

Appendix Two: Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
Design	<p><u>Principal of Development & Masterplan</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The principle of development with the uses proposed is established by the Site Allocations. 2. In accordance with those allocations, the applicants include a Wider Masterplan [section “3.0g” of their Design & Access Statement] of how the whole of the rest of the block bounded by Wood Green Common, Mayes Road, Coburg Road and Western Road could be developed in accordance with those site allocations. This shows two alternative plans, one with the Safe Store and other buildings to the east of their site retained, the other where most sites are comprehensively redeveloped. They also include (as part of their most recent revisions), massing proposals showing approximate height of those neighbouring development sites. I consider this wider masterplan to be broadly acceptable. 3. Crucially their wider masterplan shows that the north south route extending Clarendon Road through to Wood Green Common could be secured. Their proposals show it to be a broad street suitable for vehicular traffic, and that the new build shown on Guillemot Place rather too modest to justify its redevelopment (and the north south route cannot be secured without its redevelopment), and this is not an easy site to “pack a lot onto”. Its height would be constrained by its proximity to the Conservation Area and its visibility from historic Wood Green Common. However, I am confident a more viable development could be “squeezed onto this site” with the north-south route narrowing to as little as 5m width and with built form on both sides of the route. 4. Within their development, I would consider they propose a coherent network of streets and blocks, that integrate well with existing surrounding streets and the vital proposal to extend the line of Clarendon Road north, through to Mayes Road / Wood Green Common. Indeed, I would go as far as to say securing this through route, for pedestrians and cyclists, but not for vehicles. I also appreciate the proposal to link Clarendon Road to Western Road with two new streets through their site; these will improve connections to their development whilst the north-south link is incomplete and improve connectivity and permeability generally, as well as helping to humanise Western Road and creating attractive, developable and suitably sized city blocks that promote a walkable neighbourhood. 5. To the south, their wider masterplan shows a sensible, coherent, complete city block on Coburg Road between Clarendon Road and Western Road, completing their “Block D”. This is designed with blank flank walls and “sacrificial windows”, to allow buildings to build up to these, treating them as a party wall, which I consider the correct response. The courtyard in the heart of this block 	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>would be 20m wide across its narrower with, which with the heights they suggest, including a tall building on the corner of Coburg and Western, would be acceptable, although I will discuss the daylight, sunlight and privacy implications in detail below in the appropriate section. I would consider that to fit in better with and offset from the tall element in their Block D, and the locations of taller buildings in the Clarendon Square development, a tall building might be more likely on the Coburg/Clarendon corner. The “Coburg corridor” is considered a suitable zone for height, they could have shown other locations, but the proposal is one of the valid alternatives.</p> <p>6. Their latest Sensitivity Testing proposals include assessment of the impact of developments on the sites on the western side of Western Road, and their more detailed wider masterplan always included sketch proposals for development on the depot and Quicksilver sites (in the latest draft Wood Green AAP, SA24). These will have some impact, forming the opposite side of the street to their Blocks D, E and F, and potentially overshadowing (dealt with below), but the street provides some separation.</p> <p>7. However, their wider masterplan proposals are less successful at integrating the site and the network of streets to land to the east of the site. The way those sites will be developed, their form, uses and what public and private spaces will be around them, and in particular whether their existing buildings will be retained, has not yet been determined. This leads to them showing two alternative wider masterplans, with and without a new northwest-southeast street connecting Clarendon Road back to Coburg Road at its eastern end, partially through their site and partially through the Safe Store and neighbouring existing 4-5 storey buildings.</p> <p>8. In accommodating the possible (and in my view likely) retention of existing buildings on neighbouring sites, they have become unable to demonstrate how they can develop the thin “tail” of land on the site of Parma House, behind their proposed tower “Block B”. This is constrained by both the existing Safe Store building and potential development on Kingfisher Place to its south. Ground floor residential would be unlikely to be acceptable, therefore they have removed that (which was their proposal in their original planning submission). They do not consider ground floor commercial works with their business model. This part of their site is therefore not proposed to be developed until firm proposals for the neighbouring sites have come forward. I have no objection to this, but would prefer a meanwhile use.</p> <p><u>Pattern of Development & Streetscape Character</u></p> <p>9. The pattern of streets, with blocks between, creates a generally coherent form of development in my view. This places the retained Chocolate Factory in the centre of the development, as a “retained jewel” and centrepiece of the new emerging neighbourhood. Surrounding blocks would have a coherent street facing language, and where the block form can be completed, good private interior courtyards. I am also content that in the absence of completion of the other “wider</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>masterplan” sites outside of their ownership, the proposals within their site would have acceptable relationships to their neighbours in their existing form and uses.</p> <p>10. The Central Square (“Chocolate Square”) is proposed at the meeting point where the two new proposed east-west streets within the development meet the existing Clarendon Road. It is also where Clarendon Road curves, where the main entrance to the existing Chocolate Factory building and the proposed tower can both be found, the “knuckle” or centre of activity and interaction of the neighbourhood. Therefore this knuckle is proposed to be an enlarged space, an urban square. I have supported this as an idea from the start. However, I have always been concerned that it is potentially a “leaky” space without sufficient sense of enclosure, as it does not have a strong geometry of its own (rather being the residual left-over space), but this has been considerably improved during the design process by tightening up the entrances to the square in the masterplan. However, some of this, particularly the crucial southern entrance off Clarendon Road, is outside the applicants’ site ownership; so it is in the masterplan but outside the application site. For the success of the square as an urban space with a strong sense of enclosure to be fulfilled, it will be essential that neighbouring developments follow this aspect of this masterplan.</p> <p>11. There are also questions around how busy with vehicular traffic, including heavy goods vehicles (at first at least; servicing the Guillemot Place Industrial Estate just north of the site) to make it succeed as a pedestrian friendly space. To address this concern, it is proposed that vehicular traffic will be controlled. I am confident it could become a successful space in the long term, as neighbouring sites are redeveloped, provided the right sort of development takes place on them.</p> <p>12. The two east-west streets within the scheme, between Block D and E, and between Block E and Blocks A (the original Chocolate Factory building) and F, are also traffic calmed and restricted, and have contrasting characters. The street between Blocks D and E is intended to be a quiet, residential street. It adds to the general permeability of the neighbourhood and provides access to the proposed buildings along it, with entrances to residential cores, the employment space on the ground floor of Block D and two ground and first floor maisonnettes in Block E, but is not a crucial part of the wider circulation network.</p> <p>13. The street between Blocks E and A/F (“Jelly Lane”) is more important, being the main route from the development to Western Road heading north, providing the main route to Alexandra Palace Station and initially to Wood Green Common and Wood Green Station. Its western end provides vehicular access to the “yard” between Blocks A and F, but otherwise it is restricted to pedestrians and servicing. It is lined with commercial units on both sides and is intended to become a vibrant, lively space with café tables for seating out and an area of steps and ramps suitable for seating, that also resolve the change in level to the existing floor levels of the Chocolate Factory building (Block A).</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>14. The other street frontage in the proposal is onto Western Road, which is a busier road and likely to become even busier, handling most of the vehicular traffic accessing this and many of the other Heartlands developments, albeit that they are all designed to be much less car intensive than most traditional developments. Block E has the ground floor of two storey maisonnettes facing onto this; they all have front doors and front gardens onto the street, generally have their bedrooms and a balcony, providing more private amenity space on their first floors. The narrow ends of Blocks B and F have ground floor commercial frontage to Western Road and architecturally bookend the whole development's frontage to Western Road. This is done in contrasting manners; Block D as a medium-high rise tower, Block F as a contrasting, object-type, pavilion building.</p> <p>15. Overall, the proposed network of streets, along with the central square, will in my view contribute to integrating this proposal into its context and improving that context, by making it more permeable and more pedestrian friendly. The proposed streets and square are designed with good active frontage and sense of enclosure, and their proposed surfacing, landscaping and street furniture look to me like they will provide robust, durable and appropriate support to the proposed street layout.</p> <p><u>Overall Height, Tall Buildings</u></p> <p>16. A variety of heights are proposed across the site, with a general datum of eight storeys but with elements rising up in places to mark them as key places. Two elements meet the Council's definition of tall buildings: an 18 storey block opposite the main Chocolate Factory entrance ("Block B"); and 13 storey block at the south-west corner of the site (part of "Block D"). Criteria for tall buildings are set out in our Strategic Policy SP11, Design (2013, revised, but in the case of this policy largely unchanged, 2017), and given more detail in our Development Management Policy DM6 "Building Height", which also shows, in Figure 2,2, "Potential Locations Appropriate for Tall Buildings", including this area.</p> <p>17. The Council's Urban Characterisation Study identifies sites along Coburg Road as suitable for "medium-tall" buildings (approx. 6-11 storeys). A site at the corner of Coburg Road and Western Road is identified as suitable for "tall buildings" (approx. 11 storeys). The rest of this site is identified for "mid-rise" buildings (approx. 3-6 storeys). The taller element in Block D is therefore acceptable in principle as a transition to a tall building; say on the corner of Western Road and Coburg, further up Coburg or on the Coronation Sidings site on the west side of Western. This could be as part of a small cluster of medium-tall buildings around the one tall building, which the taller elements approved for the northern end of the St Williams development would also form a part.</p> <p>18. The other location, where they want their tallest building, is not identified in our Characterisation Study and has always been in danger of falling within a local view corridor; dealt with below. However the applicants argue that it is suitable as a marker for the heart of their development,</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>marking the public square. This is a valid argument for a tall building here. The immediate neighbours are also currently in industrial use, and therefore unlikely to be impacted upon by its height. Future developments on these sites could accommodate themselves to what had been built here.</p> <p>19. In the case of both tall / taller buildings, I show below that I consider they are distinctive and well-proportioned designs. The applicants have shown that they consider the microclimate effects of their proposed tall buildings, particularly of overshadowing and wind effects, have been assessed and found to be acceptable. It is especially notable that they find the Chocolate Square should achieve the highest Lawson Criteria required for comfortable sitting. Cumulative effects have also been considered, with their latest amendments including consideration of cumulative effects of both taller buildings in this application with other taller buildings not yet proposed, but on sites we would accept could be suitable.</p> <p><u>Impact on Views</u></p> <p>20. The application site is on the edge of the area identified as suitable for tall buildings, which covers the southern part of Heartlands, up to properties on the northern side of Coburg Road, which is on the southern edge of the application site. Much of the application site is outside this area; close to Wood Green Common and the Conservation Area and within the view corridors of Local Views 19, 21 & 22. However, the applicants have made a good case, with verified views, that a building of fairly but not excessively tall height, in the centre-east of their site could be acceptable.</p> <p>21. The taller tower, Block B, does appear in one local view, view 22 from Lordship Rec to Alexandra Palace. It does not obstruct the central view of the palace, but does “nudge” into the right hand side, the palm court, of the palace. However, this part of this particular view is partially obscured by a tree in Lordship Rec; the view was primarily chosen as it allowed an unobstructed and focussed view of the central rose window. The applicants also show that another popular view of Alexandra Palace from Lordship Rec, the view from the rising ground to the south-east of the Rec, retains a completely unobstructed view of the Palace with some setting.</p> <p>22. Other views of the entire proposal, particularly more local views from surrounding streets and spaces, especially the key approaches and the views from Wood Green Common are in my view acceptable. I would have preferred them to have shown their views in context both of the current state, with other current proposals, particularly the St William scheme for Clarendon Square, and with a necessarily sketchy impression of the potential other development sites, given the significant impact that the cumulative developments will have, of which this proposal is only likely to be a relatively small part.</p> <p><u>Form, Bulk & Massing</u></p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>23. Block A (the oldest part of the existing Chocolate Factory Building) is proposed to be converted in to business units, with the light well between its northern and southern wing roofed over and converted into an atrium. The main entrance would be into this atrium from the proposed square to the east (Chocolate Square). The later extension to the south would be demolished and this side would become a major, active public elevation to the building with active frontage of retail / café uses at ground floor facing onto a new east-west street. Levels are a problem as internal ground floor is below intended street ground level, necessitating a convoluted stepped area, but as this street is intended to be pedestrian only, the level of incident and the presence of steps is made the best of to create an interesting, vibrant street for sitting out and so-on.</p> <p>24. A single storey rooftop extension is proposed, set-back from all sides, which I consider is acceptable and in proportion to the existing building, which in any case has numerous existing rooftop protrusions.</p> <p>25. As noted under Streetscape above, the Chocolate Factory building addresses the proposed Chocolate Square to its east, with a main entrance leading into the central atrium, and addresses the important east-west street Jelly Lane to the south, with cafes and other spaces spilling out. To the west and north-west, between Block A, Block F and the wall to the school, is a yard space. The atrium will open out onto this yard, which will have gated vehicular access off Jelly Lane and permit deliveries and the minimum required parking. It will also contain a formal grove of trees and informal buffer landscaping against the school edge, and act as an informal activity / outdoor working / break-out space for the employment functions in Chocolate Factory (both Blocks A and F). Finally, to the north is a narrow, gated, alley space providing refuse and cycle parking and spacing the existing building, with its many windows, from the existing Guillemot Place industrial units (and whatever eventually replaces them).</p> <p>26. Block B consists just of a 18 storey tower. In place of the existing “Parma House” building, this block was to me the most problematic, when, as originally submitted, it contained a 7 storey “tail” projecting from the back of the tower. This has now been omitted and Block B can be considered as a tower alone. It faces and is entered from Chocolate Square, via a lofty, double height entrance foyer, giving it a very clear and visible entrance. I consider its proportions to now be pleasing; it is a slender tower, following revisions that have reduced its footprint and increased its height. Elevational treatment that create a distinct base, middle and top reinforce its pleasing proportions.</p> <p>27. The matter of how Block B relates to its neighbours is more problematic as those neighbours are not part of this development. To its right (south), it adjoins Kingfisher Place, a likely development site that I believe should ideally join onto Block B to create a continuous, active, built street frontage and help the sense of enclosure of Chocolate Square. Instead, the applicants propose an alleyway for service access to the block’s refuse store, with a free standing two storey wall providing an edge, to which the applicants promise, the future development on the Kingfisher Place site could be</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>built up. This is an interim solution and could be considered acceptable as such, in my view the alleyway is secured with a gate at or close to the building frontage building line. Residential accommodation does not start in Block B until the 2nd floor, which helps this development permit a close neighbour, but there will still be a discernible gap between it and whatever its southern neighbour eventually is.</p> <p>28. To its north is a wider alleyway gap, to the existing Safe Store building. This alleyway provides access to Block B's cycle store and to the area of land within the applicants ownership that is currently undecided, where the "tail" to Block B formerly went. This could still eventually become a street frontage, if the applicants full wider masterplan can be implemented, and then the relationship of the tower to its northern boundary would all fall into place. However, in the absence of that street, I would prefer if this was also gated close to the frontage, but they propose a gate at the back of the tower, by its north-east corner. The cycle store forms a 2-storey projection off the rear of the tower, and the intention is whatever is built where the tail was to be, this should join on here.</p> <p>29. Block D; This 13 storey block is the southernmost part of this application and only makes up one corner (north-western) of a city block; this whole city block will be bounded by the southern of the two new east-west streets to its north, Clarendon Road to its east, Coburg Road to its south and Western Road to its west. I had concerns with the coherence of this block but following changes in the pre-app process and since the application has been submitted, relating to the only partial site ownership. I am no longer concerned with its form or height, nor to its proximity to whatever should eventually be developed to its immediate south, on the sites fronting Coburg Road.</p> <p>30. These neighbouring sites have been identified as sites suitable for tall buildings and the Chocolate Factory applicants have now factored that into their daylight, sunlight and privacy expectations and shown them to be acceptable. They also factor in that the Coburg Road sites should have non-residential uses on at least their ground and first floors, potentially on up to five floors. Non-residential, employment, use now occupies the ground floor of this block, creating a 1st floor level podium garden space to the lowest flats, helping day and sunlight access to these private amenity spaces and providing a high degree of separation for these flats from disturbance from the employment uses below the, and on the adjoining sites. Refuse and cycle storage are housed in the linking elements at either party wall, which will be blank to enable building right up to them.</p> <p>31. There is proposed to be a medium-high, 10-storey tower at western end of their proposed Block D (the north-western corner of the complete Block D according to the masterplan, the corner of Western Road and the east-west residential street. This is of a smaller footprint to Block B, and therefore achieves the same satisfying proportions, albeit at a smaller scale. It also joins directly onto the 4-storey "tail" forming the northern edge of this proto-block, the southern side of the east-west residential street. I am happy with its height, bulk, mass, composition, fenestration, detailing,</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>materials and internal layout (excepting the lack of party walls).</p> <p>32. Block E would sit to the west of the “Chocolate Square”, south of the northern new east west street on the south side of the retained Chocolate Factory, north of the other new east-west street and east of Western Road. It is of 7-storeys, in the same architectural treatment to Block D, but forming a whole coherent city block; it has a raised podium private communal garden over the residents’ carpark in the centre of the block. I have no concerns over the design, form, mass, height, bulk, composition, fenestration, detailing, materials or internal layout of this block.</p> <p>33. The only concern might be that residential on the ground floor was not suitable on the Western Road frontage, given that this road looks like it will take most of the vehicular traffic to this and the other major neighbouring development sites, it has the council Waste Transfer Station opposite its northern end and has another potential development site opposite the rest of its Western Road length. All the residential units at ground floor on the Western Road frontage (and indeed on the residential east-west street) are two storey maisonnettes; in the Western Road cases, they all have just entrance, living, dining and kitchen on the ground floor, with two to four bedrooms on the 1st. They have their own front doors which gives sense of ownership and animates the street, but they do not have access to cores and therefore do not have access to the private communal podium or rooftop gardens. However, I am happy with this solution as they provide economic family housing in a much needed category.</p> <p>34. Block F is the small employment use block proposed to the west of the original Chocolate Factory building, north of the northern proposed east-west street, east of Western Road and south of Alexandra Park School. The school boundary also forms the Conservation Area boundary. I have no particular concerns with this block.</p> <p><u>Elevational Treatment, Fenestration, including balconies and Materials</u></p> <p>35. The most important elevational treatment decision is to use a distinct and contrasting treatment and materials palette to the workspace and residential buildings. Thus the original Chocolate Factory building, Block A, and the small additional workspace building to it’s west, Block F, are in a bright, clean, white palette of white painted brickwork, concrete and render (much of it as existing), with much of the new construction in glass panelling or “glass planks”. In contrast, the residential blocks are in a more restrained, warmer, less ostentatious, brick based palette of orderly, composed, regular and rhythmic elevations.</p> <p>36. The elevational treatment, fenestration and materials to the new workspace block and extension (Blocks A & F) are innovative and unabashedly modern, which will make clear their place within the hierarchy of the wider development as distinct from existing buildings and from newly built residential context. I am also confident the proposed materials will be robust, durable and retain</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>their clean, modern, contrasting appearance.</p> <p>37. I am generally very impressed by the sense of composition in the elevational treatment, particularly evident in the courtyard block designs of Block E. Their elevations are divided up into a 2 storey “base”, made up of 2-storey commercial units on the north and east, 2-storey maisonnettes on the south and west; a 4 storey “middle”, of a formal, repeating brick based facade; and a single storey, lightweight, recessed “attic” or top floor. This latter has a distinctive “saw-tooth” roof profile, that gives the elevations an added unusual visual identity and references the industrial heritage of the location.</p> <p>38. As for the two towers (Block B & part of Block D), I am now very happy with its proportion, fenestration, detailing and layout. It creates good quality flats, mostly dual aspect, with good, well designed recessed balconies (although with open balustrades). I like that the ground and first floor of Block B (ground only to Block D) are devoted to ancillary uses including a generous entrance lobby and glazed brick to otherwise blank bays in the facade, and that the top two floors are recessed behind deep two storey reveals creating a special “attic”.</p> <p>39. I am happy with the palette of materials proposed but would like the final choice of materials to be subject to condition. It will also be essential to ensure quality of construction by having approval of key details prior to construction, to prevent these being watered down by “value engineering”. Of particular importance to the residential elements of this development would be parapet details and depth of window reveals (which in my view should be at least one brick, probably more on the two towers). The top floors of the lower rise blocks, with their set-back, lighter weight materials and saw-tooth roof profile, should also be subject to approval of materials and details to ensure it is both distinctive and a design of integrity. It would be preferable in my view if these elements were more generously glazed, and if the fenestration related more logically to the roof profile.</p> <p><u>Residential Quality (flat, room & private amenity space shape, size and quality)</u></p> <p>40. All flat and room sizes comply with or exceed minima defined in the Nationally Described Space Standards, as is to be routinely expected. Similarly, all residential units are provided with private amenity space in compliance with London Plan and Mayoral Housing SPG requirements.</p> <p>41. There are single aspect flats within the scheme but these are all east or west facing, they are generally not family sized (3 or more bedrooms) unit and none of them are at ground level, so this is not unacceptable. These flats should be provided with means of sun screening and assisted natural ventilation to overcome the effects of solar gain.</p> <p>42. There are a small number of inconsistencies in the plans; a few flats in the areas subject to the most recent amendments appear to have been “not fully worked out”; some flats seem not to have entrance doors off their core or a corridor giving access, and a flat on the 1st floor of Block E is</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>completely convoluted! However, I would be confident these would be sorted out (and it would be in any developers' interests to sort them out) before construction.</p> <p>43. All flats on the north and south side are dual aspect, with single aspect east and west facing, with recessed balconies facing Western Road and projecting balconies elsewhere; all projecting balconies have solid balustrades. There are no projecting balconies to either of the towers or to any of the Western Road elevation; all these flats have amenity space form recessed balconies or roof terraces. It is notable that the ground and first floor maisonnettes in Block E facing Western Road, where ground floor front gardens alone would not provide very good quality, private, peaceful external amenity space, are also provided with generously sized, 1st floor recessed balconies, accessed off their master bedrooms, as an alternative, more private and more sunny external amenity space.</p> <p><u>Daylight, Sunlight and Privacy / Overlooking of Neighbours</u></p> <p>44. Of relevance to this and the following two sections, Haringey policy in the DM DPD DM1 requires that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...Development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development’s users and neighbours. The council will support proposals that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity spaces where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land;</i> <i>b. Provide an appropriate amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and residents of the development...”</i> <p>45. The applicants provided Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing assessment of their proposals and of the effect of their proposals on neighbouring dwellings as part of their Environmental Statement. These have been prepared broadly in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment’s publication “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice” (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011) , known as “The BRE Guide”. Whilst their complete absorption into the Environmental Statement is in my experience unusual and unwieldy, leading to conclusions being couched in the highly formal, analytical, tabular form of such documents, the results appear sound and believable.</p> <p>46. The assessment finds that the impact of the development on existing neighbouring residential and relevant non-residential uses (particularly the school) is remarkably and impressively favourable, with virtually no noticeable detrimental effects on windows or external amenity areas. The</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>applicants' amended report says the only reductions would be small, just noticeable reduction of winter sunshine to some windows to houses on Mayes Road, east of the development; these houses would continue to receive the BRE standard for annual sunlight. However, I cannot see any reduction in the figures for winter sunlight in their appendix 9.2A. In this, the development is helped by being separated from more sensitive neighbours with intervening industrial sites, but it is also in my view further testament to the generally modest height of the proposals; an isolated, slender taller building will have much reduced impact as that impact will be transient.</p> <p>47. The daylight and sunlight levels achieved to habitable rooms and external amenity areas within the proposed development are in my opinion good. 82.3% of 554 habitable rooms within the proposed development are reported as receiving the BRE Standard of daylight, which is a high proportion of a higher density development in an area of central urban character. 67% of south facing rooms tested receive the BRE standard for sunlight, not such an impressive performance but one I would be happy with.</p> <p>48. I am not completely happy with the spaces the applicants have chosen to assess for sunlight to amenity space within the development (in Appendix 9.4). They assess a number of road spaces such as the street between Blocks D & E, yet omit obvious private amenity spaces such as the private and private communal podium and rooftop amenity spaces to Block D. I am confident the rooftop amenity space to D would receive much more than sufficient sunlight, as the rooftop amenity space to E that has been tested achieves 96% on 21st March (the BRE standard is at least 2 hours on 50% on this date). However, the podium to E receives only 33%, and other podium amenity spaces, including balconies, are also likely to be less than adequately sunlit. The applicants' data does show that the podium of Block E would receive excellent sunlight on the summer solstice, and if some parts would not receive as much sunlight, they would receive some and have a sunny view.</p> <p>49. The "yard" space behind Block A also does not quite receive the BRE standard, but this is not considered to be a public or residents' private amenity space. The main public spaces, Chocolate Square and the pedestrianised section of Jelly Lane, would also usefully receive good amounts of sunlight. Here again the applicants' data fails to reveal, as it includes areas of road and other space that cannot be counted, including the alleyways along the side of Block B and the "to be developed" space behind it, but fails to include the best bit or the square, immediately in front of and to the side of Block A. They have also failed to show the effect of neighbouring likely developments south of the square. However as their tests show all of the area of the square they have tested receiving sunlight, I am confident that at least 50% would.</p> <p>50. However, it should be noted that the BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations; as in London, the Mayor of London's Housing SPG acknowledges. In particular, the 27%</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>VSC recommended guideline is based on a low density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable. Paragraph 2.3.29 of the GLA Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city.</p> <p>51. I am content that the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing quality of the proposals would be acceptable in what is an urban location. In addition, it has been shown that the effects of these proposals on neighbours would be acceptable.</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p>52. I am generally happy with the designs of this proposal. This is a very important site, the centre of a major regeneration area, containing the heart of the “Cultural Quarter”, a place where vibrant modern employment needs to be combined with much needed new housing. The masterplan and pattern of proposed development is one which in my view supports and encourages these ambitions. The block pattern and network of streets, leading to a central square, has the potential to making a well integrated, permeable and pedestrian friendly neighbourhood.</p> <p>53. I am content that the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing effects of the proposal, on the development itself and on neighbours both existing and to come, are acceptable; indeed those on existing neighbours are very good for such an intensive, urban development, in an area of significant intensification. I am also confident that the detailed design of the proposed housing and workspaces will produce acceptable, rising to high quality accommodation, within a pleasant, rising to innovative, architectural proposal. I am also content that the proposed tall buildings are justified and of elegant, high quality design, that will compliment not harm the other buildings and spaces around and contribute to wider placemaking objectives.</p>	
<p>Carbon Management</p>	<p><i>Updated comments:</i></p> <p>Energy The policy requirement is zero carbon for the residential element and 35% improvement beyond building regulations for the commercial. The scheme delivers a 37.7%, and 41% improvement beyond Building Regulations 2013, for residential and commercial spaces respectively. The applicant is offsetting 62.3% to achieve zero carbon in the residential element. The overall approach is policy compliant.</p> <p>A Carbon Offset Contribution is required for the residential element of the development to the sum of £463,590 (171.7*£2,700), where zero carbon has not been achieved. This should be included within a S106 condition.</p>	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Energy – Lean The applicant has proposed an improvement of beyond Building Regulations of 12% for the residential portion of the development and 41% for the commercial portion of the development. This will be achieved through improved energy efficiency standards in key elements of the build. This is policy compliant and a positive.</p> <p>Energy – Clean The scheme proposes single energy centers for each block for heating and hot water. In total 14 boilers will be installed in the 5 energy centers that are located in Blocks A, B, D1, E, and F.</p> <p>This is not the single energy centre that is required in policy. But the Council has agreed this principle.</p> <p>We do need more detail on the schemes Energy Centres and its heating delivery, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need to see basement plans for each of the buildings showing the space of the energy centres - and to ensure that the energy centres are large enough to house the boilers now, and there is space for heat pumps / exchangers that will be required to connect to the Wood Green DEN, and that the centres are accessible for pipework and new equipment (punch points through the wall etc); 2. We need to know that the flue and air quality issues from the Energy Centre have be mitigated and do not emit pollutants into taller neighbouring buildings (the flue from Blocks E and D may blow into the taller block B); 3. We will need details on how the 5 energy centres will be connected to the Wood Green DEN. This will be demonstrated through a route map sized for the developments heating and hot water needs. And we require the developer to install pipework under their landscaping from each of the energy centres to the edge of the site (onto Coburg Road) or to fund this work at a later date. This could be approximately £1,400 per meter, but total cost will vary on the distance required. <p>This detail can be conditioned to ensure that the site will be able to connect to the Wood Green DEN.</p> <p>Energy – Green The application has reviewed the installation of various renewable technologies. They are proposing installing 140 kWp (circa 900m2) roof-mounted PV system is proposed for the site, which is expected to provide a further 12% reduction in on-site CO2 emissions.</p> <p>These above details should be conditioned to be delivered:</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Suggest Condition: Details of the boiler facilities and associated infrastructure, serving the heat and hot water loads for all the units on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 6 months prior to any works commencing on site. The details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) location of the energy centres in the buildings; b) specification of equipment and operational standards of the site wide network (advice and expected standards can be provided by the Council); c) flue arrangement and air quality mitigation measures; d) operation/management strategy; e) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed and funded to connect to the Wood Green heating network (including the proposed connectivity locations, punch points through structure and route of the link) ; and f) agreement to connect to the Wood Green DEN within a 5 year period of competition on site <p>Once these details are approved the Council should be notified if the applicant alters any of the measures and standards. Any alterations should be presented with justification and new standards for approval by the Council.</p> <p>Theses boiler facilities and infrastructure shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided and so that it is designed in a manner which allows for the future connection to a district system in line with London Plan policy 5.7 and local plan SP:04 and DM 22.</p>	
	<p>Suggested Condition: Details of the construction standard of the energy network and its ongoing operation shall be confirmed to the Council 3 months prior to any works commencing on site. These details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Confirmation that the site wide heating and hot water network has been designed and shall be constructed following the CIBSE / ADE Heat Networks Code of Practise; and b) Confirmation that the operator of the heating and hot water network shall achieve the standards set out in the Heat Trust Scheme. And that the developer will sign up to this standard to ensure that users have transparency of costs for customer protection. The 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="474 231 1711 295">Heat Trust Scheme standards and membership shall then be continued for the life of the heating and hot water network on the site, unless a regulatory scheme takes its place.</p> <p data-bbox="474 319 1711 383">REASON: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided in line with London Plan policy 5.7 and local plan SP:04 and DM 22.</p> <p data-bbox="474 414 1711 510">Suggested Condition: You must deliver the carbon reduction measure and standards as set out in the Energy Strategy, by Etude, Revision 001, dated September 2017</p> <p data-bbox="474 542 1711 694">The development shall then be constructed and the deliver the carbon savings set out in this document. Achieving the agreed carbon reduction of 40% reduction beyond BR 2013 across the site (37.7%, for residential and 41%, for commercial spaces). Confirmation that these energy efficiency measures and carbon reduction targets have been achieved must be submitted to the local authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval.</p> <p data-bbox="474 726 1711 821">The Council should be notified if the applicant alters any of the measures and standards set out in the submitted strategy (as referenced above). Any alterations should be presented with justification and any new proposals for approval by the Council.</p> <p data-bbox="474 853 1711 949">If the targets are not achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.</p> <p data-bbox="474 973 1711 1005">Reason: To comply with London Plan Policy 5.2. and local plan policy SP:04</p> <p data-bbox="474 1069 1711 1197">Expected Legal Agreement: The applicant agrees to pay the Carbon Offset Contribution of £463,590.00 to the Council upon commencement on site. This contribution will be used to deliver carbon reduction projects and programmes across the borough in line with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="474 1252 1711 1364">Sustainability Assessment The applicant has submitted a pre-assessment Sustainability Assessment within their Energy Strategy for the various blocks as follows - BREEAM refurbishment pre-assessment of Block A, very good, BREEAM new construction pre-assessment of Block F, excellent, and Indicative Code for Sustainable</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Homes pre-assessment for Blocks B, D1 and E (Code Level 4).</p> <p>This approach is policy compliant, supported, and it should be conditioned, as follows:</p> <div data-bbox="472 349 1671 1129" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Suggested condition: You must deliver the sustainability assessment as set out in the Sustainability Statement, by Etude, Revision 001, dated September 2017</p> <p>The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and shall achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLOCK A - BREEAM Refurbishment 2014 'Very Good' • BLOCK F - BREEAM New Construction 2014 'Excellent' • Blocks B, D1 and E - Code for Sustainability Homes Level 4 <p>A post construction certificate shall then be issued by an independent certification body, confirming this standard has been achieved. This must be submitted to the local authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval.</p> <p>In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the whole development, a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authority's approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.</p> <p>Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development in accordance with London Plan policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan.</p> </div> <p>Overheating Risk We expect a dynamic thermal model be undertaken for all London's future weather patterns. While the risk to the dwellings may be acceptable. We would advise that this risk is minimized at design stage, through designing in passive ventilation and appropriate mitigation strategies.</p> <p>We recommend that these are addressed through the following condition:</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Suggested Condition To demonstrate that there is minimal risk of overheating, the results of dynamic thermal modeling (under London’s future temperature projections) for all internal spaces must be given to the Council for approval. This should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 6 months prior to any works commencing on site and shall be operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.</p> <p>Details in this strategy will include measures that address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the standard and the impact of the solar control glazing; - that the heating pipe work space is designed in to the building allow the retrofitting of cooling and ventilation equipment - details on the passive design features have been included - details on the mitigation strategies which are included to overcome any overheating risk currently and in the future <p>This model and report should include details of the design measures incorporated within the scheme (including details of the feasibility of using external solar shading and of maximising passive ventilation) to ensure adaptation to higher temperatures are included. Air Conditioning will not be supported unless exceptional justification is given.</p> <p>Once approved the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: London Plan Policy 5.9 and Local Policy SP04 and in the interest of adapting to climate change and to secure sustainable development.</p>	
Housing	<p>Affordable Housing Provision This development proposes to deliver a mixed used scheme with 35% affordable housing comprising of 72 units of affordable housing. 32 London Affordable rent units and 40 London Living Rent intermediate tenure. This level of affordable units whilst just below Haringey’s Strategic Policies of 40% Borough wide target’ is acceptable.</p> <p>Further this complies with the adopted London Plan strategic policy 3A.10 which seeks the maximum amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>Dwelling mix and tenure The Council will seek 60% affordable housing mix – 11% 1beds, 45% 2beds, 33% 3beds and 11%</p>	<p>Noted. On balance the affordable housing provision is acceptable and will be recommended as a s106 heads of terms</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>4beds. and 40% intermediate housing with a mix of 30% 1 beds, 60% 2 beds,10% 3 beds, (LBH Housing Strategy2017-22). The proposed mix and tenure provides a larger proportion of 1bed units and does not meet the above strategy.</p> <p>This site sits within the Wood Green AAP (emerging policy) this is a designated growth Area & potential Opportunity area with levels of increased density. policy requires a suitable mix of tenures and unit size to be provided that are genuinely affordable.</p> <p>A portfolio approach is to be adopted within the AAP to ensure that any reduction in the percentage of family size units in the Town Centre locations should be offset by increased family units in other specified site locations. This actively ensures overall dwelling mix targets are met.</p> <p>The council requires 10% of new residential developments to be fully wheelchair accessible to ensure housing choice for disabled residents.</p> <p>The applicant will need to have regards to the benchmark rent levels as set out in in the mayor's affordable homes programme 2016-2021 funding guidance. Active consideration should be given to including the London Affordable Rent (LAR) and London Living Rent (LLR) this will be based on 1/3 of the ward median.</p> <p>The applicant will need to give careful attention to the new Intermediate Housing Policy adopted February 2018.</p> <p>Consultation The affordable housing units are to be transferred to a registered provider. However, negotiations for the transfer of the units must take place with Council in the first instance where agreement cannot be reached then units to be transferred to a preferred partner agreed by both the developer and the Council.</p> <p>Conclusion It has been negotiated that the developer is willing to provide an increased contribution of 35% affordable housing (32 London affordable rent units (2 x 4 bed / 6 person duplex, 1 x 3 bed / 5 person duplex, 7 x 2 bed / 4 person duplex, 14 x 3 bed / 5 person flats, and 8 x 2 bed / 4 person flats), 40 London living rent units (5 x 2 bed / 3 person flats and 35 x 1 bed / 2 person flats), and a total of 206 habitable rooms). This is 72 units with a split of 45% social housing and 55% intermediate housing.</p>	
Arboriculture	This proposed development will result in the removal of 13 Lawson cypress trees within the site. These trees are of low quality and value, which have been poorly maintained previously. It is also proposed to	Comments noted and financial obligation

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>remove 2 Field maples which are growing in the public highway. These two trees were planted 7-8 years ago and although they are in a good condition, their removal would be approved on the condition a financial contribution is made to allow for replacement trees to be planted in the local area. It is suggested in the Arboricultural report provided that the contribution should be over £10,000. The total amount of the financial contribution must be confirmed ASAP prior to agreement to remove the 2 Field maples.</p> <p>There are some minor changes to levels near 2 Silver birch trees, any impact can be mitigated by the recommendations in the method statement. All new buildings are outside of the root protection areas of the retained trees.</p> <p>The new landscaping includes the planting of 45 new trees which will more mitigate for the loss of the existing trees and greatly increase local canopy cover.</p> <p>All tree protection measures must be implemented as per the recommendations within the Tree Protection Plan and Method Statements contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>requested to replace public highway trees</p>
<p>Economic Regeneration</p>	<p>1. General comments Subject to WSG addressing the conditions/comments set out in the “Specific comments” section below, the EDT strongly supports the proposed development because of its potential jobs, commercial space, business, financial contribution to the Council and contribution to the physical and economic transformation of the Wood Green Cultural Quarter/ employment area. Based on the estimates of the WSG Planning & Development Consultants, Lichfield, the proposed development would have the following economic impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of 10,657 sq. of mixed-use commercial floor space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Affordable Workspace: Of this space, subject to the completion of Section 106 Agreement, they WSG will offer the businesses space in Block E (1014m², 11,000 sq. ft.) at a 20% discount to the market rent for a minimum of 5 years post completion. WSG will accept a reasonable endeavour obligation to offer a first refusal period of six month post completion to Collage Art at the stated rent on Workspace standard lease terms. If Collage Arts do not take up the offer within the six months Workspace are free to market the space. As outlined previously Workspace’s experience of moving exiting tenants is that they only wish to move once. • Business Continuity support fund: Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, WSG will set aside the sum of £500,000 to support the relocation and re - establishment of businesses. This will cover the reasonable cost associated with a customer’s relocation with in 	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Workspace's portfolio or to like for like accommodation within Wood Green.</p> <p>The development is estimated to bring the following Local Authority benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £1.4m New Homes Bonus payment (over a 4 year period) • 344,000 Council Tax revenue per annum • £4.5m Planning contributions (S106 and SIL) • £537,000 Business rate revenues per annum <p>2. Specific comments</p> <p>(i) WSG's planning and development (Lichfield), should provide detailed data, rationale and assumption under-pinning the figures outline in 1 above</p> <p>(ii) Supply chain opportunities for Haringey businesses. As a key condition for the LBH's Economic Development support and of the S106 agreement, the WSG must set out or provide a strategy on how local businesses will benefit from the supply chain activities arising from this development</p> <p>(iii) Construction jobs and local labour policies : As per the Council's Planning obligation (S106) and Local labour policies, developers, contractors and sub-contractors are required use at least 20% of local suppliers and labour. This obligation should flow throughout the entire supply chain. The Council would be happy to supply a list of local builders/construction companies for the main contractor to consider for their tender list. In addition, at least 5% the main contractor and its supply chain workers and apprentice must be from the borough. The Council's Skills and Employment team and its construction training partners will work with the main and sub-contractors to agree local recruitment targets.</p> <p>(iv) Provision for broadband and telecom infrastructure Provision of broadband infrastructure: Planning Policy DM54 requires all new developments in regeneration areas including Wood Green, to provide ultrafast infrastructure and connections – in order to meet the Council priority of providing digital infrastructure which facilitates regeneration and economic development. Developers should therefore include appropriately designed ducts/risers/access points to their sites and across their sites. The Council can provide the developer with a list of specialist consultants that could provide advice new build/broadband infrastructure related matters</p>	
Waste Management	<p>The proposed application has made appropriate provision for waste receptacles required for residential units as outlined in the application.</p> <p>The managing agent will need to have a cleansing schedule in place to ensure waste does not end up on the public highway.</p>	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>There needs to be a management plan in place to ensure receptacles are within the correct pulling distances at time of collection.</p> <p>Commercial waste must be stored and collected separately, arrangements for a scheduled waste collection with a Commercial Waste Contractor will be required. The business owner will need to ensure that they have a cleansing schedule in place and that all waste is contained at all times.</p> <p>Commercial Business must ensure all waste produced on site are disposed of responsibly under their duty of care within Environmental Protection Act 1990. It is for the business to arrange a properly documented process for waste collection from a licensed contractor of their choice. Documentation must be kept by the business and be produced on request of an authorised Council Official under section 34 of the Act. Failure to do so may result in a fixed penalty fine or prosecution through the criminal Court system.</p> <p>The above planning application has been given a RAG traffic light status of AMBER for waste storage and collection because it is unclear if arrangements have been made for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All waste collection vehicles would expect to enter and exit the development in a forward moving motion. (It has not been made clear if they will be able to achieve this) • Waste receptacles will need to be within 10meters pulling distance from waste vehicles at time of collection. (It has not been made clear if this is possible) 	<p>Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>
<p>Pollution</p>	<p><u>Initial:</u> <u>AQ modelling</u></p> <p>I have now looked at the AQ assessment and have some reservations; there are discrepancies between some of the details and data used in the assessment. I would like be grateful for some clarification:</p> <p>The transport statement states that 32 parking spaces for residential use, 2 car club spaces, 2 commercial spaces and loading bays for servicing vehicles will be provided. However, paragraph 13.16 the EIA appendix 3.1-3.2 dealing with the AQ assessment states that the development would provide 18 car parking spaces (including 13 disabled spaces).</p> <p>Also it is not clear why the traffic data and therefore modelled concentrations are based on previous applications relating to the Gas works site Table A13.1'with application refs. HGY/2016/0026 and HGY/2016/1661) and A13.2 (HGY/2017/0403- this application is in fact a EIA scoping study for Clarendon Road Gasworks Site so no data would have been included in any case). Is this to represent cumulative development?</p> <p>It is not clear why one set of concentrations are presented for one set of receptors included in the main</p>	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response								
	<p>AQ section of the EIA and other data is presented in Appendix 13.2 covers receptors located at the blocks only (and which if any of the data combines the impact of the emissions from both the traffic and the heating plant.</p> <p>It does not appear that the modelled emissions from the chimney stacks has taken into account the proximity of having significantly taller buildings located near to blocks of lower height and therefore how this will impact on the dispersion of the flue gases from the chimneys.</p> <p>No information has been included on the NOx emissions for the boilers used in the model. This this should be provided as mg/kwh (dry NOx @0% O2) to ensure that the proposed boilers are capable of meeting the London Plan SPG standards for emissions and that assessments are based on the proposed boilers for the development.</p> <p>AQ neutral</p> <p>The AQ neutral assessment includes NOx emissions information as g/s but not as mg/kwh. The total area for the development is described as 9,376 m2 (GIA) in the planning application description yet the calculation of the Benchmarked NOx Building Emissions for each Land-Use Category has been based in the following figures:</p> <table data-bbox="465 810 1025 938"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land Use</td> <td>GIA (m2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residential (C3)*</td> <td>21,815.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Uses (B1, D1 and D2)</td> <td>8,242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retail (A1, A3)</td> <td>1,134</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This will make a significant difference to the assessment and must be corrected.</p> <p><i>Further comments:</i></p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>The London Plan, Policy 7.14 states that new development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) where development is likely to be used by large numbers of those particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, such as children or older people) such as by design solutions, buffer zones or steps to promote greater use of sustainable transport modes through travel plans 	Land Use	GIA (m2)	Residential (C3)*	21,815.7	Commercial Uses (B1, D1 and D2)	8,242	Retail (A1, A3)	1,134	
Land Use	GIA (m2)									
Residential (C3)*	21,815.7									
Commercial Uses (B1, D1 and D2)	8,242									
Retail (A1, A3)	1,134									

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promote sustainable design and construction to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings; • be at least 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)). • Ensure that where provision needs to be made to reduce emissions from a development, this is usually made on-site. <p>The site is also adjacent to a TFL identified hotspot focus area.</p> <p><u>Energy</u> The energy statement does not propose CHP for the development instead individual block boilers will provide heat to each building. The statement does not provide information on the size or number of boilers that will be required or their associated emissions.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> The transport assessment states the site will be provided with 32 parking spaces for residential parking. A further two accessible car parking spaces will be provided off-street to serve the commercial units and four loading bays are proposed to meet the demand for servicing and deliveries. Two car club spaces on site are also proposed. 20% of all car parking spaces (seven spaces) are to have Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP), with a further 20% of spaces provided with a passive provision for EVCP. The development should be designated to be permit free. The proposals also include a Residential Travel Plan, Framework Travel Plan, and a Delivery & Servicing Plan. The latter should provide greater detail on how it proposes to identify deliveries that could be reduced, re-timed or consolidated. There are no proposals for promoting the use of low or zero emission vehicles; these must be developed.</p> <p><u>Air Quality Assessment</u> The Air Quality assessment does not include an assessment of the development alone but only in conjunction with the consented Haringey Heartlands and proposed Haringey Heartlands schemes.</p> <p>Data relating to the proposed heating plant for the Development has been provided in Table A13.3a in the amended Air Quality Assessment Detailed Methodology (Appendix 13.2A). The proposed heating plant includes 14 boilers. The emissions have been reduced significantly in the amended document therefore it is important that the plant in the operational development meets the emissions used in the assessment. However there is some inconsistency in the stack parameters (i.e. release rate) used in Table A13.3a in Detailed methodology compared to the information included in Table A13.4 (appendix</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>13.3) of the Air Quality Neutral assessment.</p> <p><u>AQ neutral assessment</u> An air quality neutral assessment has been undertaken (Appendix 13.3).</p> <p><u>Demolition and Construction</u> The assessment of dust/PM10 effects from demolition and construction of the development site is considered to be a high-risk site in relation to nuisance dust.</p> <p><u>Contaminated Land</u> A Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study by Albury S.I. Limited (Report Ref 16/10755/GO/Rev 2 Issued July 2016) has been submitted. The on-site sources identified within Table 3, Preliminary Conceptual Site Model, includes made ground, infilled ponds, tanks, former incinerator, electrical sub-stations, former Generator House and backup generators. Offsite sources include a gas works 120m to the south. Other sources not referred to in the Conceptual Site Model include the railway sidings 20m to the west, screw factory to the south, works, and a Car Breakers Yard on north west boundary of site. These sources must be taken into account in the Phase II site investigation. The Preliminary Conceptual Site Model identified potential contaminants including PAH, Heavy Metals and ACM (Asbestos), Ground gases and vapours, PCB's, Hydrocarbons, Kerosene or Diesel and Asbestos (ACM) within buildings. It recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An exploratory ground investigation to assess the identified risks and identified potential sources of contamination. • A detailed UXO assessment is undertaken to assess whether an UXO engineer is in attendance depending upon the outcome of the assessment. • The redundant water supply borehole present on site should be surveyed and decommissioned in accordance with EA guidance (The location of this feature should also be borne in mind when designing the proposed building foundations) <p>In undertaking the Phase II site investigation all potential sources should be considered.</p> <p>I recommend the following conditions:</p> <p><u>Air Quality Assessment/AQ neutral</u></p> <p>Before development commences a revised AQ assessment including predicted concentrations incorporating combustion plant emissions and an AQ neutral assessment with a comparison of</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>development emissions against London Plan emission benchmarks for buildings and transport. (taking into account the council's comments) must be undertaken.</p> <p><i>Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction.</i></p> <p><u>Combustion and Energy Plant</u></p> <p><u>Boilers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to commencement of the development details of all the chimney heights calculations, diameters and locations will be required to be submitted for approval by the LPA prior to construction. • Prior to installation, details of the Ultra Low NOx boilers for space heating and hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40 mg/kWh. <p><i>Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction.</i></p> <p><u>Contaminated land: (CON1 & CON2)</u></p> <p><u>CON1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before development commences other than for investigative work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Utilising the information from the Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study (and comments above) a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced and a Phase II site investigation shall be carried out. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a risk assessment to be undertaken, ▪ refinement of the Conceptual Model, and ▪ the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p style="text-align: center;">requirements.</p> <p>The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>b) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.</p> <p><u>And CON2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied. <p><i><u>Reason:</u> To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.</i></p> <p><u>Management and Control of Dust:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No works shall be carried out on the site until a detailed Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP), detailing the management of demolition and construction dust, has been submitted and approved by the LPA. The plan shall be in accordance with the GLA SPG ‘Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition’ and shall also include a Dust Risk Assessment. <p><i><u>Reason:</u> To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the commencement of any works the site or Contractor Company is to register with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the LPA. <p><i><u>Reason:</u> To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No works shall commence on the site until all plant and machinery to be used at the 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>demolition and construction phases meets Stage IIIA of EU Directive 97/68/ EC for both NOx and PM and all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant to be used on the site of net power between 37kW and 560 kW has been registered at http://nrmm.london/. Proof of registration must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works on site.</p> <p><i>Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An inventory of all NRMM must be kept on site during the course of the demolitions, site preparation and construction phases. All machinery should be regularly serviced and service logs kept on site for inspection. Records should be kept on site which details proof of emission limits for all equipment. This documentation should be made available to local authority officers as required until development completion. <p><i>Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.</i></p> <p><u>As an informative:</u></p> <p>Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out.</p>	
Conservation	<p>Background:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The site is part of the wider Haringey Heartlands, identified by the Council for regeneration as a high density employment and residential-led mixed-use development. The site is well located within Wood Green with access to the amenities along the High Road within a close distance and an extensive road and rail network. The applicant has submitted a detailed Design and Access Statement and Environmental Impact Assessment (including Townscape Visual Impact Assessment) along with other planning documents which I have read in detail to make the assessment below. I have also been involved in the pre-application discussions with the applicants and other colleagues from the Council. <p>Assessment of Significance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are no designated built heritage assets on the site, which currently contains a cluster of 	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>buildings of various sizes and scale. There are several small businesses, offices, creative industry uses and some light industry. The original Chocolate factory dates back to early 1900s and is locally listed (non-designated heritage asset). Built in the Modernist style, the building is rendered in white with large crittal type windows. At five storeys, the building forms an important landmark and was the original Barratt's Confectionary Factory. The building's later additions and development was shaped by the growth of the company. Historically, this association is of high value in the industrial and manufacturing history of Wood Green. More recently, the factory has been used as artist's workshops and studios, adding another dimension to its significance. Overall its architectural and historical value along with community associations as a creative hub adds to the building's significance within Wood Green.</p> <p>4. Whilst the site itself in not within a conservation area and does not contain any listed structures, there are conservation areas and listed structures in its vicinity which contribute to the local townscape character such as Alexandra Palace (II) and Alexandra Palace Park (Registered Historic Park, II). The site is visible from various conservation areas such as Wood Green Common, New River, Alexandra Palace and Hornsey High Street Conservation areas. The site also appears in long distance views of the Palace from other several locations across the borough. These are identified in the Borough's locally significant views.</p> <p>Development proposal:</p> <p>5. The Wood Green Area Action Plan identifies this site as a key regeneration site. This aspiration follows from the earlier Haringey Heartlands Development framework that also identified the site for re-development. The area is also identified as a key opportunity site in the Mayor's London Plan. In addition, it is also an area that has been identified as a potential site for tall buildings. As such the area is likely to undergo a vast change in both intensity and variety of land uses, as well as the scale and height of buildings with clusters of tall and taller buildings. This would create a new character within the area, that of a 'town centre' and 'civic hub' typology with key 'marker' buildings located close to transport nodes.</p> <p>6. Given this context, the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the envisaged AAP framework. It retains the Chocolate Factory and gives it a new context with new uses and public realm improvements. However, the tall and taller elements of the development would have an impact upon the views of Alexandra Palace from various locations within the borough. Views from the Palace and other adjacent conservation areas would also be affected. These views have been discussed in detail in the applicant's Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA).</p> <p>7. Part of the significance of the Alexandra Palace is derived from its 'hill top' location. The development will partly block some long distance views of the Palace, for example from the entrance of Lordship Rec on Adams Road (View 16). The development would also be visible from the Palace and the</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Park when looking towards Wood Green.</p> <p>8. Additionally, the blocks will dominate views most significantly from Wood Green Common Conservation Area, Hornsey High Street and New River Conservation Areas. These areas are primarily domestic and residential areas, characterised by two to three storey Victorian or later terraces with some new development up to 7 storeys along the New River. As such, the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, would be at odds with the adjacent area and is considered to cause some harm to these heritage assets, qualified as less than substantial under the NPPF.</p> <p>9. It is important to note that the view of Alexandra Palace from entrance of Lordship Recreational Ground from Adams Road (View 16) would be partially blocked and would not be considered appropriate from a heritage point of view. This is considered to cause a higher level of harm than those caused by others. However, this harm would be less than substantial.</p> <p>Assessment of harm against mitigation and benefits</p> <p>10. Having regard to the envisaged vision of the Wood Green AAP, the scale and intensity of the envisaged AAP is such that any development at these locations would have an impact on the views as described above. It is therefore important to ensure that the urban form and architectural language of the blocks is of very high quality, one that would mitigate the adverse impact of these views, resulting in heritage and townscape benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm.</p> <p>11. In most cases, the views are considered to be positive, one that signifies the changing townscape and 'role' of Wood Green in the 21st Century. The Master plan framework envisages more permeability of the site connecting the area with the wider social infrastructure through key pedestrian and vehicle routes. Buildings are designed to create and address new public routes, open squares and streets that are considered to be positive to the urban form and functionality of the area. As such, it is considered that the overall impact of the proposal would be positive, that would outweigh the less than substantial harm caused due to their scale.</p> <p>12. However, the harm caused by the blocking of a key view of Alexandra Palace from entrance of Lordship Recreational Ground from Adams Road (View 16) would not be considered appropriate from a heritage point of view. Whilst less than substantial, the harm is not considered to be outweighed by other design and heritage benefits. This should be balanced against other planning and regeneration benefits.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>13. From a conservation point of view, it is considered that the proposal by virtue of its scale would cause harm to the setting of Wood Green Common, Hornsey High Street and New River Conservation Areas. However, the proposed built form, urban typology, and circulation pattern along with the layout of</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>the blocks is likely to result in positive townscape benefits that would outweigh the harm caused.</p> <p>14. The tallest tower of the proposal would block a key view of Alexandra Palace causing harm to the significance of Alexandra Palace (II), Alexandra Palace Park (Historic Park and Conservation Area). Despite the townscape benefits described above, this harm is not considered to be outweighed and should be balanced against other planning and regeneration benefits.</p>	
<p>Drainage</p>	<p><i>Initial:</i> I don't appear to have received a completed Haringey, Pro-forma, I understand our guidance was given to the applicant I need to see a completed form.</p> <p>With the limited opportunity on this site for above ground SuDS solutions I would prefer to see a deep green roof substrate rather than a Sedum mat roof unless this can be justified.</p> <p>Although we don't normally like the inclusions of pumps the site levels indicate that this is a reasonable method for the use of them and accept the reason for their inclusion.</p> <p>Were any soakage tests carried to confirm the level of any potential infiltration?</p> <p>I haven't seen a maintenance plan/schedule for the lifetime of the development or who will be responsible (management company) for the maintenance.</p> <p>Other than that, what is being proposed for the drainage is acceptable in principal at this stage.</p> <p><i>Follow on:</i> I've now had a look through this and would like to refer to my previous response, there has been a pro-forma submitted that is just about acceptable. The coefficient value (CV) on the pro-forma Haringey expect to see a value of 1, the consultant has acknowledged this & suggested they will adjust it as per our guidance. Can we ask for the pro-forma to be re-submitted to show the change and, I've also just noticed the Micro-drainage calculations show FSR calculations, this will need to be re-submitted to show the CV change using the FEH methodology which is now the preferred method rather than the FSR.</p> <p>I'm satisfied the site has low permeability so tank storage will be used to attenuate the water before being pumped to the sewer.</p> <p>There's no response to the question raised about having a deep substrate Green Roof over a Sedum Roof.</p> <p>Unless I've missed something (& it's possible I have) I cannot find anything suggesting who will be</p>	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	responsible for the maintenance of the pumps and the tanks, so I would like to see a management maintenance schedule including who will be responsible for the lifetime of the development	
Transportation	<p><u>Transport Context</u></p> <p>The site is located in to West of Wood Green underground station and has it main pedestrian access via Clarendon Road, Coburg Road and Mayes Road, the site consists of several building which are to the east and west of Clarendon Road, Clarendon Road is a dead end road and there is not direct pedestrian or vehicular access from Clarendon Road to Mayes Road.</p> <p>The Public Transport accessibility level varies across the site from 6 in the north east closest to Wood Green station to 4 in the furthest south west corner. The site is 450 metres from Wood Green station, (12 minutes' walk), 570 metres from Alexandra Palace Rail Station, with 12 bus routes (29, 67, 121,123, 141, 184, 221, 243, 329, W3 and W4 within PTAL the (640 metres) walking distance of the site.</p> <p><u>Description of Development</u></p> <p>The applicant is proposing the partial demolition, change of use and extension of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the car parks to provide a mixed use development comprising: 230 dwelling (29x studios, 98 x1 bed, 72 x 2bed, 29x 3 bed and 4 x4 bed units), 1,350 sqm of A1-A3, 10,657 Sqm of B1 and 1,144 sqm and D1-D2 use with 29 car parking spaces for the development including 2-wheel chair accessible car parking spaces for the commercial aspect of the development. The applicant is also proposing to provide a total of (341) cycle parking spaces for the residential aspect of the development and (107) cycle parking space for the commercial aspect of the development.</p> <p>The existing condition surveys were conducted as part of the three planning applications submitted (Clarendon Square, Iceland site, and this application) as part of the various Transport Assessment (TA), a summary of the surveys is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) audit of the walking routes to the local public transport interchanges: Alexandra Palace Station, Hornsey Rail Station, Wood Green Station, Turnpike Lane Station; Wood Green High Road which offers access to a number of local bus routes and Penstock Foot path, which provides essential east/ west traffic free walking and cycling connectivity to the site. The results of the PERS audit concluded that all the above routes with the exception of Link 11 (Hornsey Park Road) was acceptable. Link 1 scored poorly in terms of reduced effective widths on both sides of the footway and pedestrians/user conflict due vehicles parked on the footways. The audit highlighted issues with Link 5 Penstock Footpath in terms of surveillance and security, which could be perceived as a deterrent to the use of the path, in addition the audit, highlighted a general lack of legibility and signage of the various walking routes. 2) Level of Cycling Service (CLOS) assessment of the key junctions surrounding the including: 	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Turnpike Lane/ Hornsey Park Road/ Wightman Road, Station Road/ High/ Lordship Lane and Turnpike Lane/ High Road/ Green Lanes/ Westbury Avenue. In general, apart from the Wood Green Common Link the majority of the cycle links scored poorly due to a lack of dedicated cycle facility to separate cyclist from motor vehicles and legibility including wayfinding signs. The assessment of the junction also scored poorly due to the lack of dedicated advance signalling for cyclist.</p> <p>3) The TA included Parking surveys of the roads within 200 metre of the site in line with the Lambeth methodology, the survey included the following roads; Western Road, Coburg Road, Clarendon Road, Mary Neuner Road, Hornsey Park Road, Brook Road, Malvern Road, Ravenstone Road, Silsoe Road and Park Ridings. The results of the car parking survey conclude that within the surveyed area there were some 338 car parking spaces (residents bay and business bays) with a maximum of 208 car parking space occupied at 20:00 hours with 130 (38.46%) of car parking space available on street within the surveyed area. We have therefore concluded that the area surrounding the site is not suffering from high on street car parking pressure; however it is to be noted that the roads to the northeast of the site are not currently covered by a controlled parking zone.</p> <p>4) The TA has reviewed the last 5 years' personal injury collision data, within the local surveyed area, there were 73 collisions the majority of the collisions were recorded as slight with no fatalities, four of the injuries were recorded as serious injury. It is to be note that on reviewing the accident data for Mayes Road. Western Road and Station Road there is a concentration of accidents close to the crossing points on Mayes Road, which would indicate that the current crossing points are not located on the pedestrian desire line or additional crossing points are required.</p> <p><u>Trip Generation</u></p> <p><u>Existing</u></p> <p>The applicant has conducted surveys of the existing site which has 7 Buildings comprising a total of 18,325 sqm with a range of uses including B1, B2, and D1 with some 12,769 sqm of B1 and some 4,715sqm of B1/D1 and D2 use including "Bakery" which is some 2020 sqm and of off street car parking spaces. The surveys concluded that the existing site generated a total of 403 In/out trips (322 in and 81 out) during the Am peak hour and a total of 372 in/out trips (78 in and 294 out) during the Pm peak hour, over a 12-hour period the existing site generated a total of 4318 trips (2159 in and 2159 out). The majority of the trips generated by the site is by sustainable mode of transport with car drive and car</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>passenger trips only accounting for 20.24% of the total amount of trips generated by the site, with 79.76% of by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p><u>Proposed Trip Generation</u></p> <p>The applicant used sites from the TRICS database to predict the trips that are likely to be generated by the development proposal based on 230 residential units. The residential aspect of the development proposal would generate 136 in/out trips (22in and 114 out) persons trips during the critical Am peak hour and a total of 110 in/out trips (70 in and 40 out) during the critical Pm peak hour with a total of 1,126 persons trip over the entire day.</p> <p>The applicant's transport consultant used sites from the TRICS database to forecast the number of trips that are likely to be generated by the retained/ reprovod B1 office element of the development proposal of 9,307 Sqm this is a reduction in the current B1 floor space. The applicant has not assessed the trip that are likely to be generated by D1-D2 element of the proposed development. It is to be noted that the B1 use will generate more trip when compared to the D1-D2 use, with the exception of D1 religious institution use which will generate trips outside the operational hours of the existing Wood Green outer control parking zone. We will therefore require a condition restricting the use by D1 religious institution use until these impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigation has been provided. The proposed B1 space will generate a total of 166 in/out (160 in and 6 out) person tips during the am peak periods and 187 in/out (181 in and 6 out) persons trips during the Pm peak hour and 1,732 in/out person trips over the day.</p> <p>It is to be noted that limited car parking will be provide as part of the development, and the applicant's transport consultant has rebalance the 2011 census data modal split to reflect this, whilst we acknowledge that the car drive mode share will reduce. We have considered that although there will be limited car parking on site there is currently a high level of all day car parking available within the local area that is within easy walking distance of the site. Hence a reduction in the car drive mode share from 30% to 5% is not realistic. We have therefore considered that the car mode share should be revised or the applicant will need to accept a S.106 obligation to have a maximum of 5% car driver trips as part of the travel plan.</p> <p>The applicant has not produced a trip generation information for the proposed A1-A3, we have concluded that the new retail space will service mainly local needs and given the combined quantum of retail proposed in the local area by this development and the neighbouring developments. The majority of the additional trips generated by the site will be liked-trips. It is also to be noted that as the applicant is not proposing to provide any off street car parking space for the proposed 1,350sqm of A1-A3 floor space, we have considered that the majority of the trips generated by these uses will be by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p><u>Parking Provision</u></p> <p>The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 27 off street car parking spaces to support the residential</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>aspect of the development which equates to 0.12 car parking spaces per unit, which will allow for 10% (23) wheel chair accessible car parking and a further 4 car parking spaces which will allocated to the 4 bed and 3 bed family size units. The car parking provision for the family size units are below the car parking provision required to support the Councils Development Management DMPD which require all three plus bed units to have access to an off street car parking space. However we have considered that given that the site has a good public transport accessibility level an enhance car club membership should be provided for the three plus bed units. Provided this is secured as part of the S.106 agreement, we have considered that the car parking provision proposed is acceptable as the area surrounding the site is located in the Wood Green Control Parking Zone and has not been identified as an area currently suffering from high on street car parking pressures. We have also considered that the sites has good public transport accessibility level. This is in line with the Council's Local Plan Policy SP7: Transport, which focuses on promoting travel by sustainable modes of transport, maximum car parking standards and car free developments. Car free developments are further supported by Haringey Development Management DPD, Policy DM32 which support car-free development where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There are alternative and accessible means of transport available; b) Public transport is good; and c) A controlled parking zone exists or will be provided prior to occupation of the development <p>This development proposal will be dedicated as a car free/ car-capped development the Council will prohibit the issuing of car parking permits to the future occupiers of the residential element of this development in any current or future control parking zone, residents will be eligible for visitors parking permits.</p> <p>It is to be noted that although the site is located in the Wood Green Control Parking Zone, there are some roads to the north of the site that are currently not covered by a control-parking zone and are in within easy walking distance of the site. We will therefore be seeking a financial contribution towards the design and consultation of parking control measure to restrict parking in these areas, the contribution has been estimated at £25,000 (twenty five thousand pounds). This will have to be secured byway of the S.106 agreement. We will also require the applicant to submit a parking management plan for approval before the development is occupied; this must be secured by way of condition.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to provide two off street car parking space for the commercial aspect of the development, this is much less than the number of car parking spaces which currently exist on site. The applicant has not provided details on what elements of the existing commercial use will be retained and the associated car parking requirements associated with this use. It is therefore very difficult to assess if the car parking provision is sufficient to serve the needs of the future occupants of the commercial element of the development. However, it is to be noted that the Council's Local Plan Policy SP7 seek to reduce car use and promote travel by sustainable modes of transport. In addition the applicant is proposing to provide a commercial travel plan to support the commercial aspect of the development,</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>including the provision of commercial car-club, this will be secured by the S.106 legal agreement.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to provide cycle parking from the development in line with the 2016 London plan which require, 1 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces per studio and 1 bed unit and 2 cycle parking spaces per 2 or more bed unit, and 6 short stay cycle parking spaces for short stay. The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 341 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces for the residential aspect of the development and a total of 107 cycle parking spaces for the business and commercial elements the development. The cycle parking provision is in line with the London Plan, we will require the design and layout and implementation of the cycle parking spaces to comply with the 2016 London Cycle Design Standard (LCDS).</p> <p><u>Impact on Public Transport</u></p> <p>When considering the impact of the development on public transport we need to consider the cumulative impact of this development and the other developments (Clarendon Square and the Island site) and the impact on the various modes of public transport (Underground, Local Buses, Rail and the local cycle network). In relation to this development proposal given the significant reduction in B1 floor area and C3 residential having a lower trip rate this development proposal would only result in a slight increase in the number of underground trips by some 22 additional trips and result in a reduction in the number of train and bus trips.</p> <p>There is a need to improve the accessibility to the local bus network for future residents of the development in particular those residents who have a disability or those residents who are not able to walk long distances. TfL is seeking a financial contribution of £ 1,250,000 to divert two bus routes to service this site and the neighbouring development sites. We have considered that given the Council's Local Plan Policy SP7 seeks to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport; we will require a financial contribution of £200,000 (two hundred thousand pounds) towards securing two bus routes to serve the development.</p> <p>Based on our assessment of cumulative impact of the three development proposal on the underground network; we have concluded that the majority of the trips generated by the site will be at Wood Green Station and there is current capacity at the station to cater for the demands of this development. We will require a contribution from the developer to improve the walking routes to and from the station including providing and new pedestrian crossing facility on Mayes Road with the Junction of Brook Road and improvements to the Caxton Road and Caxton Mews pedestrian link, which provide access to the High Road. The primary pedestrian access to the development will be via Mayes Road and Brook Road. The PERS audit of the existing pedestrian environment surrounding the site and on the key routes to the public transport interchange highlighted that all the routes requires clear legible signage. In addition, the</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>majority of the accidents were recoded as slight accidents totalling 16, with a number of cycle collisions taking place on Mayes Road between the junction of Coburg Road and Brook Road. It is to be noted that there are two existing crossing point one signalised and one un-signalised at this location however it would seem that the crossing points will need to be reviewed and a crossing point provided at the appropriate location. The cost of the highways contribution has been estimated at £150,000 towards improvements to these links.</p> <p><u>Impact on the Highways network</u></p> <p>The proposed development will result in a reduction in the numbers of vehicular trips generated by the development hence any increase in the number of serving trips will be inconsequential when compared to the reduction in vehicular trips.</p> <p><u>Access and Servicing Arrangements</u></p> <p>The site currently doesn't have a delivery and servicing plan, the applicant has forecasted the number of servicing trips that will be generated by the development proposal, we have considered that as the servicing of the residential and commercial aspect of the development can be completed via Western Road and Clarendon Road. The number and times of the deliveries can be managed byway of Service and delivery Plan. We will therefore require a service and delivery plan to be secured byway of S.106 agreement the plan must be monitored annually in line with the frame work travel plan for a minimum period of 5 years.</p> <p><u>Highways Layout</u></p> <p>The proposed development will require changes to the highway network including changes to Clarendon Road and Western Road including the removal of the existing crossovers and providing new vehicular crossovers to access the development. The applicant's proposed highways scheme includes a new public realm scheme on Clarendon Road which includes raised shared surface with new trees and shared surface footway parking. The cost of the highways works has been estimated at £ 549,000 (five hundred and forty nine thousand pounds) not including any statutory utilities works.</p> <p><u>Travel Plan</u></p> <p>The applicant's transport consultant has produced a draft travel plan to support the development proposal the travel plan have been assessed using ATTRIBUTE. The travel plan, including the targets and measures proposed in the travel plan are to be secured by the S.106 agreement the applicant will be required to pay £2k (two thousand pounds) per travel plan for travel pan monitoring for a minimum of 5 years.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="465 256 618 288"><u>Conclusions</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 320 1713 384">On assessing this application, we have concluded that subject to the following S.106 obligation and conditions the transportation planning and highways authority would not object to this application:</p> <ol data-bbox="465 408 1713 1391" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 408 1713 687">1. <u>Car-free Development</u> The owner is required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the residential units are defined as “car free” and therefore no residents therein will be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development. The applicant must contribute a sum of £4000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order for this purpose. Reason: To ensure that the development proposal is car-free and any residual car parking demand generated by the development will not impact on existing residential amenity. <li data-bbox="465 711 1713 1391">2. <u>Residential Travel Plan</u> Within six (6) months of first occupation of the proposed new residential development a Travel Plan for the approved residential uses shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority detailing means of conveying information for new occupiers and techniques for advising residents of sustainable travel options. The Travel Plan shall then be implemented in accordance with a timetable of implementation, monitoring and review to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, we will require the following measure to be included as part of the travel plan in order to maximise the use of public transport: <ol data-bbox="562 991 1713 1391" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="562 991 1713 1086">a) The developer must appoint a travel plan co-ordinator, working in collaboration with the Estate Management Team, to monitor the travel plan initiatives annually for a minimum period of 5 years. <li data-bbox="562 1086 1713 1150">b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables, to every new resident. <li data-bbox="562 1150 1713 1302">c) Establishment or operate a car club scheme, which includes the provision of 2 car club bays and two cars with, two years’ free membership for all residents and £50.00 (fifty pounds in credit) per year for the first 2 years. And enhanced car club membership for the family sized units (3 plus bed units) including 3 years membership £100 (one hundred pounds) per year from membership for 3 years. <li data-bbox="562 1302 1713 1366">d) We will also like to see Travel Information Terminals erected at strategic points within the development, which provides real time travel information <li data-bbox="562 1366 1713 1391">e) the travel plan must include specific measures to achieve the 8% cycle mode share by the 5th 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>year. f) The applicants are required to pay a sum of, £2,000 (two thousand pounds) per year for a period of 5 year for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives. Reason: To enable residential occupiers to consider sustainable transport options, as part of the measures to limit any net increase in travel movements.</p> <p>3. <u>A Work Place travel Plan</u> The Travel plan must be secured by the S.106 agreement. As part of the travel plan, the following measures must be included in order to maximise the use of public transport. a) The applicant submits a Works place Travel Plan for the commercial aspect of the Development and appoints a travel plan coordinator who must work in collaboration with the Facility Management Team to monitor the travel plan initiatives annually for a period of 5 years and must include the following measures: a) Provision of welcome residential induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information, available bus/rail/tube services, map and timetables to all new residents, travel pack to be approved by the Councils transportation planning team. c) The applicant will be required to provide, showers lockers and changing room facility for the work place element of the development. d) Establishment or operate a car club scheme, which includes the provision of 1 car club bays and one cars with, two years' free membership for all commercial units. d) The developer is required to pay a sum of £2,000 (two thousand pounds) per year per travel plan for monitoring of the travel plan for a period of 5 years. This must be secured by S.106 agreement.</p> <p>Reason: To promote travel by sustainable modes of transport in line with the London Plan and the Council's Local Plan SP7 and the Development Management DMPD Policy DM 32.</p> <p>4. <u>Public realm</u> We will require the applicant to make a financial contribute of £150,000 (one hundred and fifty thousand pounds) by way of a S.106 agreement towards a package of measures to improve the walking condition on the following key walking routes: 1. Penstock Foot path 2. Haringey Park Road 3. Mayes Road 4. Coburg Road, Caxton Road/ Caxton Road to Wood Green High Road. Reason: To promote travel by sustainable modes of transport (cycling) in line with the London Plan</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>and the Council's Local Plan SP7 and the Development Management DMPD Policy DM 32..</p> <p>5. <u>Control Parking Zone consultation CPZ</u> The applicant developer will require to contribute byway of a Section 106 agreement a sum of £23,000 (Twenty three thousand pounds) towards the design and consultation on the implementing parking management measures to the south east of the site, which are currently not covered by a control parking zone and may suffer from displaced parking as a result of residual parking generated by the development proposal. Reason: To ensure that any residual car parking demand generated by the development proposal will not have any adverse impact on the local highway network and the residential amenity of the existing local residents.</p> <p>6. <u>Bus Route Contribution</u> The applicant will be required to contribute towards enhance the connectivity to the existing bus network, we will be seeking a contribution of £200,000 (two hundred thousand pounds) to secure the diversion of two bus routes to service the development site. Reason: To facilitate travel by sustainable modes of transport to and from the site.</p> <p>7. <u>Section 278 Highway Act 1980</u> The owner shall be required to enter into agreement with the Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act to pay for any necessary highway works, which includes if required, but not limited to, footway improvement works, access to the Highway, measures for street furniture relocation, carriageway markings, and access and visibility safety requirements. Unavoidable works required to be undertaken by Statutory Services will not be included in the Highway Works Estimate or Payment. In addition, the cost estimate is based on current highways rates of the permanent highways scheme. The developer will be required to provide details of any temporary highways scheme required to enable the occupation of each phase of the development, which will have to be costed and implemented independently of this cost estimate. The cost of the S.278 works have been estimated at £549,533 (five hundred and forty nine thousand pounds) and must be indexed linked and reviewed annually or before the implementation of each phase of the highway works. Reason: To implement the proposed highways works to facilitate future access to the development site.</p> <p>8. <u>Construction Management Plan.</u> The applicant/ Developer is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months (three months) prior to construction work commencing on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>(Inc. demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Clarendon Road, and the roads surrounding the site is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods, the plans must take into consideration other site that are being developed locally and were possible coordinate movements to and implement also measures to safeguard and maintain the operation of the local highway network. Give the sensitivity of this location combined with the other developments proposed in the local are the CMP will require monitoring the developer will be require to pay £3,000 (three thousand pounds) toward the monitoring of the CMP. Reason: to ensure that the impacts of the development proposal on the local highways network are minimised during construction.</p> <p>9. <u>Parking Management Plan</u> The applicant will be required to provide a Parking Management Plan which must include details on the allocation and management of the on-site car parking spaces including the wheel chair accessible car parking spaces to the front of the building and the 5 commercial car parking spaces. The residential car parking spaces must be allocated in order of the following priorities regardless of tenure (Private/ affordable):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking for the disable residential units 10% of the total number of units proposed (163-169)- wheel chair accessible car parking spaces) 2. A minimum of 1-wheel chair accessible car parking space for the commercial element of the development. 3. Family sized units 3+ bed units 4. Two bed 4 four person units 5. Two bed units 6. one bed units and studios. <p>Reason: To ensure that the allocation of the off street car parking spaces is in line with the Council's development management DMPD Policy DM 32 which seeks to priorities parking for the family sized units.</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Cycle parking Design and Layout</u> The applicant will be required to provide the correct number of cycle parking spaces in line with the 2016 London Plan in addition the cycle parking spaces should be designed and implemented in line with the 2016 London Cycle Design Standard. Reason: To promote travel by sustainable modes of transport and to comply with the London Cycle 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Design Standard.</p> <p>2. <u>Electric Charging Points</u> The applicant will be required to provide 20% of the total number of car parking spaces with active electric charging points, with a further 20% passive provision for future conversion. Reason: To comply with the Further Alteration to the London Plan and the London, and reduce carbon emission in line with the Council's Local Plan Policy SP4.</p> <p>3. <u>Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management Plan.</u> The owner shall be required to submit a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) for the local authority's approval. The DSP must be in place prior to occupation of the development. The service and deliver plan must also include a waste management plan which includes details of how refuse is to be collected from the site, the plan should be prepared in line with the requirements of the Council's waste management service which must ensure that all bins are within 10 metres carrying distances of a refuse truck on a waste collection day. Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic or public safety along the neighbouring highway.</p> <p>4. <u>Restriction to D1 Use</u> The transport assessment has not assessed the impacts of D1 religious institution use we will therefore require a restriction on the D1 use to exclude religious institution use until these impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigation has been provided. Reason: To ensure that the traffic and parking demand generated by the development proposal will not adversely impact on the local highways network.</p>	
Noise	<p>In response to this application, a general site visit to the proposed location was undertaken on the 4th December 2017. I have examined the methodology, results and recommendations produced by Barton Willmore LLP in their Noise and Vibration report dated October 2017 reference 21650/A5/ES2017. The report assesses the potential impact that noise and vibration will have on;</p> <p>1) the existing noise sensitive receptors during the construction works 2) the existing noise sensitive receptors when the development is completed and operational 3) the end users when the development is completed and operational.</p> <p>With respect to noise and vibration, there are no objections made in principle to this application for a proposed mixed development, however the following conditions shall apply.</p>	<p>These comments are all noted and discussed further within the material planning considerations. Conditions are recommended as applicable.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response												
	<p>Internal Noise Levels within Residential Units</p> <p>The report states that with the specified recommended glazing and ventilators installed within the proposed residential units (with the windows closed) the following internal noise levels in accordance with BS8233:2014 will be achieved;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="481 411 1583 571"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="481 411 848 443">Time</th> <th data-bbox="848 411 1216 443">Area</th> <th data-bbox="1216 411 1583 443">Maximum Noise level</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="481 443 848 512">Daytime Noise 7am – 11pm</td> <td data-bbox="848 443 1216 512">Living rooms and Bedrooms</td> <td data-bbox="1216 443 1583 512">35dB(A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="481 512 848 571"></td> <td data-bbox="848 512 1216 571">Outdoor Amenity</td> <td data-bbox="1216 512 1583 571">55dB(A)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="481 571 848 639">Night Time Noise 11pm - 7am</td> <td data-bbox="848 571 1216 639">Bedrooms</td> <td data-bbox="1216 571 1583 639">30dB(A)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>With no individual events to exceed 45dB LAmax (measured with F time weighting) between 23.00hrs - 07.00hrs. standard in bedrooms at night,</p> <p>Table 14.19 of the report illustrates the preliminary assessment results for the worst affected residential facades (Blocks B, D & E) using typical glazing configurations of 27 & 29dB Rw +Ctr with all windows closed. Whilst additional attenuation will be required in the form of acoustically rated passive ventilation the report doesn't confirm the acoustic performance of these vents.</p> <p>Requirement</p> <p>The applicant shall be required to submit a scheme of sound insulation (glazing and ventilators) to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of works.</p> <p>A test shall be undertaken prior to the discharge of this condition to verify that the required internal noise levels have been met. The results of this test shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.</p> <p>Fixed Building Services Plant Noise Condition</p> <p>Noise arising from the operation of any plant together with any associated ancillary equipment shall not increase the existing background noise level (LA90,15mins) when measured (LAeq , 15mins) 1 metre external from the nearest residential or noise sensitive premises. This condition shall remain applicable for the duration of its use.</p> <p><i>Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers consistent with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006</i></p> <p>Scheme of Sound Insulation</p>	Time	Area	Maximum Noise level	Daytime Noise 7am – 11pm	Living rooms and Bedrooms	35dB(A)		Outdoor Amenity	55dB(A)	Night Time Noise 11pm - 7am	Bedrooms	30dB(A)	
Time	Area	Maximum Noise level												
Daytime Noise 7am – 11pm	Living rooms and Bedrooms	35dB(A)												
	Outdoor Amenity	55dB(A)												
Night Time Noise 11pm - 7am	Bedrooms	30dB(A)												

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>The applicant will be required to submit and install a scheme of sound insulation between the commercial (flexible Use Classes A1, A3, B1, D1& D2) properties and the proposed residential units. The details of this scheme shall be submitted for approved by the Local Authority before the commencement of any works.</p> <p>Construction Impacts Prior to the to the commencement of the development a Construction Method Statement (CMS) shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority outlining measures that will be taken to control dust, noise and other environmental impacts of the development.</p> <p><i>Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties consistent with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.</i></p> <p>Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise The results from the Vibration Assessment undertaken in accordance with BS6472:2008 indicates that "Adverse Comments are unlikely" on the end users when the development is completed. However, during demolition & construction stage, the nearest noise sensitive premises (Alexandra School) will be affected on a short term basis. To mitigate against noise andvibration, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be produced and submitted for approval. The Council Enforcement Response (Noise Team) will encourage that an application for prior consent under s.61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 is made to the Council's Enforcement Response (Noise Team) to ensure that noise and vibration from the demolition and construction process are directly and effectively regulated on site.</p> <p>External Amenity Spaces - Balconies Although the noise levels on some of the balconies on the western façades are predicted to exceed the WHO Guidelines upper daytime outdoor sound level from steady, continuous noise of 55dB LeqT, the noise experienced is considered not to be of such a level as to prohibit the use of these spaces. The decision as to whether the balconies are utilised should be at the discretion of the future occupants, with most favouring the option of private external space than no private external space at all. This can be seen as an additional benefit considering that there is shared amenity place available. The applicant has incorporated attenuation measures in the design to reduce noise in the most exposed facades of Block E</p> <p>Operational Hours of Use I was unable to find any recommendation on the proposed hours of use for the commercial premises or confirmation of the end users. I would recommend that the Local Planning Authority impose a restriction on the operational hours of use, which is not dissimilar to the existing A1, A3, B1, D1 and D2 use premises in the local area.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p><i>Reason: This permission is given to facilitate the beneficial use of the premises whilst ensuring that the amenities of adjacent residential properties are not diminished consistent with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.</i></p> <p>Vehicular deliveries to the commercial premises will be made from on the roadside/public highway and designated loading bays.</p> <p>Restriction on Deliveries</p> <p>Deliveries to the site should be restricted between the hours 07.00hrs - 19.00 Monday to Saturday with No deliveries on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p>	
EXTERNAL		
Environment Agency	<p>We have no objections to the above application subject to the inclusion of the condition below.</p> <p>Condition No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a scheme for decommissioning the abstraction well(s) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide details of how these redundant boreholes are to be decommissioned. The scheme as approved shall be implemented prior to commencement of enabling works for any part of the permitted development.</p> <p>Reason There are likely to be two deep abstraction wells on site TQ39/023 and TQ39/023B into the Chalk and these are potential portals or pathways for connecting the surface contamination with the deep Chalk Aquifer. Whilst the EIA states that they will be decommissioned it does not say at what stage in the development or include an assessment of the risk if contamination is mobilised in the vicinity of these wells.</p> <p>These wells should be decommissioned before any remediation or enabling works commence.</p>	Noted. The condition is recommended as requested.
Crossrail Safeguarding 2	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 23 February 2018, requesting the views of the Crossrail 2 Project Team on the above application. I confirm that this application relates to land within the limits of land subject to consultation by the Crossrail 2 Safeguarding Direction. If the Council, in its capacity as Local Planning Authority, is minded to grant planning permission, please apply the following conditions on the Notice of Permission:</p> <p>C1 None of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until detailed design and Construction method statements for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements</p>	Condition and informative recommended.


Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>and for any other structures below ground level, including piling and any other temporary or permanent installations and for ground investigations have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Accommodate the proposed location of the Crossrail 2 structures including temporary works II. Accommodate ground movement arising from the construction thereof, III. Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of Crossrail 2 within its tunnels and other structures. <p>The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statements. All structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by paragraphs 1(i), 1 (ii) and 1 (iii) of this condition on shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building[s] hereby permitted is/are occupied. No alteration to these aspects of the development shall take place without the approval of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Crossrail 2.</p> <p>Informative: Applicants should refer to the Crossrail 2 Information for Developers available at crossrail2.co.uk. Crossrail 2 will provide guidance in relation to the proposed location of the Crossrail 2 structures and tunnels, ground movement arising from the construction of the tunnels and noise and vibration arising from the use of the tunnels. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Crossrail2 Safeguarding Engineer in the course of preparing detailed design and method statements.</p> <p>In addition, the latest project developments can be found on the Crossrail 2 website www.crossrail2.co.uk , which is updated on a regular basis. I hope this information is helpful, but if you require any further information or assistance then please feel free to contact a member of the Safeguarding Team on 0343 222 1155, or by email to safeguardcrossrail2@tfl.gov.uk</p>	
Designing Crime Out	<p>1.0 It is my professional opinion that crime prevention and community safety are material considerations, because of the proposed use, design, layout and location of the development proposed.</p> <p>1.1 To ensure the delivery of a safer development in line with Local Development Framework policies SP11 (See Appendix for details of these policies), I have highlighted some of my main areas of concern in Section 2 and I have recommended the attaching of a suitably worded condition, together with an informative.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>2.0 I can confirm that I have not met with the project architects or agents to discuss the intention around Secured by Design (SbD) as laid out in L.B. Haringey' SP11 policy, The London Plan.</p>	



Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Crime analysis and research provided by Police.Uk (see appendix 2 for reported incidents only) indicates that, Burglary, Criminal Damage, Violence against the person, Street crime, such as Theft, Theft from the person, Theft Snatch, Fraud (ATM), Alcohol/Drugs misuse & Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) are the main types of crime that affect the existing residents on a regular basis.</p> <p>I have reviewed the planning application and unbelievably I can find no reference to crime prevention or security within the documents available, I formally object to the proposed development as it fails to disclose how it will address the crime prevention requirements in addition to due to the areas of concern (See 2.1 below) I request a dialogue with the project design team following the completion of the relevant SbD application forms at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Following consultation with the MPS Designing Out Crime team, the project has the potential to achieve a Secured by Design Gold Award & Commercial Award.</p> <p>Concerns: 2.1 In summary I have site specific concerns in relation to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community/Amenity space in • Balcony Design regard to ASB • Perimeter treatments • Access Control • Postal strategy • Refuse Store/s • Bicycle Stores • Compartmentalisation • Physical Security • Masionettes • External Lighting • Vehicle Delivery strategy • CCTV (Public Realm) <p>Should the project be granted planning permission I request the following condition be attached to the application.</p> <p>Community Safety - Secured by Design Conditions: 3.0 (1) I request that prior to carrying out above grade works of each building or part of a building, details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve full Secured by Design' Accreditation.</p> <p>The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>(2) Prior to the first occupation of each building or part of a building or use, a 'Secured by Design'</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>accreditation shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or use.</p> <p><u>Community Safety - Informative:</u> 3.1 In aiming to satisfy the condition the applicant should seek the advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs). The services of MPS DOCOs are available free of charge and can be contacted via docomailbox.ne@met.police.uk or 0208 217 3813.</p> <p><u>Crime Figures:</u> 4.0 Crime and disorder is a factor for consideration with this application. Crime data affecting this application are highlighted in appendix 2 below.</p> <p><u>Legislation & SBD Guidance:</u> 5.0 The LB Haringey LPD Core strategy requires all developments to demonstrate and apply the principles and practices of the Secured by Design (SBD) scheme. The measures recommended below are not intended to be prescriptive but to provide a suitable direction for the development. As a matter of course, all due consideration should be given to the SBD 'Homes 2016' guide (available online via http://www.securedbydesign.com/professionals/guides.aspx)</p> <p>Crime prevention and community safety are material considerations. If the L.B. Haringey are to consider granting consent, I would ask that the condition(s) and informative detailed above are attached. This is to mitigate the impact and deliver a safer development in line with national, regional and local planning policies. I would also like to draw your attention to Section 17 CDA 1988 and the NPPF, (See appendix) in supporting my recommendations.</p> <p>5.1 Whilst I accept that with the introduction of Approved Document Q of the Building Regulations from 1st October it is no longer appropriate for local authorities to attach planning conditions relating to technical door and window standards I would encourage the planning authority to note the experience gained by the UK police service over the past 26 years in this specific subject area.</p> <p>That experience has led to the provision of a physical security requirement considered to be more consistent than that set out within Approved Document Q of the Building Regulations (England); specifically the recognition of products that have been tested to the relevant security standards but crucially are also fully certificated by an independent third party, accredited by UKAS (Notified Body). This provides assurance that products have been produced under a controlled manufacturing environment in accordance with the specifiers aims and minimises misrepresentation of the products by unscrupulous manufacturers/suppliers and leads to the delivery, on site, of a more secure product.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>I would therefore request that the benefits of certified products be pointed out to applicants and that the Local Authority encourages assessment for this application.</p> <p>For a complete explanation of certified products please refer to the Secured by Design guidance documents which can be found on the website. www.securedbydesign.com .</p>	
<p>Transport for London</p>	<p><i>Initial:</i> The following comments represent the views of Transport for London officers and are made on a "without prejudice" basis. They should not be taken to represent an indication of any subsequent Mayoral decision in relation to a planning application based on the proposed scheme. These comments also do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority.</p> <p>Site description</p> <p>The development site is located within the Wood Green area of the London Borough of Haringey. The site and the urban environment directly surrounding it are bounded by Coburg Road to the south, Mayes Road to the east and western road to the west and north. Alexandra Primary School is located to the north of the site.</p> <p>The nearest section of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A406 North Circular Road which is approximately 2.6km to the north of the site. The nearest section of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is the A105 High Road Wood Green which is approximately 350 metres to the east.</p> <p>The nearest London Underground (LU) Station from the site is Wood Green (Piccadilly Line) which is approximately 0.8km to the north-east of the site. The nearest rail station from the site is Alexandra Palace which is approximately 1km to the north-west of the site.</p> <p>The nearest bus stops are located on Station Road, approximately 300m to the north. They serve routes W3 and 184, which provide convenient bus access to both Wood Green LU Station and Alexandra Palace rail station. A further 12 routes serve the High Road Wood Green, though these are on average at least 750 metres from the nearest part of the site.</p> <p>Due to the aforementioned public transport connections, the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of the site is rated as 4 (on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is excellent and 1 is very poor).</p> <p>We understand the development to be made up of:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Land use C3: 216 residential units</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="472 233 875 256">☐ Land use A1-A3: 1,134sqm GIA</p> <p data-bbox="472 261 835 285">☐ Land use B1: 8,242sqm GIA</p> <p data-bbox="472 320 667 344">Trip generation</p> <p data-bbox="472 384 1709 504">The proposed development is forecast to generate fewer trips than the existing land use that it is replacing, therefore the number of trips to and from the site is forecast to reduce: there is a forecast net reduction of approximately 1,700 two-way trips across the day, including approximately 600 car trips. TfL is satisfied the trip generation methodology used to reach these forecasts.</p> <p data-bbox="472 539 618 563">Car parking</p> <p data-bbox="472 598 607 622"><u>Residential</u></p> <p data-bbox="472 662 1709 842">32 car parking spaces are proposed for the residential element of the development. This represents a residential car parking ratio of 0.15 spaces per unit which is London Plan compliant and appropriate given the site's public transport accessibility level. The Transport Assessment states that all accessible units will be provided with an accessible parking space, which aligns with the London Plan / London Plan Housing SPG recommendation. It is proposed that the London Plan electric vehicle charging standards for residential parking - 20% active and 20% passive provision - will be met.</p> <p data-bbox="472 877 618 901"><u>Commercial</u></p> <p data-bbox="472 941 1709 1061">The existing 7 commercial car parking bays along Clarendon Road are to be reconfigured but retained for the businesses on site and in the surrounding area. In addition, 2 off-street accessible car parking spaces will be provided for the commercial element of the development. The Transport Assessment states that the proposal represents a reduction in commercial car parking, which is satisfactory.</p> <p data-bbox="472 1096 551 1120">Buses</p> <p data-bbox="472 1160 1709 1216">There is a forecast net reduction in bus trips from the site; therefore no bus capacity mitigation is required.</p> <p data-bbox="472 1251 568 1275">Cycling</p> <p data-bbox="472 1315 920 1339"><u>Analysis of local conditions for cycling</u></p> <p data-bbox="472 1378 1709 1402">In TfL pre-application advice, we recommended that a Cycle Level of Service (CLoS) assessment should</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>be carried out on the cycle routes and junctions in the site vicinity and on key routes. The applicant has identified cycle routes in the vicinity of the site but has not assessed the quality of these routes. We request that an assessment of the quality of the local cycling environment is undertaken, including links onto the proposed Quietway 10 (described below).</p> <p>We would like to highlight that there is a proposal for a Quietway Route to run along the western site boundary on Western Road. This proposed route is Quietway 10 that will link Farringdon to Palmers Green via Finsbury Park.</p> <p><u>Cycle Parking Quantum</u></p> <p>A total of 350 cycle parking spaces (344 long stay plus 6 short stay) are proposed for the residential element of the development, which meets London Plan minimum standards.</p> <p>A total of 36 cycle parking spaces (7 long stay plus 29 short stay) are proposed for the retail element of the development and 66 cycle parking spaces (55 long stay plus 11 short stay) are proposed for the commercial/employment element of the development. TfL requests that the GEA floor space figures for these elements of the development are provided in so that London Plan compliancy can be determined.</p> <p><u>Location and Access to Cycle Parking</u></p> <p>We welcome the provision of cycle parking at ground floor level and close to the core of the building enabling easy access to/ from residential units.</p> <p>Figures 1, 2 and 3 have been taken from "FIGURE 4.4 - CYCLE PARKING LOCATION PLAN" in the Transport Assessment. Access to the highlighted cycle storage facility in Figure 1 may be convoluted due to likelihood of blockage by parked vehicles, users needing to negotiate 3 internal doors, a right-angled corner and a potential narrow corridor.</p>  <p>Figure 1: cycle parking storage facility that TfL has accessibility concerns regarding</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="465 256 1711 320">We also have accessibility concerns regarding the cycle parking highlighted in Figure 2 - the operation of the two tier racks may block access to the nearby cycle racks.</p> <div data-bbox="465 344 913 683">  </div> <p data-bbox="943 379 1189 504">Figure 2: cycle parking stands that TfL has accessibility concerns regarding</p> <p data-bbox="465 719 1711 807">We welcome the provision of short-stay cycle parking spaces in the public realm. However, some of the stands seem to be located along pedestrian desire lines and may obstruct the footway – see Figure 3 as an example.</p> <div data-bbox="465 839 974 1249">  </div> <p data-bbox="1003 842 1267 967">Figure 3: an example of where short stay cycle parking appears to block the footway</p> <p data-bbox="1003 1241 1182 1273"><u>Type of stands</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 1305 1711 1369">Whilst the Transport Assessment states that a mix of cycle parking stands will be provided to cater for larger models of bicycles, this does not appear to be reflected on the plans.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="465 231 577 255">Walking</p> <p data-bbox="465 292 1196 316"><u>Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) assessment</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 352 1720 440">The Council should work with the Applicant to address the specific issues identified in the PERS assessment as needing improvement. Table 2.1 and 2.2 of the PERS report outline a number of red and amber issues which should be improved through s106/278 agreements.</p> <p data-bbox="465 477 551 501"><u>Safety</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 537 1720 715">There are a number of pedestrian collisions that have occurred nearby along Mayes Road, particularly between the junctions with Coburg Road and Brook Road, suggesting that a potential desire line is not being met by the current provision of crossing points. It is important that our streets provide a safe, comfortable and attractive environment for walking, with streets that are safe and easy to cross. The Council should seek a contribution from the developer to improve safety on this street and make it easier to cross.</p> <p data-bbox="465 751 607 775"><u>Wayfinding</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 812 1720 1054">Page 3 of the DAS makes recommendations for wayfinding improvements which should be secured through a S106 contribution for new Legible London signage. In addition, there is existing Legible London wayfinding signage on the High Street and around Wood Green Underground Station and the developer is encouraged to finance a map refresh of these signs to reflect the new land use at the development site. A further sign at the corner of Mayes Road / Station Road would help link up the existing and already proposed signage and improve wayfinding to and from the development site. The Council will need to coordinate local wayfinding signage with that associated with nearby forthcoming development and balance contributions accordingly.</p> <p data-bbox="465 1091 564 1115">Freight</p> <p data-bbox="465 1152 622 1176"><u>Construction</u></p> <p data-bbox="465 1212 1720 1394">TfL guidance requires an Outline Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) to be submitted with the planning application. This document is omitted. Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement is headed "Construction Methodology and Phasing". We have reviewed this chapter against our Outline CLP guidance. A plan showing construction by phase and peak daily deliveries has been provided. However, for the Outline CLP to be acceptable to TfL, the following items are required at pre-determination stage:</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> regional and local context maps showing planned construction freight routes; and <input type="checkbox"/> demonstration that the following have been considered: delivery scheduling, freight retiming and holding/consolidation areas to reduce trips in peak periods. </p> <p>TfL also request that a Detailed CLP is secured by pre-commencement condition.</p> <p><u>Deliveries</u></p> <p>A Delivery and Servicing Plan (October 2017) is included in the submission material. The document would benefit from more specific detail, for example, whilst the DSP measures are generally covering the right areas, there is a lack of detail regarding how these measures will be delivered.</p> <p>A full DSP should be secured by condition.</p>	
Network Rail	<p>Thank- you for consulting Network Rail on the above application,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any existing rights of access to NR freehold land and use of access points is checked and maintained going forward, or alternatives arrangements are agreed with Property before development starts • With regards to the height of the development, there needs to be confirmation that instances of glare/ reflection from the glass is suitably managed to ensure that there is no risk to driver operations. Glare study is recommended. <p>The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion of works on site, does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encroach onto Network Rail land • affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure • undermine its support zone • damage the company's infrastructure • place additional load on cuttings • adversely affect any railway land or structure • over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land • cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development 	Noted and condition recommended

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="562 229 875 253">both now and in the future</p> <p data-bbox="468 292 1709 349">The developer should comply with the following comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail's adjoining land.</p> <p data-bbox="468 384 725 408">Future maintenance</p> <p data-bbox="468 416 1709 1026">The development must ensure any future maintenance can be conducted solely on the applicant's land. The applicant must ensure that any construction and any subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. The reason for the 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) stand off requirement is to allow for construction and future maintenance of a building and without requirement for access to the operational railway environment which may not necessarily be granted or if granted subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. Any less than 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works. The applicant / resident would need to receive approval for such works from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer, the applicant / resident would need to submit the request at least 20 weeks before any works were due to commence on site and they would be liable for all costs (e.g. all possession costs, all site safety costs, all asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any third party access to its land. No structure/building should be built hard-against Network Rail's boundary as in this case there is an even higher probability of access to Network Rail land being required to undertake any construction / maintenance works. Equally any structure/building erected hard against the boundary with Network Rail will impact adversely upon our maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments.</p> <p data-bbox="468 1061 589 1085">Drainage</p> <p data-bbox="468 1093 1709 1391">Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 10 - 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Plant & Materials All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.</p> <p>Scaffolding Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.</p> <p>Piling Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.</p> <p>Fencing In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail's boundary must also not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.</p> <p>Lighting Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Noise and Vibration The potential for any noise/ vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway must be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which hold relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night time train running and heavy freight trains.</p> <p>Vehicle Incursion Where a proposal calls for hard standing area / parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.</p> <p>Network Rail strongly recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsanglia@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with us to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from our website at www.networkrail.co.uk/asp/1538.aspx.</p>	
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>Waste Comments Surface Water Drainage - 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. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.</p> <p>Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you email us a scaled ground floor plan of your property showing the proposed work and the complete sewer layout to developer.services@thameswater.co.uk to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required.</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.</p>	<p>Noted and conditions/informatives recommended</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.</p> <p>'We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission:"A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality."</p> <p>Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.</p> <p>Water Comments Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. 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.</p> <p>Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to any planning permission: There is a Thames Water main crossing the development site which may/will need to be diverted at the Developer's cost, or necessitate amendments to the proposed development design so that the aforementioned main</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>can be retained. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for maintenance and repair. Please contact Thames Water Developer Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: 0800 009 3921 for further information.</p> <p>No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.</p>	
<p>Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust</p>	<p>1.0. Introduction</p> <p>1.1. Set in 196 acres of parkland, Alexandra Palace is an iconic North London destination of important historical significance. Opened in 1873, it provides a significant recreational resource for the public, particularly benefitting the local population of Haringey (London Borough of Haringey). Our thriving events programme sees over 700,000 people visit the Palace each year to enjoy a varied programme of live sport, exhibitions and music gigs. The total number of visitors to the site (including the Park) is c3.2m visitors per year.</p> <p>1.2. On events days, there can be anything between 10,000 and 50,000 people coming to the Park and Palace, many of whom arrive via public transport. The Park particularly is at capacity in some areas, placing heavy pressure on the flora and fauna, the recreational facility and the Trust in terms of managing the impact of visitors, litter and security - all of which are compounded by historical poor drainage. There are areas of the Park that have not been designed for prolonged periods of everyday use or large volumes of visitors. The on-site security team keep a daily record of Incidents of Interest and it is estimated that the split between issues relating to the Park and to the Palace is c60/40, rising to 70/30 over the summer months as the team deal with a variety of anti-social behaviour activities from rough sleeping to fly-tipping and graffiti.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Heritage is further discussed in the material considerations section of this report.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>2.0. Land at Chocolate Factory and Parma House</p> <p>2.1. In line with Haringey Council's Site Specific Allocation DPD, this site (SSA19) plays an important role in improving the connectivity to the Cultural Quarter by replacing the current dead end at Clarendon Road with a pedestrian and cycling connection through to Wood Green Common and Alexandra Palace Station.</p> <p>2.2. SSA19 also highlights that Coburg Road may become a predominately cycle and pedestrian route linking Wood Green with Alexandra Park and Palace and the west of the Borough through the Penstock Tunnel. As part of the wider masterplan, the Trust would welcome discussions with the applicant during the next stage so as to ensure the opportunity to improve this link is maximised, particularly with regards to the improved treatment at nodal points (10), wayfinding features (11) and the improved railway arch (12) as all of these relate specifically to the connection to Alexandra Park. In line with the SSA, APPCT are keen to understand what development contributions (CIL or otherwise) will be made available for these improvements. This is particularly pertinent given that in its current state, the Park is not equipped to receive increased footfall and cycle traffic in this location. A discussion about how this location could be improved for this purpose would be welcomed, along with a plan for ensuring future long-term resilience of this part of Alexandra Park.</p> <p>2.3. In addition, APPCT would like to understand what other opportunities there will be for contributions towards upgrading, maintaining and improving the local area's existing open spaces, including Alexandra Park. The proposals for the Chocolate Factory redevelopment include some provision for rooftop play space (870m²) located within the podium landscaped area to Block E and the rooftop areas to Block E and D. The application states that the needs of 12+ year olds will be met within the surrounding parks and open spaces within walking distance of the site, including Wood Green Common, Alexandra Park and Ducketts Common. The applicant's Design and Access Statement also states that the site can benefit from its close proximity to large open green spaces including Alexandra Park and the assessment of local play opportunities illustrates that 8 out of the 11 identified are within Alexandra Park.</p> <p>2.4. It is highly likely that the residents (adults as well as children) living in the 216 new dwellings (estimated to have up to 499 people living in them) will use Alexandra Park as their default recreation space. Haringey's network of open spaces is integral to the Borough's environmental well-being. APPCT is keen to ensure the strategic open space of Alexandra Park can be a sustainable, welcoming and well-maintained recreational asset for the Borough's residents without impairing our ability to welcome the public from further afield.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>2.5. Whilst the Trust acknowledge that in accordance with Haringey’s Development Management DPD the application site falls within an area designated as appropriate for taller buildings, Block B will be substantially taller than the existing buildings around it and as Block B is over 10 storeys and over 30m in height, there is concern about the impact on the existing views and setting of Alexandra Palace and Park.</p> <p>2.6. The application site lies within a number of locally significant views, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lordship Lane at Bruce Castle • Watermead Way railway bridge • Downhill Park Road • Adams Road <p>2.7. As highlighted in the applicant’s Heritage Statement the completed development will generate a visual change within part of the wider setting of Alexandra Park through the introduction of buildings that are larger in both form and scale than those currently existing in the mid-ground view from the South Terrace and the Lower Field. APPCT is keen to ensure that this impact will be thoroughly assessed and adequately mitigated against.</p> <p>2.8. APPCT does acknowledge that a new focal point for the new north-south route linking Haringey Heartlands and Wood Green Common will support key routes, helping navigation and wayfinding within the streetscape and between local attractions. APPCT would welcome discussions around signage so as to ensure that routes to and from the Park and Palace are embedded in the FFE (furniture, fittings and equipment) design package.</p> <p>2.9. The proposed east-west tree-lining is welcomed, as is the planting on roofs to soften the massing of the built form, in particular the tree planting at podium level.</p> <p>2.10. Finally, although not immediately adjacent to the site, consideration should be given by the developer to build into their sales contracts and documentation information to purchasers about the Park and Palace to ensure awareness that APPCT is an entertainment venue not ‘just a park’ (to avoid complaints to APPCT from new residents). Precedents for this exist, for example at Wembley Park.</p>	
National Grid	<p><u>Should you be minded to approve this application please can the following notes be included an informative note for the Applicant</u></p> <p>Considerations in relation to gas pipeline/s identified on site:</p>	Noted and included as an informative.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.</p> <p>If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.</p> <p>If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required.</p> <p>All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.</p> <p>Email: plantprotection@cadentgas.com Tel: 0800 688 588</p>	
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES		
	<p>Proposal results in demolition of building currently occupying and no indication of whether new building will be sufficient for light industrial work or if this will be affordable</p>	<p>Proposal has indicated space is flexible in design and purpose.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about demolition and wanting minimum disturbance and nuisance from noise and pollution • Traffic impacts during construction phase • Tall building out of character with surrounding existing form • Alexandra Park will be overshadowed • Want six storey and under to maintain human scale • Increasing housing without considering existing resident needs to future requirements for education or hospitals etc • Increase in road users and parking • High density generates future and expensive problems 	<p>Construction phase development conditioned where applicable. Tall building and heritage discussed in material considerations. Such needs for community are covered by CIL. Transport and parking discussed in material considerations.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
<p>91 objections have been received namely regarding the first three points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Collage Arts and wider consequence for area. • No mention of affordable rents for workspace or studio space • No provision for affordable housing • Only proposed provision of 'clean studios' • Provision of generic workspace may not meet wider requirements of future occupants • Tall building is overbearing • Loss of valuable heritage buildings • Out of character development in terms of scale, impact and land use • Already plenty of regeneration so this is not needed • No parking provision for commercial occupants • Over development resulting in further impact on traffic • Loss of youth programmes • Residential too close to the recycling depot • Loss of Karamel • Loss of Mountview Academy 	<p>Collage Arts to be offered affordable workspace. Affordable housing provision has increased to 35%. 'Clean studios' within Chocolate Factory is within their business model but not restricted to such. Proposal has indicated space is flexible in design and purpose. Tall building and heritage discussed in material considerations. Area is centre of regeneration area with intensified development aspired for. Parking meets policy requirements. Loading bays provided. Traffic impacts discussed in material considerations. Collage Arts have been offered floorspace. Recycling depot acknowledged but still forms part of site allocation. Karamel is not part of this application site. Mountview Academy</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		have already indicated they are relocating to Peckham.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned the scheme has not considered the relationship to the adjoining development parcels/allocations on the basis of the submitted Masterplan. • North/south divide of Guillemot Place divides and reduces developable area for this site making it unviable and undeliverable which undermines council's objective to regenerate area • Alignment of pedestrian cycle route has not been considered in a coordinated manner so does not satisfy site allocation requirements • Believe tall landmark building proposed could have prejudicial impact on the future development of Guillemot Place with regard to daylight and sunlight • Guillemot Place is currently operational and relies on vehicular access via Clarendon Rd so require an interim arrangement for the full implementation of the proposed works to Clarendon Rd 	<p>Amendments to masterplan requested. North-south divide is specific requirement of site allocation. Amendments to this particular design requested. Sensitivity testing has been requested. Public realm works are phased to ensure vehicular access provided.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No provision for the relocation / accommodation of artisan bakery, one of the larger employers in Haringey, despite the undertaking in the local AAP to support businesses such as this. 	Unfortunately the site allocation does not provide for the retention of this use.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Chocolate Factory could result in a loss of jobs • Tall building overlooks Alexandra Palace green space, a school and other residential properties • Building should incorporate more parking for occupants and visitors as the area is already subject to a lot of parked cars • Construction lorries should not use Mayes Rd and construction hours limited 	<p>Loss of employment floorspace allowed by site allocations. Tall buildings discussed in material considerations. Parking provision meets policy requirements. Construction logistics plan requested.</p>