



**Haringey** Council

Please note that the Council has amended the protocol with regard to hearing representations at Planning Sub-Committee meetings. Objectors or supporters should advise the Council by noon on the working day immediately prior to the Sub-Committee meeting (for a Monday meeting this would be by noon on the Friday prior to the Sub-Committee) in order to allow appropriate administrative arrangements to be put in place. The number of speakers will usually be limited to two speaking for a proposal and two speaking against the proposal with a time limit of 3 minutes i.e. a maximum of 6 minutes.

Persons interested in addressing the Committee in relation to an application should contact the Committee Secretariat team on 020 8489 1512 by noon the working day prior to the Planning Committee meeting.

Please be advised that speaking slots will be allocated on a strictly first come first served basis. Discretion will remain with the Chair regarding the number of representations permitted at Planning Committee meetings and time allocated outside of the guideline set out above.





**Haringey** Council

---

## Special Planning Sub Committee

---

WEDNESDAY, 25TH MARCH, 2015 at 7.00 pm HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

**MEMBERS:** Councillors Ahmet (Chair), Akwasi-Ayisi, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Carter, Gunes, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Patterson and Rice

This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. The Council may use the images and sound recording for internal training purposes.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for web-casting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the Committee Clerk at the meeting.

### **AGENDA**

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. URGENT BUSINESS**

It being a special meeting of the Committee, under Part 4, Section B, paragraph 17 of the Council's Constitution, no other business shall be considered at the meeting.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

**4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

In accordance with the Sub Committee's protocol for hearing representations; when the recommendation is to grant planning permission, two objectors may be given up to 6 minutes (divided between them) to make representations. Where the recommendation is to refuse planning permission, the applicant and supporters will be allowed to address the Committee. For items considered previously by the Committee and deferred, where the recommendation is to grant permission, one objector may be given up to 3 minutes to make representations.

**5. RIVERSIDE SCHOOL WHITE HART LANE N22 5QJ (PAGES 1 - 14)**

Construction of music and art classrooms with additional services and circulation, located on first floor. New school entrance and vehicle drop off and pick up rearrangement at ground floor.

RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.

**6. BELMONT PRIMARY SCHOOL, RUSPER ROAD, LONDON, N22 6RA (PAGES 15 - 28)**

Proposed single storey extension of infants and junior primary school to create new and improved facilities for existing pupils. The extension proposed includes the erection of a new secure entrance, new teaching / learning, therapy and meeting rooms and male and female wcs. Refurbishment and renovation works of existing school areas adjacent to the extension are also proposed and include the organisation of the existing classroom into staff PPA, medical room and new group room.

RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.

- 7. HOLY TRINITY CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL SOMERSET ROAD N17 9EJ (PAGES 29 - 38)**  
Fencing off of a small parcel of land within the boundaries of Holy Trinity Primary School to enable the creation of a new pathway leading from Fairbanks Road to Monument Way leading onto the High Road.  
  
RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.
- 8. ILSE AMLOT CENTRE FOR WOMEN & CHILDREN SOMERFORD GROVE N17 0PT (PAGES 39 - 56)**  
Erection of single storey extension to provide additional educational accommodation to increase provision for 2 year old children.  
  
RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.
- 9. MUSWELL HILL POLICE STATION 115 FORTIS GREEN N2 9HW (PAGES 57 - 90)**  
Proposed conversion of former Police Station to 9 no. residential units  
  
RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions and subject to a s106 Legal Agreement.
- 10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  
To be confirmed in lieu of approval of the calendar for the new municipal year by Full Council.

Bernie Ryan  
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance and  
Monitoring Officer  
Level 5  
River Park House  
225 High Road  
Wood Green  
London N22 8HQ

Maria Fletcher  
Principal Committee Coordinator  
Level 5  
River Park House  
225 High Road  
Wood Green  
London N22 8HQ

Tel: 0208 4891512  
Email: maria.fletcher@haringey.gov.uk

Tuesday, 17 March 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015

Item No.

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

<b>1. APPLICATION DETAILS</b>	
<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2014/3573	<b>Ward:</b> Woodside
<b>Address:</b> Riverside School White Hart Lane N22 5QJ	
<b>Proposal:</b> Construction of music and art classrooms with additional services and circulation, located on first floor. New school entrance and vehicle drop off and pick up rearrangement at ground floor.	
<b>Applicant:</b> Haringey Council	
<b>Ownership:</b> Haringey Council	
<b>Case Officer Contact:</b> Anthony Traub	
<b>Date received:</b> 18/12/2014	
<b>Drawing number of plans:</b> 100; 110; 111; 151; 152; 153; 155; 157; 158; 159; 200; 299; 300; 301.	
<b>1.1</b>	This application is being referred to the Planning Committee because the Council is the applicant.
<b>1.2</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle of additional educational facilities is welcomed</li> <li>• The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenity is acceptable</li> <li>• The design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable</li> <li>• There would be no significant impact on traffic movements or parking locally</li> </ul>

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives and/or subject to sec. 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following matters:

### Conditions

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials to be approved
- 4) Transportation footway memorandum
- 5) CMP
- 6) Stage 2 road safety report

### Informatives

- 1) Positive statement



<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	
3.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5.0	LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6.0	CONSULTATION
7.0	MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
8.0	RECOMMENDATION
9.0	APPENDICES: Appendix 1: Consultation Responses Appendix 2 : Plans and images

### **3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **3.1 Proposed development**

3.1.1 This is an application for the erection of a first floor extension to Riverside School on the White Hart Lane frontage. The extension is set on columns above the existing forecourt to the school and is proposed to provide additional music and art teaching space plus an additional disabled WC, a music multi sensory room and a music therapy room. It will be clad in vertical faced fins along the western and White Hart Lane elevations and brick on the eastern elevation.

3.1.2 At the same time the applicant proposes to rationalise the existing car parking area to the front of the building to enable bus movements within this space and the introduction of regular disabled parking bays. An additional pedestrian entrance is proposed to the western edge of the site frontage with one of the other entrances being moved eastwards to serve vehicles.

3.1.3 The school currently accesses music and art space within the adjoining Woodside School. The latter has now secured Academy status and this proposal is part of a process to house all teaching within the confines of the Riverside School site.

#### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

3.2.1 Riverside High School is a secondary special educational needs school accommodating 120 pupils situated on White Hart Lane. Housed within a two storey L-shaped building on the southern side of White Hart Lane the school was completed in 2012. The school is surrounded by 2-4 storey buildings of varying age and condition which make up Woodside School and beyond that by open space and playing fields. The site lies opposite to the New River Sports Centre and Community Centre which is Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The open parts of the school site are also MOL.

#### **3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

3.3.1 HGY/2008/0655 - Redevelopment of Woodside High School, to comprise demolition of part of existing central school block, erection of new two storey block fronting White Hart Lane, new three storey block at rear of site, covered walkways, parking and landscaping, and re-cladding of existing Block C. To incorporate Woodside High School, William C Harvey and Moselle Special Schools. GRANTED - 10/06/2008.

3.3.2 HGY/2014/3096 - Construction of single classroom extension located at first floor level over part of an existing terrace. GRANTED – 19/12/2014

### **4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- 1) Transport
- 2) Waste

3) Education

The following responses were received :

Internal:

Transport- LBH Transportation: No objection to the proposal. Conditions recommended.

Waste- if no increase in pupil numbers then existing provision is adequate.

## 5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers. No response was received.

## 6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design and appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transportation

### 6.2 Principle of Development

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

6.2.2 The NPPF recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. London Plan policy 3.18 lends support to proposals which enhance education provision and serve to meet the demands of a growing population. Local Plan policy SP16 seeks to ensure the appropriate improvement and enhancements of community facilities.

6.2.3 Local Plan policy SP13 sets out that the impact of new developments next to designated open space should be managed. London Plan policy 7.17 sets out that the strongest protection should be given to MOL.

6.2.4 This proposal serves to enhance the facilities on offer at the site, providing:

1. a new SEN classroom;
2. new entrance;

3. new seating area for waiting parents;
4. a new buggy store;
5. a new office and meeting room;
6. a new teaching and learning room
7. a new therapy room.

6.2.5 The scheme provides improved facilities at the school to the benefit of the pupils, staff and parents. The scheme accords with the Council's aims to support the provision of a high standard of education in the borough and in accordance with policy SP16 of the Local Plan.

6.2.6 The site sits opposite MOL however the element of MOL opposite the site contains the grandstand and running track. The proposal does not impact on the openness of the MOL and as such is acceptable.

### 6.3 Design and Appearance

6.3.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, which identifies that all development proposals, should respect their surroundings, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

6.3.2 The proposal involves the erection of a contemporary, single storey addition to the existing building that would create a new frontage and entrance to the school. The scale and location of the extension is not considered significant in the context of the site and the wider surroundings. The extension will be set back from neighbouring properties with existing site screening measures remaining in situ. The new building will be a noticeable addition at this point but not so much as to undermine the pattern of development to any significant degree. The use of high quality materials will also serve to integrate the extension into the existing vernacular. A condition is recommended requiring the submission of material samples should the application be approved.

6.3.5 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in general accordance with London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11.

### 6.4 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.4.1 Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.

6.4.2 The extension is isolated from any neighbouring habitable room windows given the immediately surrounding neighbours are community facilities. Therefore, there will be no consequential loss of outlook or light for neighbouring residents.

6.4.3 Again, given there are no nearby residential properties any alteration in existing vehicular movements associated with the site will not harm the amenities of any sensitive properties.

6.4.3 The proposal is therefore not considered to harm the amenities of neighbours and is in general accordance with saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

## 6.5 Transportation

6.5.1 The site has a low PTAL level, the site is within reasonable walking distance of the W3 bus route available on White Hart Lane to the north east of the site, which runs with a two-way frequency of 24 buses per hour. The site is also within walking distance of the W4 bus route to the south west of the site, running with a two-way frequency of 12 buses per hour. Both of these services provide frequent links to Wood Green underground station. Although the proposal involves an increase in the number of classrooms, there is no intention to increase the number of staff or pupils. The proposal is therefore not expected to result in an increase in operational traffic generation or parking demand.

6.5.2 The applicant intends to retain the existing separate “in and out” vehicular access arrangement. However, the proposals will involve the relocation of the school’s western vehicular access to a more centrally located point along the sites frontage onto White Hart Lane. MLM Consulting Engineers have produced a transport statement (TS) to support the application, which includes a Stage 1 Safety Audit. The Safety Audit indicates a need for off-site remedial highway works as well as the installation of additional safety measures in the form of a guardrail.

6.5.3 A significant amount of pupils travel to and from the site by specialist mini-buses, which will have the use of dedicated loading bays to the front of the site. Although there will not be any formal on-site facilities for parents/guardians to pick-up or drop-off students, the TS observes that no such an arrangement currently exists and that parent/guardians tend to use the pay and display car park across the road from the site. It has been noted that the proposal includes the retention of two designated disabled parking bays for the use of staff and visitors.

6.5.4 The School intends to retain the existing refuse collection arrangement which will take place from the neighbouring school site. However, looking at the track runs, there is still a concern that vehicles larger than minibuses may find it difficult to exit the site and carry on the journey in an eastern direction. Therefore, a condition is included requiring a Stage 2 Safety Audit be carried out and all necessary remedial works carried out before the first use of the proposed extension.

6.5.5 The proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the existing highway and transportation network. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 6.9 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP7.

## **7.0 HUMAN RIGHTS**

7.1 All applications are considered against a background of the Human Rights Act 1998 and in accordance with Article 22(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003 where there is a requirement to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. Reasons for refusal are always given and are set out on the decision notice. Unless any report specifically indicates otherwise all decisions of this Committee will accord with the requirements of the above Act and Order.

## **8.0 EQUALITIES**

8.1 In determining this planning application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under equalities legislation including the obligations under section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976. In carrying out the Council's functions due regard must be had, firstly to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, and secondly to the need to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different equalities groups. Members must have regard to these obligations in taking a decision on this application.

## **9.0 CIL APPLICABLE**

9.1 The proposal is for a school extension and is not subject to CIL.

## **10.0 CONCLUSION**

10.1 The proposal involves a first floor extension for an additional class room.

10.2 The proposal is subservient and complementary in fill development to the existing school campus and is an improvement to the provision of educational facilities on site whilst not compromising neighbouring amenity or the surrounding highway network. Given the above, this application is recommended for APPROVAL.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

11.1 GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions.

11.2 Applicant's drawing No.s: 100; 110; 111; 151; 152; 153; 155; 157; 158; 159; 200; 299; 300; 301.

Subject to the following conditions:

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 plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those being:
  - 100; 110; 111; 151; 152; 153; 155; 157; 158; 159; 200; 299; 300; 301.

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

3. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no development shall take place until precise details of the external materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted be submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and consistent with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

4. The proposal will require alterations to the public footway in order to cater for the new access arrangements. Prior to construction works being carried out on-site the applicant shall issue a Memorandum of Understanding that would secure payment for the required measures.

Reason: To maintain highway safety conditions for vulnerable pedestrian groups at this location and to create a safe route into and out of the school.

5. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on White Hart Lane is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid school drop-off and collection times and the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation and highways network and in the interests of highway safety.

6. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on White Hart Lane is minimised. It is also

requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid school drop-off and collection times and the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation and highways network and in the interests of highway safety.

INFORMATIVE 1: 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.




**APPENDIX 1 - Consultation responses**


<b>No</b>	<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Questions/Comments</b>	<b>Responses</b>
1	LBH Transportation	No objection to the proposal.	Conditions recommended
2	LBH waste	if no increase in pupil numbers then existing provision is adequate.	

APPENDIX 2 – Plans


SITE LOCATION PLANS



### Proposed Site Layout



### Proposed Elevations



Planning Sub Committee 25th March 2015

Item No:

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

<b>1. APPLICATION DETAILS</b>	
<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2015/0347	<b>Ward:</b> West Green
<b>Address:</b> Belmont Primary School, Rusper Road, London, N22 6RA	
<p><b>Proposal:</b> Proposed single storey extension of infants and junior primary school to create new and improved facilities for existing pupils. The extension proposed includes the erection of a new secure entrance, new teaching / learning, therapy and meeting rooms and male and female wcs. Refurbishment and renovation works of existing school areas adjacent to the extension are also proposed and include the organisation of the existing classroom into staff PPA, medical room and new group room.</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Ownership:</b> Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Case Officer Contact:</b> Anthony Traub</p>	
<b>Date received:</b> 04/02/2015	
<b>Drawing number of plans:</b> 5444-1000 Rev C, 5444-1001 Rev B, 5444-1010 Rev B, 5444-1020 Rev B, 5444-1100 Rev C, 5444-1200 Rev C, 5444-1201 Rev C, 5444-1210 Rev C, 5444-1250 Rev C and 5444-1300 Rev C.	
<b>PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:</b>	
<p>Not in a Conservation Area  Not a Listed Building  Belmont CPZ</p>	
<p><b>1.1</b> This application is being referred to the Planning Committee because the Council is the applicant.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle of additional and refurbished facilities are welcomed</li> <li>• The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenity is acceptable</li> <li>• The design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable</li> <li>• There would be no significant impact on traffic movements or parking locally</li> </ul>	

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives:

Conditions:

1. Implementation within 3 years
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials to be submitted
4. Construction management plan

Informatives:

1. Co-operation
2. Hours of construction

In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to the officer's recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	
3.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0	CONSULTATION
5.0	RESPONSES
6.0	MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle of development;</li> <li>• Design and appearance;</li> <li>• Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;</li> <li>• Transportation.</li> </ul>
7.0	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8.0	CONCLUSION
9.0	RECOMMENDATION
10.0	APPENDICES Appendix 1 – Consultation Responses Appendix 2 – Plans

### **3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **3.1 Proposed Development**

3.1.1 The proposal involves the erection of a single storey extension to create new and improved facilities for existing pupils. The extension proposed includes the demolition of an existing classroom and the erection of a new secure entrance, new teaching / learning, therapy, meeting rooms and male and female wcs. Refurbishment and renovation works of existing school areas adjacent to the extension include the re-organisation of the existing classroom into staff PPA, medical room and new group room.

3.1.2 The proposal would service existing students and would not increase the capacity of the school.

#### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

3.2.1 The subject site is a junior and infant school located behind houses on Rusper Road, Downhills Park Road, Mannock Road and Boundary Road, N22. The school consists of 1960/70s and contemporary single and two storey buildings. Surrounding development is residential and access to the school is via Rusper Road. The site is not in a conservation area.

#### **3.3 Planning and Enforcement History**

3.3.1 HGY/2004/0905 GTD 25-05-04 Renewal of existing fence with 3m high palisade fencing.

3.3.2 HGY/2005/1190 GTD 16-08-05 Caretakers Flat, Belmont Junior & Infant School, Rusper Road London Change of use of property from caretakers house to office space.

3.3.3 HGY/2014/1298 GTD 01-07-14 Belmont Junior & Infant School Rusper Road London Replacement of existing single glazed timber windows and doors with new aluminium powder coated double glazed windows and doors

3.3.4 OLD/1959/0589 GTD 12-10-59 Erection of Infants School.

#### **4.0 CONSULTATION**

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application and the following responses were received:

- 4.2 a) LBH Early Years: Supports the provision of improved facilities.  
b) LBH Transportation: No comments received.

#### **5.0 RESPONSES**

5.1 The following were consulted on the application:

Ward Councillors  
Adjoining neighbours (82 letters sent)  
LBH Education

5.2 The following comments were received: (responses to comments under Appendix 1):

- LBH Education: Supports the provision of improved facilities.

#### **6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design and appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transportation

##### **6.2 Principle of Development**

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

6.2.2 The NPPF recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. London Plan policy 3.18 lends support to proposals which enhance education provision and serve to meet the demands of a growing population. Local Plan



policy SP16 seeks to ensure the appropriate improvement and enhancements of community facilities.

6.2.4 This proposal serves to enhance the facilities on offer at the site, providing:

1. a new SEN classroom;
2. new entrance;
3. new seating area for waiting parents;
4. a new buggy store;
5. a new office and meeting room;
6. a new teaching and learning room
7. a new therapy room.

6.2.5 The scheme provides improved facilities at the school to the benefit of the pupils, staff and parents. The scheme accords with the Council's aims to support the provision of a high standard of education in the borough and in accordance with policy SP16 of the Local Plan.

### 6.3 Design and Appearance

6.3.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, which identifies that all development proposals, should respect their surroundings, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

6.3.2 The proposal involves the erection of a contemporary, single storey addition to the existing building. The scale and location of the extension is not considered significant in the context of the site and the wider surroundings. The extension will be set back from neighbouring properties with existing site screening measures remaining in situ. The new building will be a noticeable addition at this point but not so much as to undermine the pattern of development to any significant degree. The use of high quality materials will also serve to integrate the extension into the existing vernacular. A condition is recommended requiring the submission of material samples should the application be approved.

6.3.5 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in general accordance with London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11.

### 6.4 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.4.1 Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, or overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.

6.4.2 The extension will be set some 25 metres away from the rear wall of the neighbouring residential dwellings that front Rusper Road. The nearest

habitable room windows are approximately 25 metres away and these would have limited views of the proposal given the separation distance and existing out building and screening measures. There will be no consequential loss of outlook or light for neighbouring residents.

6.4.3 There would be no increase in child or employee numbers entering the site, therefore there would be no increase in existing vehicular movements associated with the site.

6.4.3 The proposal is therefore not considered to harm the amenities of neighbours and is in general accordance with saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

## 6.5 Transportation

6.5.1 There would be no increase in child or employee numbers entering the site, therefore there would be no increase in existing vehicular movements associated with the site.

6.5.2 The development would not generate any increase in traffic and parking demand which would have any adverse impact on the local highway network in the area surrounding the site. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 6.9 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP7.

## 7.0 **CIL APPLICABLE**

7.1 Given that the proposal relates to an educational establishment, neither Mayoral or Haringey CiL apply.

## 8.0 **CONCLUSION**

8.1 The proposal is seen to be a complementary in-fill development to the surrounding townscape, improving existing educational facilities for children in Haringey. Given the above, this application is recommended for APPROVAL.

## 9.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

9.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and informatives:

### **Conditions**

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:

5444-1000 Rev C, 5444-1001 Rev B, 5444-1010 Rev B, 5444-1020 Rev B, 5444-1100 Rev C, 5444-1200 Rev C, 5444-1201 Rev C, 5444-1210 Rev C, 5444-1250 Rev C and 5444-1300 Rev C.

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

3. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no development shall take place until precise details of the external materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted be submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and consistent with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

4. Prior to commencement, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and implemented accordingly thereafter. The Plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on the High Road and Whitbread Close is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated 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.

**Informatives:**

INFORMATIVE 1: 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 2: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-


- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

**10.0 APPENDICES****APPENDIX 1 – Consultation responses**


No	Stakeholder	Questions/Comments	Responses
1	LBH Education	Supports the improvement of education facilities	

APPENDIX 2 – Plans


SITE LOCATION PLAN




Aerial Photographs



Proposed Site Plan



### Proposed Floor Plan






### Proposed Floor Plan



### Proposed Elevations



SEN Extension Elevation  
1 : 50



Planning Sub Committee 25th March 2015

Item No:

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

<b>1. APPLICATION DETAILS</b>	
<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2015/0438	<b>Ward:</b> Tottenham Hale
<p><b>Address:</b> Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School Somerset Road N17 9EJ</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Fencing off of a small parcel of land within the boundaries of Holy Trinity Primary School to enable the creation of a new pathway leading from Fairbanks Road to Monument Way leading onto the High Road.</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Ownership:</b> Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Case Officer Contact:</b> Anthony Traub</p>	
<p><b>Date received:</b> 11/02/2015</p> <p><b>Drawing number of plans:</b> MWP/01/01</p>	
<p><b>PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:</b></p> <p>Not in a Conservation Area Not a Listed Building</p>	
<p><b>1.1</b> This application is being referred to the Planning Committee because the Council is the applicant.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The blocking up of the school space is acceptable.</li> <li>• The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenity is acceptable</li> <li>• The design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable</li> <li>• There would be no impact on traffic movements or parking locally</li> </ul>	

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives:

Conditions:

1. Implementation within 3 years
2. In accordance with approved plans

In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to the officer's recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	
3.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0	CONSULTATION
5.0	RESPONSES
6.0	MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle of development;</li> <li>• Design and appearance;</li> <li>• Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;</li> <li>• Transportation.</li> </ul>
7.0	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8.0	CONCLUSION
9.0	RECOMMENDATION
10.0	APPENDICES Appendix 1 – Consultation Responses Appendix 2 – Plans

### **3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **3.1 Proposed Development**

- 3.1.1 The proposal involves the fencing off of a small parcel of land within the boundaries of Holy Trinity Primary School to enable the creation of a new pathway leading from Fairbanks Road to Monument Way leading onto the High Road. The creation of the pathway itself does not require planning permission but will be subject to further discussion with TfL.
- 3.1.2 The proposal would improve pedestrian connectivity to Monument Way and associated bus stops along the High Road.

#### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.2.1 The site consists of a portion of the Holy Trinity Church Grounds. This area is in the south-eastern corner, and is currently fenced off from Monument Way. The surrounding area is residential in nature with other schools in the locale. The site is not in a conservation area, nor are there listed buildings on site.

#### **3.3 Planning and Enforcement History**

- 3.3.1 None relevant.

### **4.0 CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application and the following responses were received:
- 4.2 a) LBH Transportation: No objections to the proposed fence.

## **5.0 RESPONSES**

5.1 The following were consulted on the application:

Ward Councillors  
Adjoining neighbours (29 letters sent)

5.2 No representations were received.

## **6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design and appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transportation

### **6.2 Principle of Development**

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

6.2.2 The NPPF recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. SP16 of the Haringey Local Plan states that the Council will work to ensure the appropriate improvement and enhancement of community facilities (including schools)

6.2.3 In terms of planning application requirements, the aspect of the proposal which requires consent is the proposed fence. The other elements, i.e. the proposed gap in the Monument Way wall; the new footpath and the new lighting column do not require planning permission, the latter two being subject to highways legislation.

6.2.4 The proposal would fully enclose a piece of land that is owned by the school. This area between the access to the entrance to the school off the High Road, the western end of Fairbanks Road and north of Monument Way is owned by the school. For approximately 20 years the school has arranged with Haringey Council for the space to be publically accessible outside school times both as a route through but also as an accessible open space. The school are now seeking to enclose this space because of persistent issues with litter on the site (bottles etc) which have made effective use of the space by primary aged children during school time practically impossible. Indeed, the prime function of it for school children at present is apparently for litter picking exercises.

- 6.2.5 The closing up the footpath will be to the benefit of the school and its pupils. It will remove opportunities for littering which currently restricts usage and enable the school and teachers to provide enhanced opportunities for play and outdoor activity, in accordance with policy SP16 of the Local Plan.
- 6.2.6 The loss of the footpath will cause some inconvenience to some local residents outside of school hours who have benefited from the school's willingness to open up their site both for access reasons and the additional open space on offer. There is nothing to prevent the school stopping up this space however, they have offered to lose part of their site to enable the construction of a footpath linking Fairbanks Road and Monument Way. This would be welcomed and the Council's transportation section are in contact with Transport for London (the transport authority for Monument Way) to move this forward.
- 6.2.4 Overall, the proposed changes are considered to offer improved educational facilities to the benefit of the children attending the school and hence in accordance with planning policy.

### 6.3 Design and Appearance

- 6.3.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, which identifies that all development proposals, should respect their surroundings, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
- 6.3.2 The proposal involves the loss of an existing fence and the erection of a 3m high 'Paladin' style fence, which is open mesh/railings to ensure visual permeability. The location of the fence behind a large wall on Monument Way is limited in visibility and as such will not have a significant impact on the visual appearance of the area. The associated footpath alteration and new lamppost whilst ancillary to these works are not the subject of this planning application.
- 6.3.3 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in general accordance with London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11.

### 6.4 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

- 6.4.1 Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.
- 6.4.2 The fence proposed will not cause any loss of outlook or light for neighbouring residents.
- 6.4.3 The proposal is therefore not considered to harm the amenities of neighbours and is in general accordance with saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

## 6.5 Transportation

- 6.5.1 The proposal is considered to vastly improve pedestrian connectivity to and from neighbouring residential properties to the High Road and Monument Way and all associated public transport facilities because the path it enables would allow for 24 hours access. Therefore, the proposal is seen to promote the use of sustainable forms of transport whilst creating a walkable urban environment.
- 6.5.2 Overall, the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 6.9 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP7.

## 7.0 **CIL APPLICABLE**

- 7.1 No buildings are proposed and therefore there is no floor area created.

## 8.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The proposal will facilitate the enhanced educational offer provided by the school to the benefit of the staff and pupils. This offsets any inconvenience to local residents is blocking off the footpath. The scale and form of the fence is acceptable in this context. Given the above, this application is recommended for APPROVAL.

## 9.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and informatives:

### **Conditions**

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: MWP/01/01.

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

3. The new footpath and the opening in the wall on Monument Way should be completed prior to the stopping of the existing footpath. The footpath shall be permanently maintained.

Reason: In order to safeguard pedestrian connectivity.




**10.0 APPENDICES****APPENDIX 1 – Consultation responses**

No	Stakeholder	Questions/Comments	Responses
1	None received		

APPENDIX 2 – Plans


SITE LOCATION



Aerial View



Proposed Plan



Planning Sub Committee 16th March 2015

Item No:

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

<b>1. APPLICATION DETAILS</b>	
<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2014/3478	<b>Ward:</b> Northumberland Park
<p><b>Address:</b> Ilse Amlot Centre for Women &amp; Children Somerford Grove N17 0PT</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Erection of single storey extension to provide additional educational accommodation to increase provision for 2 year old children</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Beatrice Sarpong, Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Ownership:</b> Haringey Council</p> <p><b>Case Officer Contact:</b> Paul Roberts</p>	
<p><b>Date received:</b> 16/12/2014</p> <p><b>Drawing number of plans:</b> 612444-02 Rev P2; 612444-03 Rev P3; 612444-04 Rev P2; 612444-06 Rev P2; 612444-LT-00-B-1001 Rev P1; 612444-LT-00-B-1002 Rev P1.</p>	
<p><b>PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:</b></p> <p>Not in a Conservation Area  Not a Listed Building  Tottenham Hotspur Matchday CPZ</p>	
<p><b>1.1</b> This application is being referred to the Planning Committee because the Council is the applicant.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle of additional nursery facilities is welcomed</li> <li>• The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenity is acceptable</li> <li>• The design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable</li> <li>• There would be no significant impact on traffic movements or parking locally</li> </ul>	

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives:

Conditions:

1. Implementation within 3 years
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Cycle parking
5. Refuse storage
6. Travel Plan
7. Construction Management Plan

Informatives:

1. Co-operation
2. Hours of Construction

In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to the officer's recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	
3.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0	CONSULTATION
5.0	RESPONSES
6.0	MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle of development;</li> <li>• Design and appearance;</li> <li>• Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;</li> <li>• Transportation.</li> </ul>
7.0	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8.0	CONCLUSION
9.0	RECOMMENDATION
10.0	APPENDICES Appendix 1 – Consultation Responses Appendix 2 – Plans

### **3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **3.1 Proposed Development**

- 3.1.1 The proposal involves the erection of a single storey addition to the Ilse Amlot Womens and Children's Centre in Northumberland Park. The extension would be located at the north western end of this site on an area of hard standing between the existing building and the 3.2 metre high boundary fencing. The flat roofed extension would match the height of the fencing and would be finished in the same white painted blockwork of the existing nursery. Proposed at 1.5 metres wider than the existing building, the extension would have a window and door in the southern elevation and a new door is also proposed in the eastern flank wall of the existing building.
- 3.1.2 In conjunction with the above works, the interior of the Children's Centre will be amended to provide for an additional classroom space, new toilets and a relocated office. Access to the nursery will then be set away from the rest of the Centre, directly off Rothbury Walk.
- 3.1.3 The amendments will increase the capacity of the 2 year old intake at this site from the current 28 children (14 each am and pm) to 60, split into morning and afternoon sessions.

#### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.2.1 The site consists of two linked single storey structures, one the original construction being used for children from 3 to 5 years and the building for the 2 year old intake which is the subject of this application. This building has a monopitched roof and is linked to the main building by a small flat roofed linked section. A play area for the 2 year olds to the rear. The perimeter of the whole site is enclosed by 3.2 metre high green mesh fencing.

3.2.2 Pedestrian access to the site is secured off Rothbury Walk. There is no direct vehicle access to the site although servicing is undertaken via Rothbury Walk.

3.2.3 The site is situated opposite Somerford Grove Open Space, to the south east of Lea Valley Primary School and is otherwise enclosed on three sides by 4 storey blocks of flats.

### **3.3 Planning and Enforcement History**

3.3.1 HGY/2010/1108 – Demolition of boundary fence and installation of new boundary fence. APPROVED - 11/08/2010.

## **4.0 CONSULTATION**

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application and the following responses were received:

4.2 a) LBH Early Years: No comments.

b) LBH Transportation: No objection, subject to conditions.

## **5.0 RESPONSES**

5.1 The following were consulted on the application:

Ward Councillors  
Adjoining neighbours (22 letters sent)

5.2 One comment from Councillor Bevan has been received, the matters raised being (responses to comments under Appendix 1):

- Concerns as to the scale of the blank walls; Materials should blend with existing structure in colour and style.
- Request that a representative from the education service be present at the Committee and colour drawings/boards be on view. (Officer comment: A request for an education service representative has been made and the drawings will be on view).

## **6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design and appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transportation

### **6.2 Principle of Development**

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of



sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

- 6.2.2 The NPPF recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. London Plan policy 3.18 lends support to proposals which enhance education provision and serve to meet the demands of a growing population. Local Plan policy SP16 seeks to ensure the appropriate improvement and enhancements of community facilities.
- 6.2.3 Since September 2013, all local authorities have had a statutory duty to fund free early years places for the most disadvantaged two year olds using nationally prescribed criteria. The programme is designed to attempt to even out significant differences between children in terms of school readiness, based largely on wealth and opportunity. Free entitlement in this sense offers each eligible child 15 hours per week of early education, up to a maximum of 570 hours per year. The requirements for places was estimated at 882 two year olds from September 2013 this increased to 1,790 from September 2014 and beyond.
- 6.2.4 This proposal is set against the context of the increased pressure on educational facilities in Haringey and in that regard the proposal would serve to assist the Council's objective of enabling every child in the Borough the ability to have the best start in life. The scheme will also create additional employment to the tune of a potential 10 part time jobs which is welcomed. In planning policy terms the principle of development is accepted.

### 6.3 Design and Appearance

- 6.3.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, which identifies that all development proposals, should respect their surroundings, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
- 6.3.2 The proposal involves the erection of an 8 metre by 5.75 metre structure with a flat roof height of 3.2 metres. The scale and location of the extension is not considered significant in the context of the site and the wider surroundings. The extension will be set behind the existing boundary fence which will be retained in its entirety, retaining the uniform finish around this site. The new building behind the fence will be a noticeable addition at this point but not so much as to undermine the pattern of development to any significant degree. The use of matching materials will also serve to integrate the extension into the existing Centre.
- 6.3.5 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in general accordance with London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11.

### 6.4 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

- 6.4.1 Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.
- 6.4.2 The extension will be set some 6 metres away from the flank wall of the neighbouring residential block. The nearest habitable room windows are approximately 8 metres away and these would have limited views of the proposal. There will no consequential loss of outlook or light for neighbouring residents.
- 6.4.3 There will be an increased number of children and parents entering the site, however the numbers are not significant in the wider context of the non-vehicular movements associated with this site and the adjoining school at present.
- 6.4.3 The proposal is therefore not considered to harm the amenities of neighbours and is in general accordance with saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

## 6.5 Transportation

- 6.5.1 The proposed site is located in an area with a medium public transport accessibility level (PTAL3) and within the Tottenham Hotspur event day control parking zone which operates on event days Monday to Friday between 17:00 and 20:30 hours and on Saturday, Sundays, public Holidays between 12:00 to 20:00 hours. The site however does not have direct vehicular access, although servicing currently takes place via the Rothbury Walk estate.
- 6.5.2 The Council's Transportation team has reviewed the submission and assessed the traffic impacts in the wider area. It is anticipated that the larger nursery would lead to a maximum of 2 additional car drive trips (taking it to approximately 8 car trips in total). A considerable number of the trips associated with this site are linked to the adjoining Lea Valley School and it is felt that this development would likely lead to higher car occupancy levels.
- 6.5.3 The applicant will be required to provide 6 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces in line with the 2013 London Plan. A further condition is recommended requiring the submission of a construction management plan. The level of waste storage on site is considered to be sufficient.
- 6.7.4 Overall, the development is unlikely to generate any significant increase in traffic and parking demand which would have any adverse impact on the local highway network in the area surrounding the site. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 6.9 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP7.

## 7.0 **CIL APPLICABLE**

- 7.1 Given that the proposal relates to an educational establishment, neither Mayoral or Haringey CiL apply.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The proposal is seen to be as a complementary in-fill development to the surrounding townscape, utilising a currently underutilised piece of land to provide additional and needed nursery provision for 2 year old children in Haringey. Given the above, this application is recommended for APPROVAL.

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and informatives:

### **Conditions**

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: 612444-02 Rev P2; 612444-03 Rev P3; 612444-04 Rev P2; 612444-06 Rev P2; 612444-LT-00-B-1001 Rev P1; 612444-LT-00-B-1002 Rev P1.

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

3. The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing nursery building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

4. No development shall take place until details of the type and location of secure and covered cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until a minimum of 6 cycle parking spaces for users of the development, have been installed in accordance with the approved details. Such spaces shall be retained thereafter for this use only.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies 6.1 and 6.9 of the London Plan 2011 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.

5. Prior to commencement, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and implemented accordingly thereafter. The Plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on the High Road and Whitbread Close is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated 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.

**Informatives:**

INFORMATIVE 1: 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 2: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

## 10.0 APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1 – Consultation responses


No	Stakeholder	Questions/Comments	Responses
1	Councillor comments	<p>Councillor Bevan</p> <p>I have visited the site today, 15<sup>th</sup> January along with the Planning Officer.</p> <p>I have concerns as to the bland bare brick walls that will be constructed and as to the proposal to retain the existing fencing alongside the new walls constructed.</p> <p>I am seeking that the materials used by sympathetic and blend with the existing structure both in colour and style, the adjacent building should be redecorated to ensure an exact match with the new addition.</p> <p>As this is a Council application I am aware that it will be placed before the full planning committee. I am requesting that an officer from the education service attend the committee. I am also requesting that colour drawings/boards be on view showing the full details/aspects of this application.</p>	<p>Covered within the 'Design &amp; Appearance' section of the report.</p> <p>An officer from education is expected. Full plans will be available at the committee.</p>
2	LBH Transportation	<p>The site is located in an area with a medium public transport accessibility level (PTAL 3) and within walking distance of the High Road which provides access to the some 69 buses per hour for frequent connection of Seven Sisters Station rail and underground station, the site is also within walking distance of Northumberland Park Rail station which is served by two trains per hour in each direction from Stratford to Hertford East and Bishops Stratford, via Tottenham Hale. The Centre is likely to have a small catchment area, it is therefore considered that there is significant scope for children together with parents/carers to take up sustainable travel alternatives for journeys to and from the site.</p> <p>The centre is bounded by Park Lane to the South and the Lee Valley School to the north of the site with Rothbury Walk to the east of the site and the Summerford Grove adventure park to the west of the site. The site has several pedestrian access routes through the Rothbury Walk estate and pedestrian access points onto Park Lane and Almond Road. There is currently no direct vehicular access into the site, however, servicing currently takes place via the Rothbury Walk estate.</p> <p>Access from the public highways is available via Almond Road, Commonwealth Road and Trulock Road, which provide access to the Lee Valley School via a one-way traffic flow system, these</p>	<p>Conditions recommended</p>

		<p>roads have been traffic calmed with parking restrictions on the junctions and outside the school, in the form of school keep clear markings and single and double yellow lines.</p> <p>The centre as it exists provides a range of support services such as nursery and pre and after school clubs. These services are largely utilised by residents within the Northumberland Park Area. The applicant is proposing an extension to the existing Centre to accommodate an additional 30 nursery places for 2 year olds. We have examined the trips that are likely to be generated by the proposed development on a first principle, based on a maximum of 60 children in the morning peak hour (30 full time places and 30 part time places) and 30 full time places and 30 after school places part time places in the critical peak hour, we have also assumed that there will be a maximum of eight staff on site at any one time.</p> <p>Based on the above assumption there will be a maximum of 60 children and 8 staff arriving at the centre at any one time, this development based on the 2011 census data for the Northumberland Ward “travel to work by car”, would only generate some 8 car driver and car passenger trips of which the proposed increase in the number of places by 16 would only account for a maximum of 2 additional car drive trips. Given the proximity of the site to Lee Valley school and the links between the Ilse Amlot Centre, a considerable number of the trips generated by the site are linked trips which will account for a higher car occupancy levels, hence it is likely that the proposed development will result in generating less that 8 car drive / car passenger trips during the am and pm peak hours.</p> <p>It has been noted that the Planning Statement includes details of the recent accident data within the vicinity of the site. Although five accidents have been recorded in the 36 month review period, there does not appear to be any significant pattern that would indicate the need for immediate highway safety works in order to facilitate the proposed development.</p> <p>The site currently has no direct access to car parking facilities or cycle parking spaces and no new car parking spaces are proposed as part of this development. We will however require the development to include cycle parking in line with the 2013 London Plan (1 cycle parking space per 10 students), we will therefore request the provision at least 6 covered and secure cycle storage space.</p> <p>Subject to the imposition of relevant conditions, the proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the existing highway and transportation network. Therefore, the highway and transportation authority do not wish to object to the proposal. Any</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>notice of approval should include the following pre-commencement conditions:</p> <p>1. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall provide secure sheltered cycle storage to cater for six cycles as part of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To promote more trips by sustainable mode of transport to and from the site.</p> <p>2. The applicant is required to submit a construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians using the surrounding highway network is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid school drop-off and collection times and the AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation and highways network and in the interests of highway safety.</p>	
--	--	--	--


APPENDIX 2 – Plans

SITE LOCATION PLAN





Aerial Photograph




Site Photos








Existing Plan



Proposed Plan



Proposed Elevations



Planning Sub Committee 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015

Item No.

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

<b>1. APPLICATION DETAILS</b>	
<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2014/1333	<b>Ward:</b> Fortis Green
<b>Address:</b> Muswell Hill Police Station 115 Fortis Green N2 9HW	
<b>Proposal:</b> Proposed conversion of former Police Station to 9 no. residential units.	
<b>Applicant:</b> Station House (Muswell Hill) Ltd	
<b>Ownership:</b> Private	
<b>Case Officer Contact:</b> Matthew Gunning	
<b>Date received:</b> 19/12/2014	
<b>Drawing number of plans:</b> 1309.01 - 13 1309.15-16, 1309.23B,24A,25C,26B, 27B,28B,29B,30A, 21A	
<b>1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principle of converting this current vacant building is acceptable and will optimise the potential of the existing building, providing 9 residential units, contributing to meeting the housing needs of the Borough.</li> <li>• The proposed development will not cause harm to the special interest of this locally listed building or the conservation area but rather will enhance the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.</li> <li>• Given the history of the site and associated operations of the former Police Station it is considered that the use of this building for residential purposes will not exacerbate on-street parking conditions and as such will not unduly harm the amenity of nearby residents.</li> </ul>	

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 1) That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives and/or subject to sec. 106 Legal Agreement.
- 2) That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in the resolution above is to be completed no later than 30 May 2015 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management shall in her sole discretion allow; and
- 3) That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of all conditions imposed including;

### Conditions

- 1) Implementation within 3 years;
- 2) Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans;
- 3) Precise details of the materials;
- 4) Retention and/or proper recording of any hidden historic features;
- 5) Details of proposed new windows, doors, rooflights, cills to be submitted to LPA;
- 6) Central satellite antenna;
- 7) Cycle facilities to be provided in accordance with the approved details;
- 8) Details of external lighting to be submitted to LPA;
- 9) Construction Management Plan (CMP)

### Informatives

- 1) CIL;
- 2) Hours of Construction;
- 3) Party Wall Act;
- 4) Numbering;
- 5) Surface water drainage;
- 6) Groundwater discharge;
- 7) Thames Water

### S106 Heads of Terms

- A contribution of £10,000 towards the feasibility of implementation of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the area surrounding the site.
- An affordable housing contribution £89,964.00.
- Implementation/ monitoring of an approved Travel Plan.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**



3.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5.0	LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6.0	MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Principle of the development;</li><li>• External changes and impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and conservation area;</li><li>• Layout &amp; quality of accommodation;</li><li>• Residential mix &amp; affordable housing;</li><li>• Impact on residential amenity;</li><li>• Traffic generation, parking and access;</li><li>• Waste Management;</li><li>• Sustainability;</li><li>• Planning Obligations.</li></ul>
7.0	RECOMMENDATION
8.0	APPENDICES: Appendix 1: Plans and images Appendix 2: Comments by LBH Transportation Appendix 3: Comments on Local Representations

### 3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

#### Proposed development

- 3.1 The proposal is for the conversion of the former Police Station into 9 no. residential units with extensions and alteration to the building. The development would comprise of the following mix:
- 1no. 1 bedroom unit
  - 3no. 2 bedroom units
  - 4no. 3 bedroom units
  - 1no. 4 bedroom unit.
- 3.2 The existing cell block to the rear of the main building would be demolished in order to facilitate the construction of the rear extensions which would comprise 252 square metres of net additional floor space. The front and side elevations of the existing building would be retained and enhanced with the reinstatement of original features with other alterations made to the front and side elevations in order to facilitate this residential conversion.

#### Site and Surroundings

- 3.3 The application site is the former Muswell Hill Police Station located on the southern side of Fortis Green Road on a prominent corner site at the junction with Fortis Green Avenue. The site falls within Fortis Green Conservation Area and is included in the Council's local list of buildings of architectural and historic importance. The building is a substantial three storey Edwardian building built in 1904, primarily in red brick with contrasting buff coloured stone dressings and a steeply pitched roof. Architectural features include prominent porch and decorative frieze to the main entrance, window cills and lintels and open eaves. A substantial and prominent chimney stack is also a particularly notable feature.
- 3.4 The surrounding area comprises different building types and uses, including residential in the form of two-storey terraced and semi-detached properties, flatted development, and commercial uses. To the south of Fortis Green are streets of residential properties; substantial Edwardian terraces with good proportions and strongly consistent detailing.
- 3.5 The site is within walking distance of the main shopping thoroughfare of Muswell Hill Broadway (400m to the east). The site is also within walking distance of East Finchley High Road and is 950m to the north east of East Finchley Tube station.

#### Planning History

- 3.6 The most recent application for the site is a planning application in 2003 for the erection of a portable building to the rear of the building to be used by police community support officers, approved under reference HGY/2003/1516.

### 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Internal:

- 1) LBH Conservation Officer – Identifies that the proposals would improve the appearance of the building, would secure the buildings future and would be to the benefit of the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Officer asks for a number of conditions to be imposed.
- 2) LBH *Transportation* – Raise objection as set out in para. 6.38 and in Appendix 2.

External:

- 4) Thames Water Utilities – Advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity they would not have any objection but ask for informatives to be added.
- 5) Met Police – Have no objection but urge the developer to consider the standards of the Secured by Design.
- 6) London Fire Brigade – Are satisfied with the proposal; the authority strongly recommend that sprinklers are considered.
- 7) Building Control – Work will be subject to the requirements of the Building Regulations 2010.
- 7) LBH Housing Investment & Sites – Would like to see that all possible attempts to maximise the full potential of this site is explored to help contribute to the affordable housing provision in the west of the borough. At its present size this scheme is unable to sustain compliance with policy for on-site affordable provision and hence an off-site financial contribution relating to 20 % affordable contribution would be acceptable.

**5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 135 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours including an objection from Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Residents Association, are as follows:

No of individual responses: 23

Objecting: 23

Supporting: 0

- 5.2 The following issues were raised in the representations received:

Parking related

- Proposal does not include on-site parking.
- Parking is already a problem on the surrounding roads as a result of restrictions that apply from East Finchley station all the way to Lynmouth Avenue. As a result, many non residents already use Annington Road and Fortis Green Avenue to park in order to walk to the station.
- Area already suffering a lot of displacement parking being on the edge of the Fortis Green CPZ extra cars will compound the problem.

- The former police station has ample parking on-site and the plans should be re-configured to offer at least 9 parking spots for the new tenants.
- Disposal of the courtyard area will carry its own implications in terms of additional parking.
- Additional on street parking demand would damage business in the area.
- Local businesses would suffer if parking congestion reaches a point where residents request a CPZ on these roads.
- Estimates of parking needs in the area have been underestimated; problem is likely to worsen as a number of sites in the immediate area either have permission for or are likely to be the subject of applications for housing developments.
- Concerns about methodology used in traffic survey.
- Parking survey does not reflect true parking demands in the area.
- Peak demand is highest in the area between 11am and 12noon and not 12 midnight and 6am as per the Lambeth methodology.
- Concern about extra traffic in street and associated noise, pollution etc.
- Provision of cycle storage is inadequate in addressing the fact that 6 of the 7 apartments are 2-3 bed, and the townhouses are 3 and 4 bed.
- A reduction in the proposed number of units within the existing building might address both the parking and the aesthetic issues.
- Some of the units are only just over the minimum standards in terms of sizes; reduction in the number of units would have the dual advantage of reducing the parking impact and improving residential amenity.
- CPZ consultation is a necessity to protect rights of residents.

#### Design related

- Proposed rear elevation of the two Fortis Green Avenue houses involves the addition of an ugly square dormer up to the level of the chimneys, which will destroy the character of the roofline of the listed building.
- Care should be taken to keep the development in keeping with old Police Station in view that it sits in a Conservation Area.

#### Amenity related

- Inclusion of the roof terraces will have a considerable impact on residents in Annington Road.
- Application will change the nature of a quiet residential neighbourhood.
- Invasion of privacy (2 Coleraine Cottages Fortis Green).

#### Other

- Council should carry out a study of the area to determine what capacity of redevelopment the location can support.

## **6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- Principle of the development;
- External changes and impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and conservation area;
- Layout & quality of accommodation;
- Residential mix & affordable housing;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Traffic generation, parking and access;
- Waste Management;
- Sustainability;
- Planning Obligations.

### **Principle of the development**

- 6.2 Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the government's policy of presumption in favour of sustainable development. Therefore, planning permission will be granted by the Council for development that is sustainable unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal
- 6.3 Local Plan policy SP16 protects against the loss of community facilities, but exceptions to this may be considered acceptable if the facility is relocated as part of a wider strategy by a service provider. In this case better and more accessible policing facilities are being sought and replacement facilities have already been brought forward in Haringey in the new Wood Green Police Station. There are also proposals for a replacement facility at Tottenham Police Station.
- 6.4 This Police Station is therefore identified as surplus to the Mayor of London policing requirements. A residential re-use of the building is considered to be acceptable as it provides new additional housing within an existing building, which is served well by existing services and infrastructure, and is located in a sustainable location in close proximity to a town centre. The proposal also conforms with surrounding land uses.
- 6.5 While the site is located on the border of the Muswell Hill Restricted Conversion area, an area identified by the Council's saved UDP Policy HSG 11 as suffering from high parking pressures, the site falls outside this area and as such its conversion could not be refused on such grounds. Notwithstanding this the policy as written here is to control the number of single family dwelling conversions as opposed to the conversion of non-residential buildings.
- 6.6 The proposal optimises the potential of the site providing 9 residential units contributing to meeting the Borough's housing needs. The proposal is supported by London Plan Policies 3.3 'Increasing Housing Supply' and 3.4 'Optimising Housing Supply' and local plan policy SP2 'Housing', which has a target of 1,502 homes under the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) 2014.

- 6.7 The proposal is therefore acceptable in land use terms subject to an assessment against all other material considerations with special regard being given to preserving the architectural merit and features of this locally listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area and any harm caused.

**External changes and impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building and conservation area**

- 6.8 The Legal Position on impacts on heritage assets is as follows, and Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides:

“In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.” Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are “the planning Acts”.

- 6.9 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given “considerable importance and weight” when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise.”

- 6.10 The Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council says that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority’s assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

- 6.11 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
- 6.12 Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (LP) (2011) requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (HLP) (2013) requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Saved policy CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) requires that alterations or extensions preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 6.13 The building's position, substantial scale and design make the building prominent within the conservation area and as such the building is a landmark building within the streetscene. There are various remnant elements of the building's former use which are important to its character, such as the 'POLICE' engraving over the entrance porch, a flagpole at first floor level, and a metal bracket fixed to the base of the chimney stack, which would most likely have held a police lantern. There is also a stone pediment with engraved date '1904'.
- 6.14 The proposal will retain the appearance of the front and side elevations with only minor alterations. The proposal will result in more significant changes to the inner elevations. The inner/ rear elevations facing the yard have a functional, utilitarian appearance and are assessed as being of low significance both to the character of the building and to the wider Conservation Area. The proposed development does not affect the height of the existing building with the existing roof profile retained. The height of the ridge will only be raised by the thickness of the insulation needed to bring the performance of the building fabric to current standards. In more detail the alterations to the fabric of the buildings will consist of the following:

#### Fortis Green / Front Elevation

- Reinststate original windows that are now lost;
- Repair of all of the stone detailing to the windows, cills front door portico etc;
- Retain the elements of the Police Station that remind of its original use;
- Subtle lighting introduced to illuminate discretely parts of the elevation;
- A new illuminated 115 light to be installed in existing wrought iron support frame on the corner of Fortis Green and Fortis Green Avenue;

#### Fortis Green Avenue Elevation

- Insertion of new windows, doors and new roof lights (new front door openings to house 9, new pair of sash windows to house 9 and new doors to bin store);
- Existing low-level steel fencing with mesh infill panels will be removed and replaced with a true period replication of a steel / iron fencing style in keeping with the age of the building;

### Rear Elevation

- Removing the cell block, remodelling the rear of the main buildings;
- Erection of new small extension to the rear part of the building;
- Simple materials palette for the inner elevations – buff coloured London stock;
- Windows and doors will be either powder coated aluminium frames or painted hardwood frames;
- Glass balustrades to roof terrace edges and lead cappings to walls and other weathering details in this area;
- Dormer windows at roof level will have metal cladding detailed and the appearance of lead to the roofs.

6.15 The degree of alteration to the front and side elevations are minor preserving the special interest of this locally listed building and the significance of its contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The alterations to the inner elevations are also acceptable and while more significant these elevations have been modified over time and have limited architectural merit. The proposed extensions/ alterations to these inner elevations would be contemporary in nature and would add interest to these elevations. The design approach has been assessed and is acceptable. The demolition of the existing cell block to facilitate the extensions would not give rise to the loss of a part of this building of historic/ architectural significance.

6.16 Overall, the proposals will not cause harm to the conservation area and would improve the appearance of the building thereby enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. The alterations would secure the building's future use thus providing wider public benefits in terms of cherishing the building's past for the enjoyment of future generations. In this case the proposal would serve to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area as such complying with the relevant legal tests and planning policies outlined above.

### **Layout & Quality of Accommodation**

6.17 London Plan 2011 Policy 3.5 'Quality and Design of Housing Developments' requires all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwelling in particular to be of sufficient size and quality. The standards by which this is measured are set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG 2012.



- 6.18 While the conversion of the building here to residential use is affected by the fabric, scale and configurations of the building the resulting flats meet or exceed the minimum standards set out in The Mayor's London Housing Design Guide 2011 in terms of overall floor area. The proposed residential accommodation has been designed/ laid out sensitively to respect the existing character of the building and will provide good quality accommodation.
- 6.19 The proposal seeks to use the existing layout of principal rooms and circulation spaces in order to maintain the primacy of the historic main entrance. The original staircase, lobby and other elements of the original plan form would be retained in the interest of creating an attractive internal environment to the building. In terms of access 7 of the units will gain access from the existing main entrance from Fortis Green while two-units (houses) will have their own dedicated entrances onto Fortis Green Avenue. The various rooms in the development will have generous windows and all units are dual aspect thereby providing cross ventilation.
- 6.20 The two new housing units will benefit from their own garden space. Unit 1 a 3-bedroom duplex unit will have a south facing garden of 54 square metres. Unit 3 a 2-bedroom unit which is constrained by it's location in the corner of the building will have a courtyard garden of 11 square metres. Unit 4 will have a south facing roof terrace of 9 square metres. Both units 6 and 7 will benefit from a roof terrace of 6 square metres.
- 6.21 The location of this site will mean that future residents will also benefit from its proximity to good quality open spaces (Highgate Wood, Cherry Tree Wood, Coldfall Wood and Muswell Hill Playing Fields).
- 6.22 The proposal will provide an acceptable standard and layout of accommodation for its future occupants in line with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2011 and the Mayor's Housing SPG.

### **Residential Mix & affordable housing**

- 6.23 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan highlights that new developments should offer a range of housing choices in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types. The proposed mix comprises 1 x one-bedroom, 3 x two-bedroom, 3 x three-bedroom and 1 x four-bedroom unit. The mix of units proposed here is considered to be acceptable adding to the local housing stock in accordance with national and local planning policies.
- 6.24 Policy SP2 of the Local Plan requires developments of less than 10 units to provide 20% of the scheme as affordable housing or to make an equivalent financial contribution. In this case as a vacant building credit would apply (as per revised National Planning Practice Guidance issued on 28 November 2014) the financial contribution is calculated only on the net additional floor space (252 square metres) rather than on the total floorspace of the building. An affordable housing contribution will therefore be secured here (£89,964.00) based on the uplift in the floorspace.

- 6.25 The proposal will provide an acceptable residential mix and will make a financial contribution to the delivery of affordable housing in the Borough. The proposal would therefore meet the aims and objectives as set out in the NPPF, London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6, saved UDP Policy UD3, Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12.

### **Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers**

- 6.26 London Plan 2011 Policies 7.6 and 7.15 and saved UDP 2006 Policies UD3 and ENV6 require that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings and the residential amenity of adjoining occupants in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.27 The conversion of the building to residential use does not present issues in terms of privacy and overlooking. While concerns have been raised by a resident of 2 Coleraine Cottages, located opposite the site, in respect of loss of privacy, the front and side elevations (street elevations) are unchanged and as such do not present new issues of overlooking.
- 6.28 The massing of the new extensions to the rear and siting of the private terraces have been carefully considered so that no material harm will be caused to the occupants of neighbouring properties by way of loss of light or privacy. In respect of the flats in the adjoining building (111-113 Fortis Green) and the pair of semi-detached houses located to the rear of this building (111a & 111b) the roof terraces will have timber louvred privacy screens on the side closest to these properties so as to minimise overlooking. The properties on Annington Road are positioned sufficiently far away so as not to be overlooked by the proposed terraces in question. In fact given the position of 111a & 111b the line of vision from such roof terraces will be restricted by the height/ roof form of these dwellings.
- 6.29 The privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers will not be adversely affected and as such the proposal is in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6 policy UD3 of the UDP.

### **Traffic generation, parking and access**

- 6.30 Saved policy M10 'Parking for development' seeks to ensure that proposed developments do not adversely affect the free flow of traffic around a site and that they do not result in a material impact on existing parking levels. UDP policy M10 refers to parking standards contained within Appendix 1, which are stated as maximum standards. There are no minimum standards within policy M10. Whilst policy M10 states that proposals that do not meet these standards will not normally be permitted the policy continues by stating that parking requirements will be assessed on an individual basis as part of a transport assessment. This is particularly relevant in respect of proposals for conversion of existing buildings as opposed to new build scheme.

- 6.31 The application site has a PTAL rating of 3 (medium accessibility) being within walking distance of East Finchley underground station (10-12 minutes) and being served by the 102, 234 and 603 bus routes. The site is located on the border of the Muswell Hill Restricted Conversion area which is immediately to the east of the site. The site is also located on the edge of the Fortis Green Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which is to the west of the site. The Fortis Green CPZ operates Monday to Friday between the hours of 11am and 1pm with the primary purpose of the CPZ to restrict commuter parking.
- 6.32 The application does not provide any off street car parking spaces and as such is supported by a transport assessment. While the land to the rear of the site via Fortis Green Avenue was previously used for the parking of vehicles in connection with the Police station use (approximately 10 spaces) this land does not form part of the application site being considered in this application. There is a separate planning application by a different applicant for this site. The spaces however were principally used for the parking of police patrol vehicles.
- 6.33 It is recognised that the area surrounding the site is heavily parked with limited on street car parking spaces attributed to three factors; 1) high car ownership levels- 0.9 car parking spaces per household; 2) displaced parking from the Fortis Green CPZ and 3) parking as a result of commuter parking to access the nearby East Finchley station. The proposal however needs to be considered in the context of whether the removal of the Police Station operation and the conversion of the building into residential use would exacerbate on-street parking conditions and would unduly harm the amenity of nearby residents. Therefore an assessment needs to be made as to whether or not the surrounding roads can cope with the on-street parking demand in connection with a residential use versus the former use.
- 6.34 A transport statement has been submitted with the application. The report indicates that the proposed residential use of this building would only give rise to minimal additional traffic, compared to its previous use as a police station. The report also indicates that there is currently sufficient on-street parking availability to accommodate the additional demand created by the proposal. For the purpose of the analysis to show the implications of the vehicle trips generated by the proposed use when compared with the existing use, the applicant observed activity at nearby Hornsey Police Station, which is comparable in size and characteristics to the Police Station that was previously on the application site. The comparison here demonstrates that the proposed residential use would result in a minimal number of additional vehicular trips, with only 3 trips in the morning peak and 2 trips during the evening peak hour.
- 6.35 The submitted transport statement expects the scheme could generate ownership of up to 8 vehicles, based on 2011 census data of car ownership in the area. The census data indicates that 34.7% of households in Fortis Green Ward and 33.7% in Muswell Hill Ward do not possess a car while 45.5% and 46.6% respectively have one car.
- 6.36 A parking survey has been submitted with this application which recorded demand every 30 minutes between the hours of 18:00-23:00 and looked at the

following roads: Fortis Green, Fortis Green Avenue, Annington Road, Lymouth Road, Keynes Close, Midhurst Avenue, Twford Avenue, Eastern Road and Collingwood Avenue.

- 6.37 In this case the number of available spaces during the busiest period would reduce from 58 spaces to 47 spaces when including the adjacent development site to the south. This would result in the maximum parking demand increasing to 87.0% from 84.1%. The survey also gave consideration to the roads within the immediate vicinity of this site, namely Fortis Green Avenue and Annington Road to the south of the site. These two roads are shown to accommodate a total of 97 parking spaces (based on a space measuring 6 metres in length). In respect of these roads the survey indicates that there is available parking space within the immediate area during the busiest half hour period, with the percentage of spaces likely to reach a maximum of 91% (from 80.8%) when also accounting both developments.
- 6.38 While the Council's Transportation Team accept that the proposed trips generated by the proposed development would not impact on the free flow of traffic on Fortis Green and accept that it is likely to generate fewer trips when compared to the previous use as a police station, they object and raise a number of concerns in relation to the proposed development; namely:
- The application does not include off street parking);
  - Concern that the parking survey carried out does not comply with Lambeth methodology in respect of parking bay size and the need for the surveys to be carried out over 2 week day night (between 12:30 am and 05:30 am) (*nb it was subsequently confirmed that it does conform to the Lambeth methodology*);
  - Need for the parking survey to include morning and evening periods (7-8am and 6-7 pm) to capture the effect of commuter parking;
  - The absence of a controlled parking zone in the area restricts the mechanism to control on street parking;
  - Concerns in respect of the site's location next to a restricted conversion area;
  - Overspill in parking demand in respect of the former use would have been limited to operational use and would be temporary in nature.
- 6.39 In this case the survey (as revised) was carried out in accordance with the Lambeth Methodology (an industry standard) which considers the night time period when parking demand associated with a residential area is at its highest. The survey methodology also did assume a car required 6 metres of kerblineline to park as required by the Council's Transportation Team.
- 6.40 It is recognised the area suffers from displaced commuter parking which has increased the on street car parking pressure in the area. In this case the applicant will be required to contribute by way of a S.106 agreement a sum of £10,000 (ten thousand pounds) towards the feasibility of implementing a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the area surrounding the site. A contribution has already been secured in respect of consulting on the implementation of a

CPZ in the area surrounding the nearby St Lukes site, following approval of a planning consent to redevelop this site in 2013 (Ref: HGY/2013/0061). The inclusion of the application site here within a CPZ would help manage parking demand and address the day time parking pressures experienced in the area. The typical aim of a CPZ is to prioritise parking for residents by restricting non-resident and commuter parking. The inclusion of this area within a CPZ would however as mentioned have to be subject to separate consultation with local residents.

- 6.41 In respect of the development here and that of the adjoining site the removal of the on-street space for disabled users and removal of the police station access will effectively reinstate two on-street bays. It is also recognised that the site has good sustainable transport choices other than use by private car. There is good provision of public transport along Fortis Green with the site being within walking distance of East Finchley underground station (10-12 minutes). Cycle parking is being provided and is considered to be safe, secure, covered and convenient. The proposal is also to include a travel plan which can include mechanisms such as introductory membership to a 'car club', with welcome packs for residents. Car club schemes in Haringey now offer members access to 80 on-street vehicles across the Borough, the nearest of which is on Twyford Avenue.
- 6.42 Whilst account is taken of the concerns of local residents and Transportation Officers about the effect of parking arising out of the scheme planning officers consider that the removal of the Police Station operation is likely to reduce parking demand/ traffic generation in the local road network surrounding the site and that there is capacity in the wider area for on-street parking. The introduction of a CPZ would also further alleviate parking pressure. As such Planning Officers consider that refusal on transport grounds would not be justified. A decision here also needs to be balanced against the need/ benefit of finding a viable and suitable long term use for this vacant building.

### **Waste Management**

- 6.43 Saved policy UD7 Waste Storage of the UDP (2006) states that the Council will require all development to include appropriate provision for the storage of waste and recyclable material.
- 6.44 The siting of the bin store here will be in a new opening in the building which would be accessed from Fortis Green Avenue. This is considered to be an acceptable solution recognising the constraints of the building and the site and will be convenient in terms of collection.

### **Sustainability**

- 6.45 London Plan 2011 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to make the fullest contribution to minimizing carbon dioxide emissions. This approach is continued in Local Plan 2013 Policy SP4, which requires residential developments to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4
- 6.46 As the building in question is an historic building located within a conservation area it is understandable that the need for energy efficiency needs to be balanced with building conservation. The refurbishment of the building here however will include the following energy saving measures:
- Replacing the windows with high performance double glazing;
  - Enhanced air tightness to reduce heat loss with additional insulation to walls;
  - New additions to rear will provide a highly enhanced thermal envelope coupled with generous glazing to provide good daylight penetration;
  - All units are dual aspect thereby providing cross ventilation;
  - Energy efficient boilers and heating appliance;
  - Energy efficient, washing machines and dryers, fridges freezers and ovens.

### **Planning Obligation**

- 6.47 Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to seek financial contributions to mitigate the impacts of a development. Below are the agreed Heads of Terms:
- A contribution of £10,000 towards the feasibility of implementation of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the area surrounding the site.
  - An affordable housing contribution of £89,964.00.
  - Implementation/ monitoring of an approved Travel Plan.
- 6.48 Based on the information given in the plans, the Mayor's CIL charge will be £8,820.00 (252 sq.m x £35) and Haringey CIL charge will be £66,780.00 (252 sqm x £265). 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.

### **Conclusions**

- 6.49 The principle of converting this current vacant building is considered acceptable and will optimise the potential of the existing building, providing 9 residential units, contributing to meeting the housing needs of the Borough. The proposed development will not cause harm to the special interest of this locally listed building or the conservation area and will enhance the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

- 6.50 Given the associated operations of the former Police Station it is considered that the use of this building for residential purposes will not exacerbate on-street parking conditions and as such will not unduly harm the amenity of nearby residents.
- 6.51 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

## 7. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and S106 Agreement

Registered No. HGY/2014/1333

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 1309.01-13, 1309.15-16, 1309.23B, 24A, 25C, 26B, 27B, 28B, 29B, 30A & 21A

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 plans (1309.01-13, 1309.15-16, 1309.23B, 24A, 25C, 26B, 27B, 28B, 29B, 30A & 21A) and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. No development shall have taken place until samples of the types and colours of the external finishes have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such approved details. For the purpose of this condition, the samples shall only be made available for inspection by the Local Planning Authority at the planning application site itself.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development and in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. All new external works and finishes and works of making good to the retained fabric, shall match the existing adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture, including mortar.

Reason: To safeguard the historic fabric and the architectural character and appearance of the building.

5. Any hidden historic features (internal or external) which are revealed during the course of the works shall be retained in situ, work suspended in the relevant area of the building with the Local Planning Authority notified immediately. Thereafter where considered necessary provision shall be made for the retention and/or proper recording, as required by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the historic fabric and the architectural character and appearance of the building.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not commenced until a drawing at a scale of 1:5 is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority showing details of proposed new windows, doors, rooflights along with cills and lentils.

Reason: To safeguard the historic fabric and the architectural character and appearance of the building.

7. Notwithstanding the Provisions of Article 4 (1) and part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no satellite antenna shall be erected or installed on any building hereby approved. The proposed development shall have a central dish or aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for the residential units created: details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property, and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the historic fabric and the architectural character and appearance of the building.

8. No occupation of the flats hereby approved shall be occupied until the cycle facilities serving it have been provided in accordance with the approved details, and they shall thereafter be retained for their intended purpose unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the development provides adequate cycle parking facilities in accordance with the London Plan.

9. No development shall take place until details of a scheme for installing external lighting within the site, including night-time security lighting and its means of actuation, light spread and average illuminance, have be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development and in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.



10. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for: i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials; iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; iv) the erection and maintenance of any security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate; v) wheel washing facilities; vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.

Reason: To safeguard pedestrians, reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the local Highways network.

INFORMATIVE:

The applicant is advised that the proposed development will be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL. Based on the Mayor's CIL and the information given on the plans charge will be £8,820.00 (252 sq.m X £35) and Haringey CIL charge will be £66,780.00 (252 sqm x £265). 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.

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

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:

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses 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 0845 850 2777.

INFORMATIVE:

Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing [wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk). Application forms should be completed on line via [www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality](http://www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality). Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.

INFORMATIVE – Thames Water


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.

8.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Plans and images



Site Location Plan



Aerial View



**Front Elevation**



**Side Elevation/ Fortis Green Avenue**



Rear Elevation



Proposed Ground Floor Plan



**Proposed Front Elevation/ Fortis Green**



**Proposed Side Elevation/ Fortis Green Avenue**



**Proposed Rear Elevation**



**Proposed Side/ Rear Elevation**

## Appendix 2: Comments by LBH Transportation

### Initial Comments

The proposed site is located in an area with a Medium public transport accessibility level (PTAL 3), on Fortis Green (the A504) which links Fortis Green to Muswell Hill. The site is located on the border of the Muswell Hill Restricted Conversion area which is immediately to the east of the site. The Muswell Hill Restricted conversion area is an area which has been identified by the Councils saved UDP Policy HSG 11 as suffering from High Parking pressures. Site visits were conducted on the 14th July where it was observed that the area surrounding the site is heavily parked with very few on street car parking spaces available.

The site is also located on the edge of the Fortis Green Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which is to the west of the site, the Fortis Green CPZ operates Monday to Friday between the hours of 11am and 1pm, the primary purpose of the CPZ is to restrict commuter parking. The area to the east of the of the Fortis Green CPZ which includes that immediate area surrounding the site suffers from displaced commuter parking which has increased the on street car parking pressure.

The proposed development site was previously used as a police station with off street car parking provided to the rear of the site via Fortis Green Avenue, no existing trips or parking demand has been provided as part of the Transport Statement provided by the applicants transport consultant Vectos. The applicant is proposing to redevelop a section of the existing site to provide 9 residential units including ( 1x1 bed, flat, 3x2 bed flat, 3x3 bed flat, 1x3 bed house and 1x4 bed house), the applicant has not proposed providing any off street car parking spaces.

The applicants transport consultant has calculated the trip rates that are likely to be generated by the proposed development using the following sites from the TRAVL trip forecast database: (Orchard Court RM13, Osier Crescent N10 and Tysoe Avenue EN3). Based on the following sites this proposed development of 9 units would generate 3 in/out movements during the critical am peak hour.

Whilst we have considered that the proposed trips generated by the proposed development would not impact on the free flow of traffic on Fortis Green and is likely to generate fewer trips when compared to the previous use as a police station, we have a number of concerns in relation to the proposed development:

- 1) The applicant has submitted parking surveys as requested as part of the pre-application, and Transport Statement scoping meeting, the surveys must comply with the Lambeth Methodology, with one exception, parking bays should be 6 metres in length not 5 as per the methodology. As per the methodology the surveys must be conducted over 2 week day night between 12:30 am and 05:30 am. The surveys submitted by the applicant do not comply with Lambeth Methodology as the survey was only conducted over 1 day not 2 and the survey period was not between 12:30 am and 05:30 am. In addition the area has been identified as suffering from commuter parking, this will require the parking survey to include the morning and evening periods( 7-8am and 6-7 pm). As the



- parking surveys have not been conducted in line with the Lambeth Methodology, we cannot:
- a) Conclude that the surveys conducted represent the peak parking demand (worst case scenario) in the 200m radius of the site.
  - b) Have sufficient confidence that the applicant's site survey represents the actual parking pressures on the various roads surrounding the site.
- 2) The applicant has not provided off street parking in line with saved UDP policy M10, Parking for new developments which states that Development proposal will be assessed against the parking standards set out in Appendix 1. "Proposals that do not meet these standards will not normally be permitted. A development of this size should have provided a total of 9 off street car parking spaces. This is confirmed by the applicants transport consultants Transport Statement assessment which states that based on the 2011 census date of car ownership in the Muswell Hill Ward this development proposal would require some 0.9 car parking spaces per unit (8 off street car parking spaces).
  - 3) As the survey area 200m radius of the site includes roads which have been identified by the Council's Saved UDP Policy HSG11 as that which suffers from high parking pressures any displacement of parking into these area will impact on residential amenity and residents ability to park safely as residents would find it difficult to find on street parking spaces which in turn would result in residents parking illegally on double yellow lines, which will impact on highways safety.
  - 4) There is no controlled parking zone in the area immediately surrounding the site. As such there is no mechanism to restrict on street parking, hence although the applicant has proposed measures as part of the Travel Plan to encourage residents to travel to and from the site by sustainable modes of transport. Without a physical mechanism in place to restrict car ownership it is unlikely that the proposed travel plan measures will be successful.
  - 5) Whilst we acknowledge that the previous use as a police station may have generated some on street parking demand, this would have been limited in number due to the fact that the station had off street car parking provision and officers have free travel on public transport. As such any over spill in parking demand would have been limited to operational use and would be temporary in nature, it is most likely that this would have taken place on Fortis Green and not the surrounding residential streets subject to high parking pressures.

### **Later Comments**

In relation to the comments from Vectos (November 2014) for 115 Fortis Green Road or response is as follows.

We acknowledge that there are two separate applications for the above site, both application have been submitted with sufficient detail for us to assess the impact hence, as the highways authority we have to consider the cumulative effect of the redevelopment of the entire site on the local highways network, not doing so will underestimate the impact of this development on the local highways network.

We have assessed the result of the parking survey which demonstrated that the area surrounding the site is suffering from high parking pressures during the day and night, without the presence of a compressive control parking zone (CPZ) to prevent

displacement, as in the case from the Fortis Green CPZ the area on the edge of the CPZ suffer from high parking pressures as residents park outside the CPZ. In this case as per the correspondence and the level of parking observed during the day, this area does seem to be suffering from high parking pressure as a result of three factors, 1) high car ownership levels 0.9 car parking spaces per household; 2) displaced parking from the Fortis Green CPZ and 3) parking as a result of commuter parking to access the nearby East Finchley Underground station.

The applicant own parking survey has demonstrated that the area surrounding the site has a parking stress level of some 90.4% with only 26 car parking spaces available on street, these car parking spaces are distributed over several roads, (Collingwood Avenue, Mildhurst Avenue, Keynes Close, Lymouth Road, Fortis Green Avenue and Twyford Avenue). We must assume that residents will try to park as close as possible to their homes/ destination. During our site visits residents were observed double parking in order to remove shopping from cars and temporary obstructing the free flow of traffic on Fortis Green Avenue.

Based on the applicants transport consultant transport assessment, the likely cumulative parking requirement of the entire development based on the 2011 census data is 0.9 car parking spaces per unit. As there are no mechanism proposed to change or restrict car ownership levels for this development. We have therefore assume that characteristics of this wards including the demographics and car ownership is also unlikely to change, hence we have assume that, the likely car parking demand generated by this development will be 0.9 car parking spaces per unit. As the highways authority we must assess the worst case scenario which must assume the cumulative car parking demand generated by this development as a whole (11 car parking spaces). In assuming that the re-development of this will require the assimilation or displacement of 11 car parking spaces, we have as the highways authority assess how this can be achieved.

- 1) We must as above assume that residents will seek to park as close as possible to their place of residents or destination, in doing so this will mean that this development will displace parking into the Muswell Restricted Conversion area, as per the parking survey, Midhurst Avenue and Collingwood Avenue will be impacted by the proposed development. We have considered that any displacement of parking into the restricted conversion area is unacceptable as this is an area which has been identified by the Council's Saved UDP Policy HSG11 as suffering from high parking pressure to the extent that it has an impact on residential amenity.
- 2) Our experience, as confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate as part of previous application is that where there is the presence of high car parking pressures as in this case, there is a restriction on residents and visitors ability to park legally this in turn is likely to result in vehicles parked in areas where parking is restricted, this will impact on highways safety.
- 3) Based on the information provided, given the existing high car parking pressures in the area surrounding the site and the impacts of the proposed development on the local highways, we cannot support a development which will have a severe impact on the Highways network.

In response to the applicants comments we acknowledge that Paragraph 7.21 states that:

“The Council will apply its parking standards to restrain car use, to reduce congestion, to improve road safety, to give priority to essential users and people with disabilities, to improve the environment, to improve local accessibility and to encourage sustainable regeneration.” However we must be realistic and practical in our application of such policies, we do try and restrain car parking demand where possible, however in this case, without a Control Parking Zone in operation, combined with a S.106 legal agreement to physically constrain car ownership of any of the future occupants of this development, this policy in the form of Saved UDP Policy M9 (car –free development cannot be applied). Successful travel planning relies on both travel plan measures in the form of incentives (free travel, personalised travel planning, travel information etc) and restraints (restrict one’s ability to own a car). With the absence of a constraining mechanism, it is our opinion that the travel plan measures proposed to date cannot constrain the car ownership and car parking demand generated by this development.

We have reviewed the comments made in respect to the Crouch End Cinema proposal and have considered that it is not appropriate to compare both schemes due to their uses, location and distribution in parking.

1. People are prepared to park and walk further for leisure activities, than to park their car when they arrive home, hence why a 400m radius was considered for the cinema proposal.
2. The dynamics of the Crouch End town centre with restaurants distributed within the 400 metres radius would mean that residents’ visitors would arrive and utilise activities in various sections of the town centre, as such visitors would park further away and would be prepared to walk further; there is also a large proportion of linked trips.
3. Parking is temporary in nature between 1.5-3 hours, which reduces the long term parking stress.
4. Crouch End as a town centre generates a significant amount of parking throughout the day; hence there is a balance between, day time and evening parking demand.
5. The applicant of the cinema proposal is making a financial contribution towards reviewing the hours of the existing CPZ which will assist in mitigating the impact of the development on residential streets.

**Appendix 3: Comment on Local Representations**

<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Proposal does not include on-site parking.</p> <p>Parking is already a problem on the surrounding roads as a result of restrictions that apply from East Finchley station all the way to Lynmouth Avenue. As a result, many non residents already use Annington Road and Fortis Green Avenue to park in order to walk to the station.</p> <p>Area already suffering a lot of displacement parking being on the edge of the Fortis Green CPZ extra cars will compound the problem.</p> <p>The former police station has ample parking on-site and the plans should be re-configured to offer at least 9 parking spots for the new tenants.</p> <p>Disposal of the courtyard area will carry its own implications in terms of additional parking.</p> <p>Additional on street parking demand would damage business in the area.</p> <p>Local businesses would suffer if parking congestion reaches a point where residents request a CPZ on these roads.</p>	<p>Noted, however the removal of the police station access will effectively reinstate two on-street bays.</p> <p>It is recognised that the area surrounding the site is heavily parked with limited on street car parking spaces attributed to three factors as set out in para. 6.33. The proposal here however needs to be considered in the context of whether the removal of the Police Station operation and the conversion of the building here into residential use would exacerbate on-street parking conditions and would unduly harm the amenity of nearby residents</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>The land to the rear of the site via Fortis Green Avenue was previously used for the parking of vehicles in connection with the Police station use (approximately 10 spaces) this land however does not form part of the application site being considered in this application.</p> <p>Officers view that in the context of former Police Station operation the conversion of the building into residential use would not exacerbate on-street parking conditions.</p> <p>The inclusion of this area within a CPZ would have to be subject to separate consultation with local residents/ businesses.</p>

Question/Comment	Response
<p>Estimates of parking needs in the area have been underestimated; problem is likely to worsen as a number of sites in the immediate area either have permission for or are likely to be the subject of applications for housing developments.</p> <p>Concerns about methodology used in traffic survey.</p> <p>Parking survey does not reflect true parking demands in the area.</p> <p>Peak demand is highest in the area between 11am and 12noon and not 12 midnight and 6am as per the Lambeth methodology.</p> <p>Concern about extra traffic in street and associated noise, pollution etc.</p> <p>Provision of cycle storage is inadequate in addressing the fact that 6 of the 7 apartments are 2-3 bed, and the townhouses are 3 and 4 bed.</p> <p>A reduction in the proposed number of units within the</p>	<p>The parking survey was carried out in compliance with the Lambeth methodology and account was taken of the likely parking generated by the development in the adjoining site.</p> <p>The survey was carried out in accordance with the Lambeth Methodology (an industry standard) which considers the night time period when parking demand associated with a residential area is at its highest. The survey methodology also did assume a car required 6 metres of kerbline to park.</p> <p>As above the survey considers night time period when parking demand associated with a residential area is at its highest. Officers recognise that the area suffers from displaced commuter parking and as outlined in para. 6.40 the inclusion of the application site here within a CPZ may help manage parking demand and address the day time parking pressures experienced in the area.</p> <p>The development is likely to generate fewer trips when compared to the previous use as a police station and as such less noise and pollution.</p> <p>The development could generate ownership of up to 8 vehicles, based on 2011 census data of car ownership in the area. The application site has a PTAL rating of 3 (medium accessibility) being within walking distance of East Finchley underground station (10-12 minutes) and being served by the 102, 234 and 603 bus routes as such in part providing an alternative to car use.</p> <p>The number of units is considered to be acceptable in the context of</p>

<b>Question/Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>existing building might address both the parking and the aesthetic issues.</p> <p>Some of the units are only just over the minimum standards in terms of size; s reduction in the number of units would have the dual advantage of reducing the parking impact and improving residential amenity.</p> <p>CPZ consultation is a necessity to protect rights of residents.</p> <p>Proposed rear elevation of the two Fortis Green Avenue houses involves the addition of an ugly square dormer up to the level of the chimneys, which will destroy the character of the roofline of the listed building.</p> <p>Care should be taken to keep the development in keeping with old Police Station in view that is sits in a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Inclusion of the roof terraces will have a considerably impact on residents in Annington Road.</p> <p>Application will change the nature of a quiet residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>Invasion of privacy (2 Coleraine Cottages Fortis Green).</p>	<p>what is a large building and will contribute to meeting the Borough's housing needs.</p> <p>The proposal will provide units of an acceptable size, standard and layout.</p> <p>A contribution has already been secured in respect of consulting on the implementation of a CPZ in the area surrounding the nearby St Lukes site, following approval of a planning consent to redevelop this site in 2013 (Ref: HGY/2013/0061). The inclusion of the application site here within a CPZ may help manage parking demand and address the day time parking pressures experienced in the area. The inclusion of this area within a CPZ would have to be subject to separate consultation with local residents.</p> <p>The alterations to the inner elevations are considered acceptable and while more significant these elevations have been modified over time and have limited architectural merit. The proposed extensions/ alterations to these inner elevations would be contemporary in nature and would add interest to these elevations.</p> <p>The degree of alteration to the front and side elevations are minor preserving the special interest of this locally listed building and the conservation area.</p> <p>The properties on Annington Road are positioned sufficiently far away so as not to be overlooked by the proposed terraces in question.</p> <p>The immediate surroundings is of different building types and uses. The use of this building for residential use will be in keeping with the prevailing residential use.</p>

Question/Comment	Response
<p>Council should carry out a study of the area to determine what capacity of redevelopment the location can support.</p>	<p>The front and side elevations (street elevations) are unchanged and as such do not present new issues of overlooking.</p> <p>Local and strategic development needs including housing, employment, and school places are looked at in various planning documents (London Plan, Local Plan, Community Infrastructure Study, School Place Planning etc).</p>

This page is intentionally left blank