this area is jointly considered and coordinated by the Council and the landowners. As it stands, the Masterplan does not demonstrate the coordinated approach to securing the Council's key vision to provide a cycle/pedestrian link.</p> <p>Concerned with Officers' assertion that a route as wide as 5m could be accommodated on the site with development "squeezed onto" the remaining site, without</p> | <p>Chocolate Factory is an existing building located very close to the boundary so not unreasonable to expect some form of setback. Vehicular access would be required.</p> <p>Accept this. Need to acknowledge site constraints of Guillemot Place.</p> <p>Indicative masterplan but note site constraints of surrounding.</p> <p>Developer indicates a phased approach to vehicular/pedestrian/cycle uses to thoroughfare.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>demonstrating how this can actually be achieved. We consider that a 5m route is excessive to the extent that it threatens the potential for a viable and deliverable scheme to come forward on Guillemot Place.</p> <p>The Masterplan prepared by the applicant is not accompanied by a daylight and sunlight assessment to provide an indication of how amenity burdens are shared between the Application Site and surrounding development sites. Therefore, it is not possible for the Council to ensure that there are appropriate measures in place so that the burden of safeguarding satisfactory amenity for all development sites is shared across the development sites. We are concerned that the application is being recommended for approval without a proper consideration of the Proposed Development's relationship to the surrounding development sites, which could cost the delivery of Guillemot Place's redevelopment which is fundamentally necessary to achieve the Council's objective to secure a cycle/pedestrian route and the creation of the cultural quarter.</p> <p>We emphasise that Guillemot Place is currently operational and relies entirely on vehicular access via Clarendon Road, as it is the only access to the site. There is no condition which seeks an appropriate interim arrangement for the proposed works to Clarendon Road. We request that this is secured via a pre-commencement condition, as otherwise it would compromise the existing tenants' business.</p> <p>We note that the deficiency in the air quality assessment as identified by the Council's Environmental Officer is proposed to be dealt with by a pre-commencement condition. We object to this approach as this is a full application and there is no guarantee that the necessary mitigation measures are available and/or suitable and can be incorporated in to the scheme.</p> <p>Daylight / sunlight testing has been undertaken on an indicative scheme at Guillemot Place on the application site in its pre- and post-development states. The results confirm that an increased amount of windows within the proposed development would fall short of the BRE requirements as a result of potential development at Guillemot Place, in The Application Site's post development state. We are therefore of the opinion that the Proposed Development at The Chocolate Factory places increased restriction on the potential for development at Guillemot Place, undermining its development opportunity and the delivery of the Council's vision set out in the adopted policy. Appropriate measures should be taken to ensure the burden of safeguarding amenity is shared between both of these sites.</p> | <p>A pedestrian/cycle way should not be a narrow alleyway for safety and security reasons so 5m is not unreasonable.</p> <p>Sensitivity testing has since been submitted and considered acceptable.</p> <p>Developer indicates a phased approach to vehicular/pedestrian/cycle uses to thoroughfare. Landscaping conditions recommended further detail this.</p> <p>Condition is required to address minor concerns not principle. Work has since been undertaken to fully justify and explain methodology but due to hours of case officer is not able to be confirmed as acceptable or removed.</p> <p>Believe that indicative scheme shown for Guillemot Place is an excessive</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>height and massing given the site constraints to surrounding heritage assets.</p> |
| | <p>Object to 18 storey element as it is out of character. After Grenfell Tower disaster all buildings over 10 storeys should be rejected.</p> <p>Care should be taken not to disturb the existing neighbourhood by organising working hours and traffic whilst building so as to cause minus disturbance.</p> <p>Adequate parking and traffic arrangements should be made available for the new residents so there is not a shortage of parking spaces or traffic jams.</p> <p>The developer should provide additional local facilities (such as schools and medical centres) for new demand whilst also retaining supply for existing residents.</p> | <p>Tall buildings are accepted by policy in this area and harm to views/heritage assets have been outweighed by design and public benefit.</p> <p>Construction Logistics Plan is required in s106 agreement.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are proposed or required by s106 legal agreement.</p> <p>CIL addresses these concerns.</p> |
| | <p>The GL Hearn Report has been reviewed by our client's daylight and sunlight consultant. It shows a daylight study to assess the natural light amenity potential of neighbouring sites based on the applicant's Masterplan, once the proposed Development at the application site is in place. GL Hearn Report does not address our concerns at all.</p> <p>Given the extent of the margin between buildings on Guillemot Place's southern boundary and the space taken up by a north/south through route, the applicant has designed the Masterplan to push our building back into the site. The Masterplan shows that the Proposed Development at the Application Site is restricting the development potential of the surrounding sites to the extent that the development viability and deliverability of Guillemot Place is threatened. Other than the massing model used to undertake the assessment, there is no information as to the likely quantum of development assumed on Guillemot Place and surrounding sites.</p> <p>The analysis and information presented in GL Hearn Report does not demonstrate if neighbouring sites will suffer from an increased burden as a result of the Proposed Development, as it only tests the daylight and sunlight impact of the Proposed</p> | <p>Concerns regarding the masterplan and Guillemot Place are addressed above.</p> <p>Acknowledge that the sensitivity testing only tests the proposal on the surrounding potential development and is fair to assume that area of potential harm identified will correlate in return. Overall considered that the effects on both daylight and sunlight would be within the range that the design of those developments could make satisfactory.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Development on one hypothetical scheme.</p> <p>The Masterplan and the GL Hearn Report alone do not satisfy the requirements of Policy DM55, as it does not demonstrate that the proposal will not prejudice the future development of adjoining land or frustrate the delivery of the site allocation or wider area.</p> | |
| | <p>Object to 18 storey building as it will overshadow neighbouring properties and surrounding area. Out of character. Support more housing but must be social.</p> | <p>Tall buildings are accepted by policy in this area and harm to views/heritage assets have been outweighed by design and public benefit.</p> <p>Affordable housing proposed.</p> |
| | <p>Does not appear to have affordable rent spaces for arts/craft workers, musicians or designers. Radical change for the area.</p> | <p>Affordable workspace proposed.</p> |

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM 10

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 10

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Reference No: HGY/2018/0382 | Ward: St Anns |
| Address: St Anns General Hospital St Anns Road N15 3TH | |
| Proposal: Erection of a two-storey hospital building for mental health patients, which will provide 4 wards, for up to 70 mental health inpatients. | |

UPDATES

SECTION 106 HEADS OF TERMS

Amended to include the following revision to Clause 2, following comments from the Council's Carbon Reduction Officer:

- 2) Connection to a Future Energy Centre
 - The applicant shall undertake best endeavours to ensure that this building connects to the area wide heating network which is proposed for the whole of the St Ann's Hospital site

Amended to include the following revision to Clause 3, following clarification by the Council's Employment and Skills Officer:

- 3) 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;

- The developer shall agree with the Council to a proportion (up to a maximum of 10%) of construction jobs being undertaken as apprenticeships – a payment of £1,500 per apprentice placement would be required and apprentices shall be paid London minimum wage;
- 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.

Amended to include the following revision to Clause 4, following clarification by the Council's Transportation Officer:

4) Revised Travel Plan for the Construction Phase (including Monitoring)

- Within three months of the development first being occupied the applicant is required to:
 - appoint a co-ordinator for the construction phase;
 - submit the Travel Plan and have it approved by the Council;
 - pay the monitoring contribution of £3,000.
- 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.

Addition of a new Clause, following comments received by the Council's Carbon Reduced Officer:

6) Carbon Offsetting

- The proposed PV solar panels shall deliver 19 kWp of energy to the site;
- Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the aforementioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £1,800 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS – ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Two further objections received from 2 Grand Parade and 223 Hermitage Road taking the total received to four.

The additional issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are summarised below:

- Increased traffic congestion on Hermitage Road;
- Hospital and neighbouring residential development should be considered holistically;
- Travel plan is unambitious;
- Design may not have appropriate levels of security.

Sustainability and Biodiversity

The Council's Carbon Reduction Officer has recently commented on the application. The energy efficiency measures are supported, but further information is required on the proposed future area wide energy network and how the proposed development's connection to this would be managed. Further details are also required in respect of preventing overheating of units. These matters can be secured by conditions, and further conditions and legal agreement clauses are also recommended to secure the proposed renewables and energy saving initiatives.

Noise

The Council's Carbon Reduction Officer has recently commented on the application and stated that there are no objections to the proposal. It is considered that limiting noise emissions to 5dB below the background level is a reasonable limitation in this location, as background noise levels are already very low. In any case the proposed substation would be located a substantial distance from any residential properties and thus is not anticipated to lead to any negative impact on amenity.

Fire Safety

The applicant has confirmed that an 'enhanced construction' fire safety methodology would be used within this building instead of sprinklers. There is an emergency route for fire vehicles provided within the site to the north of the proposed building. The London Fire Brigade the Brigade have considered this additional detail and have stated that they are now satisfied with the proposals for fire fighting access.

CONDITIONS

Amendment of Condition 3 due to a typing error:

Condition 3

Details of finishing materials (including samples) to be used for the external surfaces of the mental health unit block 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 windows, accesses, the proposed entrance canopy 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 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

The following conditions have been added after delayed comments were received from the Council's Carbon Reduction Officer:

Condition 29

You must deliver the sustainability measures as set out in the approved Environmental Management Plan, dated Jan 2018, Version E, by Vinci Construction.

The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and shall achieve the agreed rating of BREEAM "Excellent" and this standard shall be maintained as such thereafter. A post construction certificate or evidence shall then be issued by an independent certification body, confirming this standard has been achieved. This must be submitted to the local authority within 6 months of completion on site for approval.

In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the development, a full schedule and costings 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) polices 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan.

Condition 30

Details of the boiler facility serving the heat and hot water loads for all of the approved medical building and its associated infrastructure, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority 3 months prior to any works commencing on site. The details shall include:

- a) location of the energy centre in the building;
- b) specification of equipment, including confirmation that the boiler facility shall deliver all the sites heating and hot water loads;
- c) flue arrangement;
- d) operation/management strategy; and
- e) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed to allow for the future connection to the area wide network (serving the whole of the St Ann's site). This shall include the proposed connectivity location, punch points through structure and route of the link.

Once these details are approved the Council should be notified if the applicant alters any of the measures and standards set out in the approved Environmental Management Plan, dated Jan 2018, Version E, by Vinci Construction. Any alterations should be presented with justification and new standards for approval by the Council.

The boiler facility and infrastructure shall be delivered in accordance with the details so approved, installed and operational prior to occupation of the development and shall be maintained until the development is connected to the St Ann's heat network. At this point this equipment will be decommissioned and all heating and hot water loads will be delivered by the St Ann's area wide heating network.

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 SP:04 and DM 22.

Condition 31

The developer will submit for approval an overheating model and report. The dynamic thermal model will assess the overheating risk (using future weather temperature projections - 2030 and 2050), and report will demonstrate how the risks have been mitigated and removed through design solutions.

This should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site and any measures shall be operational prior to the operation of the development.

This report will include details of the design measures incorporated within the scheme (including details of the feasibility of using external solar shading and passive cooling and ventilation) to ensure adaptation to higher temperatures are addressed, and the unit does not overheat. The report will include the following:

- the standard and the impact of the solar control glazing;
- that there is space for cooling pipe work and that this is designed in to the building to allow the retrofitting of cooling and ventilation equipment
- that all heating pipework is appropriately insulated
- that passive cooling and ventilation features have been included or to be retrofitted
- highlight the mitigation strategies to overcome any future overheating risk for the patients

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 2017 Policy SP04 and in the interest of adapting to climate change and to secure sustainable development.

The following condition has been added after delayed comments were received from the Council's Noise Officer:

Condition 32

The roof plant and any associated equipment shall be so designed to achieve a noise level of no less than 5dB below existing background noise level ($L_{A90\ 15mins}$) when measured 1 metre external ($L_{Aeq\ 15mins}$) from the nearest residential or noise sensitive premises.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other additional conditions are also required as described below:

Condition 33

Prior to the commencement of works to the sub-station building hereby approved details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval demonstrating the dimensions and material finish of that building, including any ancillary additional structures associated with it. Once approved, the building shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans and retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank