

**REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Reference No:** HGY/2008/1431

**Ward:** Noel Park

**Application Address:** Builders Yard, Heartlands School N22

**Date received:** 02/07/2008

**Last amended date:** 19/09/2008

**Drawing number of plans:** S5227 D0001 P1, S5227 D0050 P3, S5227 D0051 P2, S5227 D0400 P1, S5227 D0401 P1, S5227 D0402 P1, S5227 D0403 P1, S5227 D0404 P1, S5227 D0405 P1, S5227 D0406 P1, S5227 D0100 P2, S5227 D0101 P2, S5227 D0102 P2, S5227 D0103 P2, S5227 D0104 P2, S5227 D0105 P3, S5227 D0200 P3, S5227 D0201 P3, S5227 D0202 P3, S5227 D0203 P3, S5227 D0300 P3, S5227 D0301 P3, S5227 D0302 P3 & S5227 D0500 P1.

HED.770.501 Rev A Green (Sheet1), HED.770.501 Rev A (Sheet2), HED.770.502 Rev A, HED.770.101 Rev A, HED.770.201, HED.770.202, HED.770.301, HED.770.302, HED.770.303 (1 of 2), HED.770.304 (2 of 2), HED.770.305, HED.770.401 (Sheet 1 of 1), HED.770.402 (Sheets 2 of 2), HED.770.601, CBA6931.01B, CBA6931.04

**Address:** Builders Yard, Former Railway Sidings and Embankment, Safestore Storage Compound, Station Road and Adjoining Wood Green Common, N22

**Proposal:** Erection of a Secondary School arranged over three to five floor levels (gross floor area 10,930 sq metres), for approx. 1,100 students; formation of pedestrian access in wall facing Wood Green Common, and vehicular access from Western and Station Roads; provision of 39 car parking spaces, 80 cycle spaces, hard and soft landscaping, multi-use games areas, 1 roof-mounted wind turbine, new fencing to Station Road and Wood Green Common; installation of LED media screen to North elevation of South wing.

**Existing Use:** Mixed Use (Part Commercial / Treed / Scrub)

**Proposed Use:** Secondary School

**Applicant:** Haringey BSF

**Ownership:** Public

**PLANNING DESIGNATIONS**

Retrieved from GIS on 04/07/2008

UDP 2006 Cultural Quarter

UDP 2006 Blue Ribbon Network

Contaminated Land

Road Network: Classified Road

**Officer Contact:** Robin Campbell

## RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions; noting that the application will have to be referred formally to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

## SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located in the north central part of Haringey Borough. The site is bounded on the west side by the main east coast railway line. Beyond this, to the west is Alexandra Park and the filter beds of Hornsey Water Treatment Works. Immediately to the south of the site is a wooded area. Various uses exist to the east of the site, which include Wood Green Common and Quicksilver Place to the south east. To the north of the site is Alexandra Palace Station and to the north east is Avenue Gardens and the New River.

The site is irregular and elongated in shape, with the widest part being the mid section, which is opposite Wood Green Common. The site is 2.5 hectares in size and has a mix of current uses, which include:

- Commercial Uses (including storage compound, builders yard / scaffolding etc);
- Wooded / scrub section (predominantly on the south section of the site and embankment);
- Access road along west boundary of the site.

There are limited built structures on the site, with over 50% of the site consisting of hard surfacing.

## PLANNING HISTORY

Planning g	<a href="#">HGY/2008/1248</a>	Refused	29-07-08	Former Travellers Site, Station Road Wood Green London	Variation of Condition 1 (time limited permission), planning permission reference HGY/2005/0098 to allow continued use of site as storage of domestic and retail goods in single storey containers for further two years.
Planning g	<a href="#">HGY/2007/0384</a>	Granted	10-04-07	Former Travellers Site, Station Road Wood Green London	Variation of Condition 1 (time limited permission) planning permission reference HGY/2005/0098 to allow continued use of site as storage of domestic and retail goods in single storey containers for further 2 years.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Erection of a Secondary School arranged over three to five floor levels (gross floor area 10,930 sq metres), for approx. 1,100 students; formation of pedestrian access in wall facing Wood Green Common, and vehicular access from Western and Station Roads; provision of 39 car parking spaces, 80 cycle spaces, hard and soft landscaping, multi-use games areas, 1 roof-mounted wind turbine, new fencing to Station Road and Wood Green Common; installation of LED media screen to North elevation of South wing.

## **CONSULTATION**

The application was publicised by site and press notices and letters to neighbours.

### Neighbour Notification

Decorium, 22 Western Rd, N22  
Alexandra School, Western Road, N22  
63 – 109 (odd) / 86 – 11 (even) 130 – 146 (even) Mayes Road, N22  
1-2 Quicksilver Place, Western Road, N22  
3 – 32 Jack Barratt Way, N22  
4 – 17 Tower Terrace, N22  
21 – 51 Parkland Road, N22  
1 – 19 Bradley Road, N22  
64 – 138 (even), 139 – 145 (odd) Station Road, N22  
St Paul's RC Church, Station Road, N22  
1 – 27 (odd) / 2 – 42( even) Barratt Avenue, N22  
2a, 2 – 40 (even), 1 – 9 (odd) Wolseley Road, N22  
1 – 69 (odd) / 2 – 46 (even) Park Avenue, N22  
1 – 14 St Michael's Terrace, N22  
1 – 13 Buckingham Road, N22  
13 – 27 (odd) Bedford Road, N22

### Press Advertisements

Under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England & Wales) Regulations 1999 and the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 three local press advertisements were undertaken on the following dates:

- 15 August 2008, 5 September 2008 and 17 October 2008.

### Internal / External Consultation

LBH Transportation Group / LBH Cleansing / LBH Legal Services / LBH Building Control / LBH Noise and Pollution / LBH Nature Conservation / LBH Policy / LBH Arboriculturalist / LBH Parks / LBH Conservation / Design / LBH Strategic Sites

Ward Councillors (Noel Park, Woodside, Alexandra, Bounds Green Wards)  
Alexandra Palace and Alexandra Park CAAC  
Avenue Gardens Residents Association / Bounds Green Residents Association /  
Parkside and Malvern Residents Association  
Friends of Wood Green Common

Greater London Authority / Thames Water / Network Rail / Transport for London /  
Arriva / Metropolitan Police / Environment Agency / London Fire Brigade /  
Countryside Agency / Natural England / Commission for Architecture and the Built  
Environment (CABE) / Health and Safety Executive / English Heritage / London  
Development Agency / Government Office for London

## **RESPONSES**

### **1) *Local Residents***

A total of 81 resident objections have been received in relation to the application.  
These can be broken down as follows:

- 57 signed objection forms with stated grounds of refusal;
- 20 individual resident objections;
- Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee;
- Avenue Gardens Residents Association;
- Haringey Biodiversity Partnership;
- Moreland & Co Solicitors;

The grounds of objection area summarised below:

- Proposed scale, height and design will have a detrimental impact on Wood Green Common / the Conservation Area (overbearing / reduce light / block views) and is out of scale;
- Proposed wind turbines are technically and financially inefficient;
- LED Media Screen and floodlighting are unsustainable and shall have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of properties on Station Road and on Wood Green Common;
- Wrong choice of site for a new secondary school; no sequential site analysis undertaken;
- Increased congestion and pollution on Park Avenue and Station Road and surrounding streets;
- Health and safety risk due to proximity to east coast railway line;
- Inadequate access to the railway line for emergency purposes;
- Potential of desire lines across Wood Green Common;
- Detrimental impact on outlook from properties looking onto Wood Green Common;
- Detrimental impact on local residents from noise pollution as a result of proposed development (i.e. from pupils / wind turbines / Air Handling Units / Amphitheatre);
- The proposal impinges upon an area outwith the BSF ownership;
- Impact of noise and vibration on the school and teaching;
- Safety concerns as the site is contaminated;

- Disturbance and noise from additional school children in the area; increased crime / loitering;
- Detrimental impact on public transport (no capacity) and parking in the surrounding area;
- Increased noise / disturbance from school children;
- Detrimental impact on boundary wall of Wood Green Common;
- Issues of overlooking from the school to properties on Station Road;
- Inappropriate access arrangements for the school; proposed signalised junction inappropriate; safety concerns due to siting of the proposed main entrance;
- Detrimental impact on the Ecological Corridor; loss of habitat with no mitigation measures;
- Inadequate assessment of ecological / biodiversity issues within the application and ES;
- Increased pressure for the use of Wood Green Common and Alexandra Park;
- Inadequate space to create playing fields for the school;
- Increase in litter, graffiti, vandalism, pollution and intimidation by youths;
- Impact on local property prices; detrimental impact on local businesses;
- Congestion on footpaths and at bus stops;
- Visual impact on views from Conservation Areas and on views from Alexandra Park / Palace.

### Pre-Application Consultation

A 'Consultation Statement' is contained within the Design & Access Statement. The pre-application consultation process undertaken by the applicant is as follows:

- Public Consultations: 13 Sept 2007 / 23 Jan 2008 / 28 Jan 2008 / 11 June 2008 and 12 June 2008 (held at various venues: St Paul's Church / Civic Centre);
- Preliminary drawings placed on BSF Web page: Oct 2007 / Feb 2008:
- Design Review by PfS / CABE: 4 Dec 2007 / 14 Jan 2008 / 4 Feb 2008 / 5 Mar 2008 / 13 Mar 2008 /
- Haringey Design Review Panel – 17 Jan 2008;
- Design for London Project Review: 18 Feb 2008.

### Development Control Forum

This application was presented at a Development Control Forum on 17 July 2008. The minutes of this meeting are attached in Appendix 1. The comments are summarised below:

- Impact of noise from the railway line on the school;
- Safety issues for pupils accessing the school;
- Conflict in attracting staff as there is limited car parking;
- Issues of wind turbines not providing a high level of energy and being very visible;

- Would prefer a brown roof, providing for a greater depth of material on the roof;
- Questions over potential for proposing larger trees as part of the planting scheme;
- Issues of solar gain on the west elevation (railway side);
- Issues with the scale, cost, efficiency, noise and impact of the wind turbines and AHU's;
- Site is inappropriate for the purpose of a secondary school;
- Concern over future use of the Common by the school;
- Issues of staff / teachers parking in the surrounding area;
- Noise impact from use of amphitheatre;
- Impact of floodlighting / LED Screen on residential properties;
- Impact on views from Alexandra Park;
- Frequency of use of Alexandra Park by the school;
- Impact on development on Ecological Corridor and bats;
- Queries over the operation of the school (e.g. lunch times);
- Issues in increased anti-social behaviour in the area / crime etc.

## **2) *Internal Consultees***

### LBH – Sites Team

The Sites Team supports the proposal. The provision of the school complies with the Haringey Heartlands Development Framework, April 2005, and meets the Council's regeneration objectives for the area. The LDA & National Grid are currently preparing a scheme for the development of neighbouring lands and it is important that they are consulted.

### LBH Waste Management Comments

Insufficient details have been submitted in relation to Waste Management for a detailed response to be made. LBH Waste Management, request a condition be attached requiring the submission of waste management detail to LBH and requiring approval in writing by LBH prior to commencement of development. The submitted details should demonstrate compliance with LBH waste standards in terms of waste storage / recycling capacity and provision for collection vehicles.

### LBH Legal

No comment. S106 not required.

### LBH Scientific Officer – Contaminated Land

- The remediation method statement is acceptable.
- Following clearance of groundcover and undergrowth further soil testing will be carried out.
- Some removal of soil between kept trees / shrubs will be carried out to facilitate addition of capping layer (if required).
- Clean clay tray excavation can be reused as subsoil.

### LBH Arboricultural Officer

No objection to the proposed tree removal and planting scheme.

#### *Tree works / Tree Protection Measures / Planting*

- Landscape plan HED.770.305 identifies a total of 176 new trees will be planted. A variety of sizes are proposed (12-14cm girth up to 40-45cm girth). The significant number of new trees will provide more than adequate replacements for those being removed;
- Appropriate aftercare for trees and shrubs is required (see recommended conditions);
- The proposed new development can be constructed with minimal impact on the trees to be retained on site, on the condition that the tree protection measures are implemented and all construction works adhere to the recommendations in the Arboricultural Development Statement;
- The proposed tree removals will not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the site;
- The proposed planting of 176 new trees will provide more than adequate replacements for those being removed and they will enhance the biodiversity and amenity value of the site and the local area;
- Robust planning conditions must be attached to any planning approval.

### LBH Nature Conservation Officer

Objects to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Haringey UDP policy is not addressed appropriately (Policies OS11: OS6: OS16: OS17: OS: 2, 3, 4 and 5). Considered development on Ecological Corridor is contrary to UDP policy;
- Ecology chapter fails to address the ecological corridor (linking important wildlife habitats across the borough both north/south and east/west) and the Blue Ribbon Network;
- Proposal fails to mitigate for the large area of woodland and scrub habitat loss, and the physical barriers between important wildlife sites;
- Object over impact of floodlighting and wind turbines on ecological corridor and commuting and foraging bats. Suggest that the applicant consult the Bat Conservation Trust;
- Loss of ecological connectivity;

- When assessing this scheme an assessment of the impact of these proposals upon the boroughs green infrastructure as a whole should be considered;
- Object to the proposal due to the loss of habitat along a protected ecological corridor contrary to Council policy and a failure to mitigate for this adequately through new habitat creation;
- Questions the site selection process as considers not all the facts have been taken into account in ecology terms;
- Questions the need to build the Multi Use Games Area's (MUGA's) on the ecological corridor if park/playing fields are available off site. MUGA's should be relocated to retain corridor;
- Queries whether the school has an impact upon the proposed green chain at the northern tip of the site as identified in the UDP. This development should take the green chain into account, in order to promote a north – south walking and cycling route.

### LBH Policy Team (Summary)

#### *General Comment:*

- Clarification of the technical assessment of the suitability of the wind turbines to this location (height and noise) will be required;
- Clarification that policies 4A.3 and 4A.7 of the London Plan (2008) are addressed and the required 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions can be achieved;
- Baseline data used for the socio-economic assessment within ES requires updating (this has been revised and submitted by the applicant);
- Portion of the site which is designated as a Defined Employment Area is surplus to industrial and waste use needs, and is suitable for education purposes as identified in the Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (2005);
- Haringey's Employment Land Study (2004) identified the site as suitable for 'employment use with flexible approach to introduction of enabling development';
- In principle community facilities are appropriate within regeneration areas, and the education facility at this location will create jobs both during its construction and operational phases;
- Training / Employment Strategy should be undertaken as per guiding principles on employment within the UDP (2006) and policy 3A.11 in the London Plan.
- The proposal is in line with the Haringey Heartlands SPG, as well as policy CLT1 and CW1;
- Proposal addresses predicted increase in demand for education facilities within the Heartlands;
- Consider the proposed facilities will have an overall positive effect on the local community.



## LBH Transportation Group

Does not object to the proposed development, however, makes the following comments / requirements:

- The proposed parking provision of 39 spaces is considered adequate and in with UDP Policy M10;
- Increase provision of cycle parking to 120 spaces;
- Request applicant to undertake a further study of the existing capacity of the public transport infrastructure near the site;
- Seeks upgrading of footpath abutting the eastern end of the site on Station Road;
- Request additional information in relation to traffic generation, which is considered to be underestimated by the applicant;
- Request revised proposals in relation to the proposed signalised junction;
- Comprehensive Travel Plan document requires to be submitted to the Council's School Travel Plan officer for approval;
- Requires Construction Management Strategy to be produced.

## LBH Design and Conservation

No objection. Summary of comments is below:

- *The traditional brickwork boundary wall makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area – it is important that the wall be retained, however it is necessary that entrance / access gates through it be provided for the main school entrance;*
- *The mass and scale of the proposed school development is considerable; this development will be larger and more prominent than any immediate building onto Wood Green Common;*
- *Such a large development will affect the existing trees on the railway embankment and also the setting of the Conservation Area;*
- *The scale of this development is consistent with the large scale development envisaged for Haringey Heartlands;*
- *This secondary school development does bring substantial community benefits to the community which is a major consideration weighted in its favour, and PPG15 recognises the significance of such development in the historic environment;*
- *In design and conservation terms this large development will change the character of the Conservation Area, however the school is well designed, and with careful selection of high quality facing materials it has the potential to take its place and make a positive contribution in this setting;*
- *Recommend a high quality London yellow stock brickwork needs to be selected.*

## LBH Building Control

Fire appliance access appears satisfactory, but due to the complexity of the development, observations should be obtained from the LFEPA.

### **3) External Consultees**

#### Transport for London (TfL) -

- Confirmation of the good accessibility level should be confirmed by the applicant;
- Clarification should be provided to justify the level of parking provision. TfL would also encourage the applicant to investigate the scope for reducing this provision further;
- Request 121 cycle parking spaces on site;
- Consideration should also be given to pedestrian improvements to access the site;
- Further justification is required of the calculated trip generation rates;
- TfL would request that site surveys, be secured through condition and be carried out in the first year of the school opening to confirm the exact pupils origins and destinations.
- TfL would request that a S106 contribution be secured towards necessary improvements to the public transport network, particularly buses, within the school catchment area.
- TfL would require the developer to carry out an assessment of all bus stops located within 400m radius of the site;
- Assessment of passenger journeys is required to ascertain the exact number and the ability of each station/line (by direction of travel, time of day) to cope with the extra demand.
- TfL request production of a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP);
- Travel Plan is unacceptable in its current form. Targets for modal shifts should be set and a travel plan co-ordinator should be incorporated into a satisfactory management role for the plan;
- Request Servicing and Distribution Strategy and a Construction Management Strategy be produced.

Subject to the above, the proposal as it stands is unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).

#### Thames Water

##### Waste Comments

- No objection with regard to sewerage infrastructure;
- There are public sewers crossing this site, and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval.

##### 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.

## Water Comments

- The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. Thames Water therefore recommend a condition be attached to address this.

## Network Rail (NR)

NR has no objection in principle to the proposed development, however, there are certain requirements which must be met due to the proximity of the development to an electrified railway (see full response for detail):

- 5m access corridor must be maintained adjacent to NR land, for maintenance purposes;
- Surface and foul water must be diverted away from NR property;
- No materials / plant should be capable of falling within 3m of the nearest rail / overhead electrical equipment;
- No excavation / earthworks to affect integrity of railway;
- Security of the railway boundary must be maintained at all times;
- Trespass proof fence (1.8m high) shall be required adjacent to NR's boundary;
- Method Statements maybe required in relation to construction works;
- NR require to be consulted in preparation of landscape scheme for the proposal;
- Detail of external lighting should be required as a condition (avoid dazzling drivers).

## Metropolitan Police

No comment. Indicated that they were consulted by the applicant at the pre-application stage and request that this consultation continues throughout the life of the scheme to provide crime prevention advice as required.

## London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority

The Brigade is not satisfied with the proposals. As such the submitted information does not show compliance with part B5 of the building regulations in particular the forum area and fire fighting staircase.

## Natural England

No objection, however, provided comment on areas of improvement:

- Support the recommendations set out in the Phase 1 Habitat Survey produced by Entec;
- Further bat surveys should be undertaken (and a mitigation strategy put in place if required) before development commences;
- Opportunities exists for further measures such as those outlined in the Phase 1 Habitat Survey (i.e. use of native climbing plants on building wall etc.), in

order to comply with paragraph 14 of PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation;

- We welcome the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems in the application which will also provide biodiversity benefits, and the further measures incorporated under 'general biodiversity', and we would expect these to also be included as planning conditions;
- Opportunity to make improvements to Wood Green Common to enhance its ecological function;
- We support CABE's comments (page 76 of the Design Statement) in relation to potential enhancements to the New River.
- Identifies areas to be covered in Environmental Management Plan: 1) integrity of ecological corridor running from east to west; corridor function which the site currently performs should be maintained: 2) the extent and type of replanting which will take place should be made clear: 3) particular focus should be on the green bank: 4) a lighting strategy to ensure that additional lighting on the site does not adversely affect bat roosting, foraging and commuting habitats.

#### Greater London Authority (GLA)

The Mayor considers that the application does not comply with the London Plan policies on education and community facilities, industrial land and employment, design and access, transport, climate change mitigation and adaptation, the Blue Ribbon Network and noise. The possible remedies put forward by the GLA are summarised below:

- Education and community facilities: further details on the proposed layout and management of the education facilities, shared uses and proposed community facilities are required.
- Industrial land and employment: ensure site is surplus to industrial and waste use needs. A training and employment strategy should be submitted and secured through a planning condition.
- Design and access: proposed floor plans required to assess compliance with London Plan policies on design.
- Transport: Further details should be submitted in the Transport Assessment on the public transport capacity, levels of cycle parking. A delivery and servicing plan and a construction and logistics plan should be secured.
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation: a detailed energy strategy needs to be developed / revised to include detailed modelling of the proposed carbon reductions.
- Blue Ribbon Network: the proposals should include the dé-culverting of the New River as required by London Plan policy 4C.3.
- Noise: the noise strategy should be revised to inform the detailed development of the proposals.

## English Heritage

The present proposals are not considered to have an effect on any significant archaeological remains. Advise that any requirement for pre- or post-determination archaeological assessment / evaluation of this site in respect to the current application could be waived.

## Environmental Agency

Objection - The Environment Agency (EA) has maintained an objection to the proposed development on the basis that the FRA submitted '*does not comply with the requirements set out in the updated London Plan, in particular policy 4A.14 Sustainable Drainage*'.

This relates specifically to the requirement that developers '*should aim to achieve greenfield run off from their site through incorporating rainwater harvesting and sustainable drainage*.'

A revised FRA was submitted to the Environment Agency on 22 October 2008. It is understood the EA is currently considering this supporting information, before issuing a revised response to LBH.

## Haringey Design Review Panel / CABE Enabler

CABE has not commented formally on the application. Input from a CABE Enabler was obtained during the design development / pre-application stage. An initial scheme was presented to the Haringey Design Review Panel on 17 January 2008. A summary of the Panel comments and applicants response to these is detailed in Appendix 4 of the D&A Statement. The key comments are summarised below:

- Panel felt the scheme would benefit from a more coherent approach, in terms of grouping the buildings together;
- Panel commented on the need to provide a strong and identifiable entrance for the school;
- Panel recommended that the scheme be bold in presenting itself to Wood Green Common;
- Panel identified that the height and bulk of the scheme appears to exceed the established scale of the surrounds; and that the prominence of the building projecting from the wooded embankment could be an exciting focus for the Common;
- Panel identified the need for the development to be sensitive to existing trees and Wood Green Conservation Area;
- Panel expressed concern over the long access route to the MUGA.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### National Planning Policy

PPS 1: Sustainable Development & Climate Change / PPG 4: Industrial and Commercial  
PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation / PPS 10: Waste Management  
PPG 13: Transport / PPG 15: Historic Environment / PPG 17: Sports and Recreation  
PPS 22: Renewable Energy / PPS 23: Pollution Control / PPG 24: Planning and Noise  
PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk

### The London Plan - 2004

Policies 2A.1 / 2A.3 / 2A.7 / 3C.1 / 3C.2 / 3B.5 / 4B.3 / 4B.6 / 4A.6 / 4A.7 / 4A.8 / 4A.9 / 4A.10 / 4A.11 / 4A.12 / 4A.13 / 4A.14 / 4A.15 / 4B.4 / 4B.5 / 4B.7 / 5E.1 / 5E.3

### Adopted Unitary Development Plan, 2006

Policy G1 Environment  
Policy G2: Development and Urban Design  
Policy G4 Employment  
Policy AC1 Heartland/ Wood Green  
Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction  
Policy UD3 General Principles  
Policy UD4 Quality Design  
Policy UD7 Waste Storage  
Policy CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas  
Policy ENV1 Flood Protection: Protection of Floodplain, Urban Washlands  
Policy ENV2 Surface Water Runoff  
Policy ENV3 Water Conservation  
Policy ENV6 Noise Pollution  
Policy ENV7 Air, Water and Light Pollution  
Policy ENV9 Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency  
Policy ENV10 Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy  
Policy ENV11 Contaminated Land  
Policy ENV13 Sustainable Waste Management  
Policy EMP1 Defined Employment Area – Regeneration Area  
Policy EMP3 Defined Employment Area – Employment Locations  
Policy M2 Public Transport Network  
Policy M3 New Development Location and Accessibility  
Policy M4 Pedestrian and Cyclists  
Policy M5 Protection, Improvement and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes  
Policy M10 Parking for Development  
Policy OS6 Ecologically Valuable Sites and Their Corridors  
Policy OS15 Open space deficiency and development  
Policy OS17 Tree Protection

## Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a Design Guidance and Design Statements / SPG3b Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight / SPG4 Access for All – Mobility Standards / SPG5 Safety by Design / SPG7a Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement / SPG7b Travel Plan / SPG7c Transport Assessment / SPG8b Materials  
SPG8c Environmental Performance / SPG8e Light Pollution / SPG8f Land Contamination / SPG8i Air Quality / SPG9 Sustainability Statement Guidance / SPG10e Improvements to public transport infrastructure and services

## Other

CABE Design and Access Statements.  
The Mayor's Energy Strategy (February 2004)  
Haringey Heartlands Development Framework – April 2005

## **ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

### **1.0 CONTEXT**

#### **1.1 Need for School / Demand for School Places / Heartlands development**

The development proposal is for a new flagship secondary school specialising in visual arts and media. The Design & Access Statement submitted by the applicant details the requirement for this new community facility in Haringey. It identifies that a new secondary school is needed as the number of 11-16 year olds in the borough is projected to rise significantly by 2010. Appendix 1 of the D&A Statement identifies that for school years 2005/06 and 2006/07, the total surplus capacity of pupil places across Haringey Borough was between 2% and 3%. Capacity within the secondary school sector of 5% is aimed for. Due to this and the predicted growth in pupil numbers within the Borough over the next 10 years, the existing capacity is not considered sufficient. Based on this analysis, a new secondary school is required.

#### **1.2 Site Selection**

Colin Buchanan and Partners were commissioned to undertake a Strategic Sites Appraisal in 2004 in order to assess the appropriateness of six independent sites for the development of a new Secondary School to meet the needs of Haringey Borough. The sites which were assessed are detailed below:

- Tottenham International;
- Middlesex University;
- Eastern Utility;
- St Ann's Hospital;
- The Selby Centre; and
- Lawrence Road.

The assessment was based on a scoring system which related to various factors including:

- Site size, specialism, best fit with existing facilities, relationship to school network, secondary strategy, pupil flow, proximity to transport, aspect, local environmental context, regeneration, proximity to place of need, infrastructure risk / constraints, site restrictions, land availability and net cost.

The subject site, which is referred to as the Eastern Utilities site within the Colin Buchanan report scores well due to its location within the Haringey Heartlands regeneration area and in terms of proximity to existing primary schools. The report identifies that the site is not self contained as playing fields at Alexandra Park would be required, which is a detracting factor. The site scores well in relation to proximity to transport nodes. The report identifies the policy designations (within the Draft UDP) which were relevant at the time of the assessment. It identifies that the Ecological Corridor designation may cause a partial constraint on the site.

The report concludes that the Eastern Utility Site scores the best out of the six locations, for both un-weighted and weighted scoring.

It states that the *'Eastern Utility Site would be an appropriate location for a new school as:*

- *there is an identified need for such a facility in the area,*
- *the area is experiencing substantial residential growth,*
- *the new secondary school would be a considerable asset in forming a sustainable mixed use community, and*
- *there would be no significant impacts on the catchment areas of other schools'.*

### **1.3 Policy Basis / Principle of Development**

#### *London Plan*

Wood Green is a Metropolitan Centre as identified within the London Plan. Policy 5B.3 of the London Plan relates to 'Areas for Intensification in North London'. Haringey Heartlands / Wood Green is identified within the London Plan as an area for intensification. Policy 5B.3 states that borough's *'should promote development opportunities through higher density redevelopment at key transport nodes of good accessibility and capacity and in town centres and seek to achieve higher levels of provision wherever possible, especially for housing'*.

#### *Haringey UDP (2006)*

The site is covered by numerous policy designations within the Haringey UDP (2006). These are listed below:



- Policy AC1 (Heartlands / Wood Green Development);
- Site Specific Proposal 4 (SSP4);
- Defined Employment Area 19 (north part of site);
- Ecological Corridor (Policy OS6);
- Conservation Area (CSV1) (east section of the site adjoining Wood Green Common);
- Blue Ribbon Network (New River culvert under the site);
- Cultural Quarter (Policy CLT1: very small section of the site on the east boundary);
- Green Chain Proposed (Policy OS16: Crosses the north tip of the site).

In addition to these, there are several policies, which although do not specifically cover the site, they are of relevance due to their proximity to the site. These are as follows:

- Alexandra Park to the west is a designated Conservation Area, Metropolitan Open Land and an Ecologically Valuable Site (Borough Grade 1);
- Wood Green Common is a Conservation Area and Significant Local Open Land (OS3).

*Policy EMP1 states that the Council will encourage the redevelopment of the Regeneration Area Defined Employment Area's in accordance with policies AC1 and AC2 of the UDP. Site Specific Proposal 4 (SSP4) seeks proposals for 'comprehensive mixed use development to include employment, retail, housing, restaurant, healthcare and community facilities, including education'. Part (g) of Policy AC1 (The Heartlands / Wood Green) refers to meeting 'identified demands for enhanced and additional community facilities'.*

One of the key policy designations of the site is the Ecological Corridor (policy OS6), which seeks to protect the continuity of these corridors.

*Feedback from LBH Policy Team has identified that 'in principle community facilities are appropriate within regeneration areas, and the education facility at this location will create jobs both during its construction and operational phases, and will provide a necessary service for the regeneration of Haringey Heartlands as a whole and the development of a sustainable community'.*

The development site is within the Haringey Heartlands / Wood Green regeneration area, which establishes the policy basis for the development of educational uses / community facilities within this area. The site itself is subject to a range of specific policy designations, including an employment designation and being within an Ecological Corridor. In site specific policy terms, the proposal constitutes a departure from the adopted UDP (2006) designation, however, in strategic policy terms, the principle of education use is acceptable.

## 1.4 Loss of Employment land

The development site is currently occupied by various commercial tenants. These consist of:

- Site A: Crowley's;
- Site B: Beacon Europe Ltd;
- Site C: Vacant;
- Site D: Licence to a John Griffin;
- Site E: Scrap metals / Sash Windows;
- Site F: The Scaffolding Company;
- Site G: F Johnstone (The Art School);
- Site H: Vacant
- Ex-travellers Site: Storesafe Ltd

The exact number of existing employees on the site is not known, however, taking into account the uses and having undertaken several site visits, it is considered the overall employment on the site is relatively low (significantly lower than that proposed through the School development). Contact with LBH Corporate Services has identified that there are no re-location packages in place for existing tenants.

In accordance with London Plan policy 3A.11 '*Improving employment opportunities for Londoners*' the proposed school will generate approximately 120 jobs.

There is the potential for jobs created during the construction phase of the proposed development, with the opportunity of utilising local skills in line with UDP (2006) policies and in accordance with policy 3A.11 '*Improving employment opportunities for Londoners*' in the London Plan.

It is advised by LBH Policy Team that the '*portion of the site which is designated as a Defined Employment Area is surplus to industrial and waste use needs, and is suitable for education purposes as identified in the Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (2005)*'.

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT (ES)

### 2.1 Content

The above proposed development site was assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Screening and Scoping regulations, as per the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. As a result of this, the proposal was deemed a schedule 2 project due to size and location and as such, an Environmental Statement was required.

An Environmental Statement was submitted as part of the planning application for this development and has been assessed as part of the application. The key sections of the ES are detailed below, alongside which, reference is made to the sections within this report which relate to its assessment:

- Scheme Need and Alternatives (Section 1.1 / 1.2);
- Scheme Description (Section 3.1);
- Approach to Preparing the ES (Section 2);
- Legislative and Policy Review (Section 1.3);
- Townscape (Section 3.1 / 3.2);
- Visual Assessment (Section 3.3);
- Ecology (Section 3.7);
- Land Quality and Water Environment (Section 3.13 / 3.14);
- Socio-economics (Section 1.1);
- Cultural Heritage (Section 3.2);
- Traffic (Section 3.5);
- Air Quality (Section 3.7);
- Noise (Section 3.9);
- Vibration (Section 3.9).

The main issues with this application are considered to be (1) the design and built form of the proposed development, (2) impact on Conservation Area / Wood Green Common, (3) impact on Ecological Corridor, (4) transport, access and parking implications (5) impact on adjoining residential properties (6) sustainability and environmental issues.

### **3.0 MAIN ISSUES**

#### **3.1 Conservation & Design**

Policy 4B.10 (Large scale buildings – design and impact) of the London Plan requires new development to be of the highest quality design, and identifies a range of criteria to be achieved through new development .

Policy G2 and G10 of the UDP (2006) identify the need to protect and enhance Haringey's built environment. Policy UD4 'Quality Design' identifies that the *'spatial and visual character of the development site and the surrounding area/street scene should be taken into account in the design of schemes submitted for approval'*.

#### *Scheme Progression*

Within the Design & Access Statement, the applicant identifies that the proposed scheme, resulted from three original scheme design options. The three options were: 1) Linear; 2) Clustered and 3) Pavilion. Pre-application consultations were undertaken with respect to these options, which involved Haringey Council, CAGE and local residents.

Following a series of meetings with CABE in December 2007, a fourth scheme design (The Forum) was developed, which is the subject of this planning application.

The D&A Statement identifies that this fourth (Forum) scheme has been based on the input from CABE and the Haringey Design Review Panel.

Appendix 4 of the D&A Statement identifies the responses from the Haringey Design Review Panel and how the proposed development has responded to these.

### *Height / Scale / Massing*

The building consists of 10,931 sqm of gross floorspace, built over a part 3, part 5 storey structure. The following are the key aspects of the building:

- 3 storey main building located on top of the railway embankment;
- 'F' shape floorplan, with two 4/5 storey classroom wings, projecting from the main building;
- A 'forum' within the main building, which shall house a multi-purpose auditorium / studio space / sports hall and kitchen / dining spaces;
- An Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) faculty within the ground and first floor of the South Wing;
- Two vehicular access points are proposed to the site, one from Station Road, which shall be the primary access point and an access point from Western Road, which is a drop-off facility for the ASD facility;
- 39 car parking spaces (4 of which are disabled spaces);
- 60 covered cycle spaces (80 cycle parking spaces have now been proposed);
- Pedestrian access from footpath on western boundary of Wood Green Common;
- Hard and soft landscaping, including replacement trees and additional tree planting scheme;
- Renewable energy proposals including one roof mounted wind turbine, solar panels and photovoltaics.

The highest part of the built form (excluding the proposed turbine / Air Handling Unit's) is measured at 19.8m, which is the 5 storey south wing section. The highest part of the north wing structure stands at 19.2m. The 3 storey main building section, on the embankment stands at a maximum height of 12.6m. The whole building extends approximately 104m in length, bounding the railway line. The North wing is approx 19.6m in width and the South wing is approx 19.5m in width. The proposed Air Handling Units are approximately 2m in height and the single proposed wind turbine stands at approx 8.25m (supplier's specification).

The height of the existing boundary wall is approximately 2.3m. The distance between the north wing and the boundary wall would be approx 5m and the distance from the South wing would be approx 9.3m.

The existing properties on the site are small in scale and are single storey. The surrounding properties are predominantly 2/3 storey residential properties, as well as commercial properties within Quicksilver Place and Western Road, which are predominantly 2 storey.

Taken in the context of the immediate setting, the proposed building is considered not consistent with the scale of its neighbouring and surrounding properties.

The height and scale of the proposed development was guided through the pre-application consultation process, which included the Haringey Design Review Panel and CABA input. It is considered that a development of reduced height and scale could be achieved on the site, however, this would result in increased site coverage, increased loss of existing planting and a less focused layout of the school.

It is considered the proposed scale and massing of the proposal, when considered in isolation, is inappropriate for the site and its setting. However, the mitigating factors require to be taken into account, in terms of fenestration, materials and additional planting. In addition, the strategic policy requirements of providing an education facility and the inclusion within the Haringey Heartlands regeneration area, are also of relevance.

By increasing the height of the building, this has helped to reduce the site coverage and concentrate the school facilities within a smaller area. This has inevitably resulted in a building which has a greater impact on its surroundings.

The LBH Design / Conservation Team have stated that *'the mass and scale of the proposed school is considerable'* and that the proposal shall be *'larger and more prominent than any immediate building onto Wood Green Common'*. These observations are agreed with. The LBH Design / Conservation Team also identifies that the site is within *'the Haringey Heartlands Development Framework Area which is an intensification area'* and that the *'scale of this development is consistent with the large scale development envisaged for Haringey Heartlands'*.

It is considered the proposed wings facing onto the Common would be dominant structures, however, that they will not read as blank façades, due to the design detail and fenestration. The applicant has proposed a considerable amount of additional planting on the site, which, once established, shall soften the impact of the building.

Taking into account the comments received from LBH Design / Conservation Team as well as the design feedback which the scheme has been subject to within the pre-application stages, it is considered that overall, the school is well designed.

Due to the importance of materials with respect to this proposal, it is recommended that a condition be attached to require material specification to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) prior to commencement of development.

Based on the above points, it is considered that the proposed scale and massing of the building, in design terms, is, on balance, acceptable. The impact of the scale and massing on the Conservation Area and Wood Green Common and also in relation to view lines from Alexandra Park and Alexandra Palace is dealt with below.

### **3.2 Impact on Conservation Area / Wood Green Common**

PPG15 identifies the requirement of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. PPG15 also states that preserving or enhancing the area is a '*material consideration for the planning authority's handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area*' (Para 4.14).

Policies 4B.11 and 4B.12 of the London Plan relate to London's Built Heritage and Heritage Conservation.

Policy CSV1 (Development in Conservation Areas) of Haringey UDP (2006) is of relevance, as a small portion of the site is within Wood Green Common Conservation Area and the site itself is adjacent to the Conservation Area, therefore, the proposed development should respect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas as per the policy.

Wood Green Common Conservation Area Character Appraisal was approved and adopted by LBH on 11 February 2008. It is considered the key aspects of the Character Appraisal for this Conservation Area are as follows:

- Wood Green Common occupies a large area to the south of Station Road and provides the Conservation Area with its characteristic sense of openness;
- The Common is bounded to the south and west by a '*magnificent classically detailed tall red brick wall that follows a beautifully swept arc delineating the New River Path*'. '*It successfully encloses the views across the common from Station Road and is considered to be a major positive contributor to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area*'.

The impact of the proposed development on Wood Green Common has been considered in relation to the following:

- The impact of the proposed development on the setting of Wood Green Common, in visual / and aesthetic terms;
- The physical impact of the proposed development on Wood Green Common, in built terms and in terms of the proposal changing the nature of use of the Common.

#### *Impact on the Setting of Wood Green Common / Conservation Area*

The scale and design of the proposal, referred to above, would undoubtedly change the character of the Conservation Area, with the greatest impact being on the Common itself.

The primary impacts on the setting are considered to be: a) the loss of the treed embankment which currently acts as a back drop to the Common and as a buffer between the Common and the east coast railway line and: b) the scale and massing of the proposed development in terms of increasing the sense of enclosure and impact on visual amenity grounds.

#### *Loss of Tree Embankment*

In order to mitigate the loss of trees on the site, the applicant has proposed a landscaping scheme, which includes a considerable amount of replanting (176 additional trees). Whilst the character of Wood Green Common would be significantly changed, it is considered the proposed planting would mitigate this impact to a certain extent, once the planting is established. The LBH Arboricultural Officer has supported the proposed planting scheme and does not object to the proposed trees for removal.

#### *Visual Amenity Grounds / Views*

The applicant submitted a Visual Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The impact of the proposed development on views across Wood Green Common was assessed. It was concluded that there would be a 'moderate/substantial' adverse impact on views from the northern side of Wood Green Common and also from the southern edge of the Common. The Assessment concluded that the magnitude of change to the view from both locations would be 'high'.

Despite this finding, the report also stated that the loss of views across the Common would be counteracted by the '*replacement with a new landmark feature*', which also needs to be taken into account.

It is considered that the primary impact on views across the Common would be in relation to the views of Alexandra Palace. It is considered, therefore, that there would be a detrimental impact on this view.

#### *Impact on Enclosure / Sense of Openness*

Taking into account the height and scale of the structure, in terms of the impact of the proposed school on the Common/Conservation Area, it is considered that the character and setting of the Conservation Area shall be significantly impacted upon, resulting in a sense of increased enclosure.

However, it is also considered that the contemporary design of the development, and the fenestration facing onto Wood Green Common, shall introduce a level of visual interest, on the edge of this Conservation Area. In addition, it is considered the removal of the 6 x 10m high wind turbines shall reduce the overall impact of the building.

It is considered that the proposed materials are an important aspect, which can reduce the impact of the building on the Conservation Area. This is referred to by the LBH Design / Conservation Team. The fenestration of the building as it faces onto the Common is considered well designed, however, there is concern as to the appropriateness of the white coloured render panels, in relation to the immediate setting. It is considered that a high quality London yellow stock brickwork could be utilised to a greater extent to achieve greater harmony with the surrounds. It is recommended that a condition be attached requiring full details of materials and colours be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Based on the above, it is considered that there would be a significant impact on the character and setting of Wood Green Common as a result of the proposed development. It is considered there shall be a detrimental impact on views across the Common to Alexandra Palace. The proposal would result in reducing the openness of the Common and increasing the sense of enclosure. However, the development would also introduce a level of visual interest when viewed across the Common, taking into account, the scale, design and fenestration, which is inline with the higher density development envisaged for Haringey Heartlands. It is considered the proposed planting, use of high quality materials and sensitive use of colours would help to mitigate the overall impact of the building.

#### *Physical Impact on Wood Green Common / Changing Nature of Common*

There is no proposed development on Wood Green Common itself. It is considered the key physical impact on the Common shall be in the form of creating an entrance in the boundary wall which runs along the west side of the Common. In addition, it is considered that by virtue of the proposed use, there could be a detrimental impact on the Common due to a significant increase in usage, with potential for desire lines to be formed across the Common as pupils enter / leave the school.

The proposed entrance to be created through the wall on Wood Green Common shall result in the removal of 3 sections of it, each section being approx 2.6m wide. The wall itself is not listed, however, it is described within the Wood Green Common Conservation Area Appraisal as a '*magnificent classically detailed tall red brick wall that follows a beautifully swept arc delineating the New River Path*'. '*It successfully encloses the views across the common from Station Road and is considered to be a major positive contributor to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area*'.

The wall is in need of structural work to improve its stability. It is considered that as the majority of the wall is to be retained, the proposed alterations to create the entrance in the school shall have a relatively minor impact on the setting, on the



edge of the Common. As such, the proposed alterations to the wall are considered acceptable as a significant detrimental impact on the Conservation Area is not anticipated.

The proposed North wing shall be approx 5m from the boundary wall and the South wing shall be approx 9.3m. Therefore, although the wing sections of the development shall not affect the wall in a physical sense, the depth of separation is relatively small. Despite this, it is considered the proposal shall not have a detrimental impact on the continuity or character of the wall as is described in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

The impact of the proposed development on the Common in terms of increased usage and in terms of damage in the form of desire lines across the Common is considered an issue. The applicant proposes to install a barrier, in the form of railings, to run the full length of the west side of the Common, which is proposed to restrict pupils leaving the school and moving directly across the Common. It is considered that some form of railings / barrier in this location is required to avoid the problem of desire lines across the Common. It is recommended that full details of the proposed railing be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development.

Certain objections have been raised in relation to the operation of the school and whether the pupils would be able to leave the school at lunch times. This relates to the potential for pupils loitering in the Common during this time. It is considered that the specific operation of the school, in terms of when school children would be able to enter / leave is a matter which shall have to be regulated by the school and is not something which can be restricted through the planning application.

### **3.3 Impact on View Lines**

*Policy 4B.18* of the London Plan relates to '*Assessing development impact on designated views*'.

Policy UD5 'Strategic Views' of the UDP identifies that all development proposals should respect their impact on the strategic views of St Paul's Cathedral and the City from Alexandra Palace. Draft SPG1c (Strategic Views) provides additional guidance on this.

A Visual Assessment has been submitted by the applicant as part of the Environmental Assessment (Chapter 7). As part of this assessment, 10 viewpoints were selected for investigation, which included views from the following key areas:

- Alexandra Palace Viewing platform;
- Alexandra park;
- Station Road (adjacent to Alexandra Palace Station);
- North and south sides of Wood Green Common.

A Summary of the key results of the Visual Assessment are detailed below:

#### Viewpoint 1: From Alexandra Palace Viewing Platform

It is identified that the proposal would become a *'partially viewed, background feature of the view which would merge into the general built up skyline of London'*. It states that the *'turbines would be an uncharacteristic feature and would be a moving element thereby attracting the viewers eye'*. The 6 turbines have been removed from the proposal, with a single smaller turbine to remain.

The report concludes that *'the magnitude of change to the view would be low (adverse) and it is assessed that the majority of receptors using the viewing platform would not notice the change in the skyline. The overall effect would be moderate (adverse) and not significant'*.

#### Viewpoint 2: From Alexandra Park

The report identifies that the *'proposed built form would be visible in the middle distance above the railway embankment and would occupy only a small section of the view to the north east'*.

The report conclude that *'as a result of the inclusion of a new building to the skyline, and the loss of some trees, there would be a low/medium change to the view after one year and given the medium sensitivity of the receptors, effects would be moderate and not significant'*. Once the proposed planting has matured, the magnitude of change is stated as being *'low (adverse) and the overall effect would be slight/moderate and not significant'*.

#### Viewpoint 8: From the Northern Side of Wood Green Common

The Visual Assessment identifies that the roofline and massing of the proposed building would be the most *'distinctive and prominent element of the view'*, and that there would be a *'significant change to the views'* to Alexandra Palace. The Assessment identifies that the proposal would *'form a sense of visual continuity, extending the line of the built form, from the Decorium building and the other industrial structures on the south western edge of the common'*.

The Assessment concludes that the magnitude of change to the view would be 'high' and the overall effect is judged to be 'moderate/substantial (adverse) and significant'.

#### Viewpoint 10: From the Southern Edge of Wood Green Common

The Assessment identifies that the *'building would rise above the existing brick wall, and would be viewed as a building of distinctly larger scale and massing than the surrounding built form'*.

The Assessment concludes that the magnitude of change to the view would be 'high' and the overall effect is judged to be '*moderate/substantial (adverse) and significant*'. The report identifies that the loss of views of Alexandra Palace is '*counteracted by the replacement with a new landmark feature (the school)*'.

#### *Proposed Green Wall*

In order to soften the appearance of the acoustic wall on the west elevation of the site, when viewed from the west (Alexandra Palace / Park), a lattice structure is proposed along the full length of the wall, which shall support fast growing deciduous hop species (climbers), with the aim of creating a complete green wall, within 5 – 6 years. Six other evergreen and semi-evergreen species are proposed for the green wall, offering different flowering times throughout the year.

#### *Conclusions*

After reviewing the submitted information and having undertaken site visits to the relevant viewpoints, it is not considered that there shall be an unreasonable detrimental impact on views from Alexandra Palace Viewing Platform or from Alexandra Park itself. This is due to the distance between these view points and the site, the considerable intervening screening, as well as the built up nature of the surrounds.

In terms of the visual impact across Wood Green Common, towards Alexandra Palace, it is considered that the nature of the view shall be significantly impacted upon in an adverse way, taking into account the impact on the treed embankment and that in certain locations, the views of Alexandra Palace shall be lost. The statement within the Wood Green Common Character Appraisal (Adopted 02/08) is also of relevance as it states that views of '*Alexandra Palace and the area to the west of the railway line are available from much of the Common and also contribute to the area's character*'.

The proposed planting shall offer some mitigation to the loss of the treed embankment in visual terms and the design and fenestration of the building is considered to contribute towards the structure being a landmark building in this location.

In terms of Policy UD5, it is considered that there shall not be a detrimental impact on the strategic view line of St Paul's and the City from Alexandra Palace.

### **3.4 Proposed Materials**

The proposed materials for the development are as follows:

#### *Main Building / Forum*

- White coloured render solid wall panels;
- Aluminium/wood composite framed windows;
- Double Glazed curtain wall façade;
- Coloured render solid wall panels, with horizontal banding and glazed bay windows (facing the Common);

#### *North Wing*

- Yellow multi stock brick used for the main wing section;

- Timber louvre solar shading on south elevations;
- Metal panel system, with aluminium/wood composite framed windows;
- Double Glazed curtain wall façade on east elevations (facing the Common)
- Coloured render solid wall panels, with horizontal banding and glazed bay windows (facing the Common);
- Photovoltaic Cell Panels.

#### *South Wing*

The proposed materials for the wing sections are as follows:

- Yellow multi stock brick used for the main sections;
- Timber louvre solar shading on south elevations;
- Metal panel system, with aluminium/wood composite framed windows;
- Double Glazed curtain wall façade on east elevations (facing the Common)
- Coloured render solid wall panels, with horizontal banding and glazed bay windows (facing the Common);
- Photovoltaic Cell Panels;
- Media Screen (proposed on north side of south wing).

### **3.5 Transportation**

The Key objectives of PPG13 relate to promoting sustainable transport; promoting accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and also to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. London Plan policies 3C.1 / 3C.2 / 3C.3 / 3C.17 / 3C.23 are of relevance in terms of tackling congestion, parking and sustainable transport issues.

Policies M2, M3, M4, M5, M10 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 7b and 7c of Haringey UDP (2006) are also of relevance.

#### *Assessment*

The applicant submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) (Entec UK Ltd) in support of the planning application. Consultation responses were received from both TfL and LBH Transportation with respect to this, after which a Stage 2 'Traffic & Transport' report was submitted by the applicant to address the issues raised through the consultation.

The key issues raised from the consultation process relate to: 1) Traffic Capacity; 2) Parking provision; 3) Public Transport Capacity; 4) Travel Plan; 5) Level of Cycle Parking and 6) Pedestrian / Cycle Movement. These are referred to below:

#### *Traffic Capacity / Congestion / Signalised Junction*

The initial consultation responses from TfL and LBH Transportation raised issues over the TA underestimating trip generation and proposing an inappropriate signalised junction at the proposed main vehicular entry point to the school, (junction of Station Road and Park Avenue). The applicant has subsequently been in discussion with TfL in relation to this. The Stage 2 report contains details of the trip generation analysis and identifies that following discussions with TfL, the detail of the proposed signalised junction has been reviewed and reassessed,

to ensure the site access operates within the capacity during the morning and evening peak periods. It is understood that TfL are currently reviewing this additional information, therefore, feedback from TfL and LBH Transport Group is awaited on this issue.

### *Parking*

The proposed development includes 39 parking spaces, which includes 4 disabled person parking spaces. This parking shall be available to staff members and visitors only. No parking is proposed for students and no access to the site shall be allowed for parents dropping off students.

TfL requested this level of parking provision to be justified and reduced if possible. LBH Transportation have identified that this level of parking provision is considered to be appropriate, taking into account the PTAL rating for the location, the proposed use and number of employees.

It is not considered the level of parking on site shall lead to a significant increase in on-street parking in the surrounding area as the applicant has confirmed that teaching and school staff will not be eligible for essential user permits for the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) surrounding the school. This should be addressed through the Green Travel Plan.

Based on the information provided and the consultation responses received, the level of proposed parking provision is considered to be acceptable and to meet the requirements of Policy M10 of Haringey UDP (2006).

### *Public Transport*

Concern was raised through the consultation responses in relation to the capacity of the existing public transport, and that this had not been assessed as part of the submitted TA. As such, additional analysis was requested with respect to this. The Stage 2 report submitted by the applicant identifies that a bus capacity survey has been undertaken and passed to TfL for comment. This information, is therefore, still outstanding. In addition, recommendations for improvements to bus service / bus stops is the subject of ongoing discussion with TfL.

In terms of impact on the underground service, Entec has assessed travel surveys and travel plans for four compatible secondary schools, concluding that there will not be a significant impact on underground capacity.

### *Travel Plan*

The submitted TA provides a brief overview of what type of measures could be included in the School Travel Plan (STP).

### *Cycle Parking*

The applicant originally proposed to provide 60 cycle parking spaces for the development. TfL have identified that for a development of this size, 120 cycle spaces would be required. The applicant has subsequently proposed to provide 80 cycle spaces at the start of the operation of the school. This is considered acceptable, as the school will not be fully occupied until 2015, therefore, it is not considered necessary to require the provision of 120 cycle space at the outset.

In order to address the issues of public transport capacity, cycle parking and pedestrian / cycle movement, a planning condition is recommended require a full Green Travel Plan to be prepared prior to occupation of the development.

### *Pedestrian / Cycle Movement*

The proposed Green Chain Link which is identified within Haringey UDP (2006) proposals map, runs across the north tip of the site. This promotes north – south pedestrian / cycle movement. No specific proposal, has been made by the applicant in relation to this.

## **3.6 Access Statement**

An access statement has been submitted to support the planning application. It identifies the following:

### Main Entrances to the Building

- 'Main School Entrance': pedestrian access, with the gentle slope of 1 in 30 over a distance of 25m from the boundary of the site to the entrance doors;
- 'Community Entrance': access for those using the car park and out of school hours access for the community. 4 no. disabled parking spaces are located in the main car park adjacent to the entrance;
- 'ASD Entrance': located below the south wing at the Wood Green Common level, with vehicle drop off and level access to the entrance.

The proposed building has the following primary access features:

- Automatic opening doors at 'Main School Entrance' and 'Community Entrance';
- All external doors to have level thresholds;
- Access to all areas of the building via large lifts, capable of accommodating powered wheelchairs (3 lifts proposed to serve the building);

The access statement is considered acceptable for the purposes of the planning application. Compliance with Approved Documents K and M of the current Building Regulations shall be required.

### 3.7 Ecology / Green Corridor

The site is within a designated Ecological Corridor. There is a significant amount of policy (national – local) relating to biodiversity and ecology. PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) identifies that the *'aim of planning decisions should be to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests'* and that where there would be significant harm to those interests, *'local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no more harm'*.

Policy 3D.14 of the London Plan states that development should be resisted where there would be a *'significant adverse impact on the protection or conservation status of protected species or priority species...'*

Within the UDP, policy G7, OS5, OS6 and OS11 are of relevance. Policy OS6 (Ecologically Valuable Sites and their Corridors) states that development on ecologically important sites, will not be permitted unless i) there would be no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site and ii) unless the importance of the development outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.

#### *Ecological Impacts*

The LBH Nature Conservation Officer and Haringey Biodiversity Partnership have undertaken a site visit and have reviewed the submitted documentation. Both parties object to the application, with the grounds for refusal being:

- Loss of habitat; specifically loss of the former railway sidings area to MUGAs;
- Lack of mitigation of loss of habitat;
- Interruption and fragmentation of the ecological corridor and lack of connectivity;
- Interruption of flight-lines for bats;
- Impact of light pollution and wind turbines on habitats and wildlife;
- No consideration of the Green Chain Link.

The proposed development includes the following biodiversity enhancement measures, which are detailed below:

- Planting semi-mature replacement trees;
- Installing bird and bat roosting boxes;
- Green roof on the north and south wings of the development;
- Use of native climbing plants on building walls;
- Installation of water bodies that can also act as a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS);
- The planting of native water-saving fruit and flower-bearing species;

The applicant submitted an Ecological Statement as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 8), which accompanied the application. The data gathering methodology was based on a Desk Study and a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Appendix E of ES).

The Phase 1 report identifies that the site has limited potential for supporting protected and/or notable species. It does state that the woodland belt offers opportunities for birds and together with the New River (albeit a culvert) links the site to the surrounding landscape.

The Phase 1 Study identifies that a large proportion of the site comprises hard standing and derelict buildings of negligible nature conservation value. It is identified that the 'broad-leaved woodland belt offers some biodiversity value and acts as a corridor for migrating flora and fauna linking the north and south of the site.

The submitted Ecological Statement identified three 'valued ecological receptors' (off-site) which could be affected by the development. The findings are summarised below:

- 1) Potential Impact on New River: potential for deterioration in water quality during construction phase, therefore, works should be carried out in accordance with best practice guidelines.
- 2) Potential Impact on Wood Green Reservoirs: potential for indirect effect from New River, in terms of deterioration of water quality. Best practice guidelines should be followed to ensure water quality is maintained.
- 3) Potential Impact on Alexandra Park: due to the urban location of the development, changes to environmental baseline conditions related to noise and air quality are unlikely to change significantly in this location.

#### Habitat Loss

It is considered that one of the key areas of habitat loss within the existing site is in the south west section of the site, where the proposed Multi Use Games Area's (MUGA's) are to be located. The applicant identifies that the proposed site layout, minimises the area of site coverage, taking into account the requirements of the school in terms of area, and facilities. Although the proposed planting scheme introduce an element of new habitat, it is considered there shall be an overall loss of habitat at the site. The LBH Conservation Officer has requested the relocation of these MUGA's off site, to minimise habitat loss.

#### Ecological Corridor / Interruption of corridor

The interruption of the ecological corridor is one of the key areas of objection from the Nature Conservation Officer. In addition, the ecological report within the ES, identifies the importance of maintaining the east - west and north - south links, through the site, as a bat commuting routes.

The applicant has proposed to retain the vegetated embankment in the south east corner of the site and introduce a considerable amount of additional planting,



which is proposed to maintain the corridor. The applicant identifies that there is a proposed undercroft section as part of the south wing, which shall ensure there is some permeability through the development.

The applicant has proposed sections of green roof on the north and south wings of the development. This is proposed to increase biodiversity opportunities within the development.

Having considered the submissions and information available, is it considered that the proposed development shall have a detrimental impact on the ecological value of the site, incurring habitat loss and breaking the connectivity of the Ecological Corridor. Although there are mitigation measures proposed, it is not considered that these compensate for the overall detrimental impact in ecology terms.

### *Bats*

The Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Volume 3 of the ES) identified that the site had potential for roosting bats, in some of the mature trees, small buildings to the north of the site and in the culvert structure. These trees were identified as being as numbers: 9, 11, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, 36, 37, 42, 47, 48 and Group 11 (see dwg no. CBA6931.01B). Bat surveys were undertaken on the site by the applicants' consultants on 10 June 2007 (dusk) and 11 July 2007 (dawn). A following bat survey was undertaken on 18 August 2008 (at dusk).

No evidence of bat activity was identified within the culvert structure or within the small buildings to the north of the site. Little or not bat activity was detected near trees no. 9, 11, 12 and 13 and no bat roosts were detected in trees no. 22, 25, 27, 31, 36, 37, 42 and 47 during the activity survey. The survey identified that trees 24, 48 and Group 11 had a '*low potential*' as roost sites and it was recommended that the ivy be removed carefully so that they can be fully assessed. The findings do identify that activity was recorded in the immediate vicinity of these trees soon after the activity survey (soon after sunset).

Based on this, a planning condition is recommended that a further dawn survey for bat roosts be undertaken on the trees identified above prior to commencement on site to ensure there are no bats present. In addition, in relation to the potential impact of the proposed MUGA floodlights on bats, it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring a bat specialist to provide input to the proposed floodlighting scheme when being prepared for discharge of condition.

### *Culvert*

Certain consultation responses, in particular from the GLA, have referred to the opening up of the New River culvert which runs east – west across the site. This has been requested on the grounds of improving biodiversity opportunity across the site. The opening of the culvert is not part of the application.

There are significant issues related to the opening of the culvert, which need to be considered. Firstly, the open section of culvert to the east of the site (on the west side of Station Road) is not within the ownership of the applicant, therefore,

the applicant has no control over this section of the culvert. Any deculverting of the New River would require consent from Thames Water.

Secondly, were the section of the culvert under the subject site to be opened, this would result in a loss of developable site area, with the site already being significantly constrained, which, based on the proposed layout, would result in a loss of parking provision and open space, to what would be considered an unsustainable level. There would also be inherent health and safety issues related to an open river running through the school grounds, with fencing required, which would impede movement through the site.

Thirdly, two thirds of the culvert river runs under the Main East Coast Railway, which evidently cannot be opened. Approximately one third of the culvert runs under the subject site. Taking into account the issues associated with opening this small section of the culvert, it is not considered feasible and as such, it is not recommended that the Council pursue this with the applicant.

The LBH Nature Conservation Officer had originally objected partly on the grounds that the New River Culvert was not to be opened up. After undertaking a site visit, this specific ground of objection has been withdrawn.

#### *Blue Ribbon Network*

The strategic importance of the New River is identified within the London Plan, through the policies relation to the Blue Ribbon Network (Policy 4C.1, 4C.3, 3D.14)

Policy 4C.3 of the London Plan relates to Blue Ribbon Network's and seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity of these designated Network's through various policy guidelines. Policy 4C.11 seeks to increase access along Blue Ribbon Networks and states that borough's should '*protect and improve existing access points to, alongside and over the Blue Ribbon Network*'. This relates to creating new walking and cycling routes alongside the Blue Ribbon Network as well as new access points.

The Phase 1 Habitat Survey identifies that the development of the site itself may result in adverse effects to the water quality of the New River. As such, the study recommended that guidance from the EA should be sought in relation to working close to watercourses.

#### *Green Chain*

A proposed route of the Green Chain crosses the north tip of the proposed development site. Policy OS16 UDP (2006) seeks to protect Green Chains and identifies that opportunities should be taken to consolidate and strengthen them.

There is no specific reference to the Green Chain link within the application, and it is understood, no specific provision made to accommodate the proposed route. This is considered an aspect which further consideration should be given to by the applicant.

## *Living Roofs and Walls*

Policy 4A.11 of the London plan refers to Living Roofs and Walls and identifies that major developments should incorporate living roofs and walls where feasible.

The development proposes sections of the north and south wings to include a 'Green Roof'. The area of 'Green Roof', which was originally proposed on the main (3 storey) building has now been replaced by photovoltaic panels, which replace the 6 x wind turbines which have been removed.

In addition, the proposed development includes a 'Green Wall' on the west side of the building, in order to soften the impact on this elevation .

It is recommended that a condition be attached requesting full details of the 'Green Roof' and 'Green Wall' to be submitted to the LPA and approved in writing by the LPA prior to commencement of development.

### **3.8 Arboriculture / Landscaping**

An Arboricultural Development Statement (ADS) was prepared by CBA Trees and was submitted with the application. A pre-application site visit was undertaken with LBH Arboricultural Officer on 23/06/08.

The proposal involves the removal of 27 trees and two groups of small trees. 11 of these trees are proposed for removal on the grounds of sound arboricultural management. These trees are of poor quality and are categorised as R with the development statement (no's: 3, 9, 20, 21, 22, 28, 31, 34, 37, 46 and 47). The remaining 16 trees and 2 groups of trees are proposed for removal to facilitate the new development (no's: 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48 and Groups 8 and 12). These are category C trees and are considered of low quality.

The LBH Arboricultural Officer has no objection to these proposals.

The Landscape Scheme (see dwg HED.770.302) proposed by the applicant involves the planting of 176 new trees. It is considered, taking into account LBH Arboricultural Officer's response, that this new planting shall be sufficient replacement for the trees which are proposed for removal.

In line with the recommendations of LBH Arboricultural Officer, it is recommended that a condition on tree protection measures be attached to the planning permission and the adherence to the ADS be required through condition. A condition is also recommended requiring a pre-commencement site meeting with the LBH Arboriculturist to confirm the protective measures to be implemented.

### **3.9 Environmental Health**

PPG 24 'Noise' identifies that schools should generally be regarded as noise-sensitive development, and should generally be separated from major sources of noise (such as road, rail and air transport and certain types of industrial

development). Based on this, the proposed noise attenuation measures are of primary importance. London plan policies 4A.14 and 4B.6 are of relevance.

Policy ENV6 'Noise Pollution', states that the 'Council will ensure that new noise sensitive development is located away from existing, or planned sources of noise pollution. Policy ENV7 seeks to control potential pollution resulting from development.

#### *Noise from Railway / Impact on School*

A Noise Assessment has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 14). The report identifies that the noise environment is dominated by the east coast mainline, which has approximately 800 train movements per day.

The proposed layout of the school places the more sensitive teaching rooms to the east side of the site. An acoustic wall is proposed as part of the main building, running north to south along the west boundary of the development to reduce internal noise levels. This wall is to be of masonry construction, of varying heights; a maximum height of 14.8m and a minimum height of 8.6m at the mid (forum) section. A 3m high acoustic barrier fence is proposed between the MUGA's and the railway to reduce external noise levels.

The noise assessment undertaken by Faber Munsell concludes that there shall be 'significant' noise effects in some outdoor areas of the development, however, due to the proposed acoustic measures within the main building, the internal noise levels shall be within the guidelines set out in BB93.

At the time of writing this report, no consultation response had been received from LBH Environmental Health in relation to this. However, taking into account the technical information and findings submitted by the applicant and the noise requirements incumbent upon the Education Department to operate an educational facility, it is considered that noise levels from the railway can be suitably controlled to allow acceptable operating conditions for pupils / staff.

#### *Noise from Wind Turbines*

The proposal had originally incorporated 6 x wind turbines, at a height of 10m each. The applicant has subsequently proposed to remove the 6 x wind turbines and introduce 1 x 8.25m propeller wind turbine sited on the main building, for educational purposes. This turbine shall have the following specification:

- Propeller type wind turbine;
- Proven Energy WT2500;
- 8.25m in height; to be located on the roof of the north wing.

Faber Munsell's produced an Acoustic Strategy Report (at RIBA Stage E) on behalf of the applicant, which assessed the noise emissions from this turbine. It stated the following:

*"In the extreme case of high wind speed conditions, the night-time noise emission level is predicted to be exceeded by 1 dBA. This said, the assessment has not taken into account any increase in the lowest background noise level due to high*

*wind conditions. It is, however, likely that wind turbine noise emission would, in general, be 10 dBA lower than the lowest prevailing background noise level on site” (Para 5.3.4).*

*“In essence, it is unlikely that noise levels from wind turbine operation would exceed the noise limits at the nearest residential property” (5.3.5).*

Taking into account the technical information and findings submitted by the applicant and the recommended condition below, it is considered that noise from the single wind turbine can be suitably controlled to ensure no detrimental impact on adjoining properties / residents.

#### Conditions

Notwithstanding the above, it is considered necessary to recommend a condition controlling the noise emissions from this proposed wind turbine.

#### *Noise from Air Handling Units (AHU's)*

The proposed building is serviced entirely by mechanical ventilation. Two of the air handling units are proposed on the main roof of the building, with the others to the west elevation, fronting the railway line. It is proposed to only operate the air handling units when the building is in use, with the units not proposed to operate overnight. The applicant proposes to clad the units in acoustic panelling and screening to reduce noise spillage.

Within the Faber Munsell Noise Assessment, identifies that the specification of the on-site plant will ensure there is no increase in noise levels, at the closest noise receptors, i.e. the residential properties on Station Road

Taking into account the technical information and findings submitted by the applicant and the recommended condition below, it is considered that noise from the AHU's can be suitably controlled to ensure no detrimental impact on adjoining properties / residents.

#### Conditions

Notwithstanding the above, it is considered necessary to recommend a condition controlling the noise emissions from the proposed Air Handling Units.

#### *Noise from operation of School / Amphitheatre*

The applicant has identified that the proposed amphitheatre is proposed to be used primarily during school hours and occasionally some evenings.

The use of the amphitheatre as an outdoor learning area is considered reasonable during school hours and some evenings. In order to ensure the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is respected, it is recommended that a condition be imposed on the hours of use of amplified sound equipment in this part of the site.

#### *Noise / Disruption from Construction*

The Faber Munsell Noise Assessment considered increases in ambient noise levels from construction activities, which have impact on the residential properties

opposite the site on Station Road. The report identifies that the construction period is anticipated to be 18 months in duration, and that construction traffic is considered to be less than existing.

It is considered that a Construction Management Plan shall be required to be produced by the applicant prior to commencement of development and that conditions on hours of construction shall be applied.

#### *Vibration*

Chapter 15 of the ES relates to 'Vibration'. An additional Vibration Statement was submitted to LBH as supporting information on 6 October 2008. An initial assessment was undertaken in February 2008, however, the findings were found to be inconclusive. A second assessment was undertaken (by Noise & Vibration Engineering Ltd) in April 2008. The purpose of this assessment was to establish whether there would be a detrimental impact on the students and staff from vibration caused by trains passing on the east coast mainline.

The magnitude of the effect was found to be 'low', therefore, not a significant impact, based on the reinforced structural framework and concrete slab construction of the development. It was concluded that the design should achieve a satisfactory teaching environment according to levels indicated by BS6472.

Taking into account the technical information and findings submitted by the applicant, in relation to this issue, it is considered that provided the proposed structural elements of the building are implemented, there shall not be an unreasonable detrimental impact on the users of the school from vibration as a result of the railway line.

#### *Light Pollution from LED Screen / Multi Use Games Area floodlights (MUGA's)*

The proposal includes 3 x MUGA's, with floodlights proposed on 6m high masts. The treed embankment which is to be retained shall help to screen the floodlights from the residential properties on Station Road. The applicant has consulted lighting engineers who have indicated that the minimum criteria as set out in the 2005 Institute of Lighting Engineers (ILE) can be achieved, with respect to light spillage.

A condition is recommended requiring details of the floodlights and proposed mitigation to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to development of the MUGA's.

The proposed LED Media Screen shall be used to display digital art work produced by the students, and shall not be used for advertisements. The media screen shall face into the courtyard, positioned on the north side of the south wing. The proposed dimensions as indicated on the plans are 3.4m wide x 3m high, however, it is understood the exact model has not yet been decided upon. The use of the Media Screen is sought only during school opening times.

A condition is recommended requiring details of the LED Media Screen, in terms of specification and siting, to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to installation.

### 3.10 Sustainability / Renewable Energy

*Policy 4A.2 (Mitigating climate change)* of the London Plan identifies the long-term target of the Mayor in terms of reducing carbon dioxide emissions. *Policy 4A.7 (Renewable Energy)* identifies the requirement that developments should achieve a 'reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 20% from on site renewable energy generation'.

Policies UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', ENV9: Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency and ENV10: 'Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy' within the UDP (2006) are of particular relevance:

#### *Sustainable Design*

The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement which details the following aspects which have been taken into consideration, in relation to the design:

- Orientation: the school site is oriented parallel to east coast main line on former Network Rail sidings. A large masonry wall of 3 storeys is proposed to face onto the railway, which shall address the acoustic issues associated with the site. A green/living wall is proposed on this west elevation to soften the effect of the façade and to provide biodiversity benefits;
- There is limited glazed on the west façade, which provides better acoustical performance for interior spaces and limits solar gain;
- The Classroom 'wings' are oriented east-west; solar gain to south facing windows. The south facing windows have horizontal brise soleil to reduce solar gain on glazing;
- Proposed building of three and five stories reduces overall site coverage, with increased landscaping areas;
- Green Roofs are proposed on the north and south wings provided further storm water attenuation and ecological enhancement;
- Target of a minimum BREEAM 'Excellent' rating;
- The insulation levels are for the building envelope are considerably higher than Part L requirements;
- All teaching spaces are designed to reach a Daylighting Factor of 3.0%;

#### *Sustainable Energy / Renewables*

The applicant has submitted a revised Energy Strategy (RYBK: Revision A) to accompany the planning application. This is prepared in line with the London Renewables Toolkit.

A key aspect of the original proposal in terms of renewable energy for the scheme, related to 6 x wind turbines on the roof of the building. The wind turbines have now been removed from the proposal, with the introduction of a single smaller wind turbine. This is addressed within the revised Energy Strategy, which is summarised below:

The following low/zero carbon technologies have been selected for the proposed development:

#### Renewables

- Ground Source Heat Pumps are expected to deliver 700 kW of both space heating and cooling. Due to site acoustic conditions and DCSF requirements (BB93) on teaching environments, the building is fully mechanically ventilated. The high level provision and quantities of ICT equipment have also generated high cooling loads and the GSHP, together with fan coil units will meet these required loads. Carbon savings expected to be 56,430 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per year with this sizing of GSHP
- Combined Heat and Power gas-fired plant is considered for the building. This will meet the annual hot water loads for the school. Reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> per year are expected to be 33,000 kg.
- Photo Voltaic cells arranged in both rooftop and vertical positions. The total area of PVs is estimated at 550m<sup>2</sup> achieving a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction of 43,736 kg per year. As vertical, south-facing elements arranged within the architectural fabric they serve aesthetic, educational, and energy producing objectives.
- A small 2.5kW wind turbine will feature prominently on the rooftop serving as an educational resource for students to complement the many design elements and renewables serving the building.

The revised Energy Strategy identifies a 31% carbon reduction based on the above technologies. This is considered to be acceptable in relation to the GLA requirement of 20% carbon reduction with renewable technology.

#### BREEAM

It is proposed that the development shall achieve a BREEAM excellent rating at a minimum. The targeted point value is 75.

It is recommended that a condition be attached requiring confirmation of the BREEAM excellent rating, through the submission of a pre-assessment.



### 3.11 Community Benefits

Policy G8 'Creative, Leisure and Tourism' states that the '*Cultural Quarter (Wood Green), Tottenham Green and the metropolitan town and district centres will be focal points for new creative, leisure and tourism development*'. In addition, policy G9 (Community Well Being) of the UDP states that development should meet the borough's needs for enhanced community facilities from population and household growth.

One of the criteria based aspects of Policy CW1 (New Community/Health Facilities), within the UDP (2006) refers to the development of new community/health facilities, if '*c) the building is designed so that it can be used for more than one community purpose, where possible*'.

#### Assessment

Based on the above, the specific benefits which the development shall bring to the community at large, is a material planning consideration, particularly taking into account the identified need and demand for the facility.

The applicant has submitted additional information in relation to Community Benefits and makes reference to Haringey Council Strategy (Draft June 2008) entitled 'Developing Extended Services in and around Haringey Schools'.

The applicant makes reference to the following aspects of the development in relation to the above;

- Proposal includes multi-purpose education and activity spaces have inbuilt flexibility; these areas can be adjusted in size;
- 'Community use' spaces include: MUGA's, sports hall, activity studio / gymnasium, auditorium, learning resources centre, computer suites and dining area. These are all located at embankment level (level 3) for easier access;
- 12 classrooms are located on the embankment level (level 3), which can be used for after hours academic purposes;
- The layout of the building allows access to be restricted to certain areas, without compromising circulation and access to fire escapes etc.

It is evident that the proposed development shall provide significant additional community facilities. The applicant has not provided specific details in relation to the operation of the community facilities, for example, in relation to hours of operation. Control over the operation of the amphitheatre is recommended to be exercised through planning condition, in order to protect residential amenity.

### **3.12 Waste Storage / Collection**

Policy UD7 (Waste Storage) of the UDP (2006) requires that the Council's waste management standards are adhered to.

The proposed development indicates the waste / recycling storage area on the south side of the main building, to be accessed via the access road on the west boundary of the site. Overall however, there is insufficient information to allow proper assessment of the proposed waste management measures. Due to this, it is recommended that a condition be attached requiring the submission of the proposed waste management details to LBH and written approval of these details to be obtained prior to commencement of development.

### **3.13 Flooding / Drainage**

The Environment Agency (EA) have maintained an objection to the proposed development on the basis that the FRA submitted '*does not comply with the requirements set out in the updated London Plan, in particular policy 4A.14 Sustainable Drainage*'.

This relates specifically to the requirement that developers '*should aim to achieve greenfield run off from their site through incorporating rainwater harvesting and sustainable drainage*'.

A revised Flood Risk Assessment was submitted to the EA on 22 October 2008, which is currently under consideration by the EA.

### **3.14 Contaminated Land**

PPS23 'Pollution Control', identifies that the LPA should satisfy itself that the potential for contamination and any risks arising are properly assessed and that the development incorporates any necessary mitigation measures.

*London Plan Policy 4A.33 'Bringing contaminated land into beneficial use', states that the Mayor 'will work with strategic partners to enhance remediation of contaminated sites and bring the land into beneficial use'.*

Policy ENV11 of the UDP (Contaminated Land) identifies that 'development proposals on potentially contaminated land will be required to:

- a) follow a risk management based protocol to ensure contamination is properly addressed; and
- b) carry out investigations to remove or mitigate any risks to local receptors.

A geotechnical report was submitted with the planning application. It detailed the results of the Phase 1 study, identifying 'potentially significant pollutant linkages on the site'. The individual receptors are referred to below:

- Human Health: The initial assessment showed there is a risk to human health from the contamination detected within the made ground;
- Ground Water: The risk to groundwater resources in the Lambeth Group and the Chalk is deemed to be low;
- Surface Water: Further testing is required to determine impact on New River water flow;
- Building Materials: Elevated concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons were detected within the made ground. High concentrations of sulphates were detected within the soils on the site. Japanese Knotweed infestation is suspected on the southern area of the site.

A 'Remediation Method Statement' was submitted to LBH Scientific Officer in July 2008. Feedback from LBH Scientific Officer dated 4 August 2008 was received in relation to the submitted 'Remediation Method Statement'. This stated the following:

- 1) The 'Remediation Method Statement' is acceptable;
- 2) Following clearance of groundcover and undergrowth further soil testing will be carried out;
- 3) Some removal of soil between kept trees / shrubs will be carried out to facilitate addition of capping layer (if required);
- 4) Clean clay from excavation can be reused as subsoil.

Based on the above, the submitted 'Remediation Method Statement' is considered acceptable for the purposes of the planning application.

#### **4.0 COMMENTS ON RESIDENTS' OBJECTIONS**

There has been consultation with local residents both at pre-application stage by and on behalf of the Education Service, and after submission of the application by notification letters, Development Control Forum, Site Notices and Press Advertisements. However, the proposals have resulted in a substantial number of objections from local residents. These appear to be grouped into six main areas:-

1. The selection of this site for a new school is incorrect. This aspect is covered in Section 1.2 of the Analysis Section of the Report; a number of sites were examined; the Heartlands site is well located with regard to its distance from other secondary schools, and with its access to public transport.
2. The proposed wind turbines are visually intrusive, likely to be noisy, and will not provide a good return against investment costs; in the light of these comments, all but one of the turbines has been taken from the scheme.
3. Concern over height design and scale, and views from surrounding vantage points; this is covered in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 above. It is conceded that the height of the proposed school means it will be a prominent new feature when viewed from Wood Green Common, but this means that the footprint of the scheme has a lesser impact on the Ecological Corridor than it might have had.

4. Impact on the use of Wood Green Common; (noted in Section 3.2 above). This is to be minimised by careful placement of entrances to the site, and placement of railing / fencing to discourage encroachment on to the Common.
5. Increased congestion in area, congestion at bus stops; and concerns about the numbers and the behaviour of pupils going to and from the schools. Covered in 3.5 above. The capacity of bus stops will be reviewed and physical changes made if necessary.

## 5.0 OTHER MATTERS

- If the Planning Committee resolves to grant permission, this application has to be referred to the Greater London Authority, under Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008;
- It is not possible for a Section 106 Agreement to apply to this planning application, as the applicant is Haringey BSF, therefore, the Council cannot enter into a Section 106 Agreement with itself. Therefore, controls must be applied through planning conditions or informatives. For certain works outside the development site boundary (e.g. highways), 'Grampian' conditions can be imposed which prevents development until the off-site works have been completed. (For information, 'Grampian' style conditions are so named because they were first use by Grampian District Council in Scotland, and have become an accepted means of achieving works which are technically outside the site area of the application).

## 6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

### Policy / Education Need

The applicant has demonstrated the need for the proposed school, on the basis of the current insufficient capacity of secondary schools within the Borough and on the basis of the predicted increase in pupil numbers, resulting from the development of the Haringey Heartlands Regeneration Area. The requirement for the additional school places within the Borough is accepted and is a material consideration.

The site is covered by numerous policy designations. The Strategic planning policy which covers the site encourages the regeneration of the area and there is 'in principle' support for meeting identified demand for community / education uses. *Site Specific Proposal 4 (SSP4)* which relates to the site, refers to achieving comprehensive development, which includes education use. Of the site specific policies, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Ecological Corridor designation which covers the site.

A sequential analysis of appropriate sites for this school development was commissioned in 2004, which highlighted this site as scoring the highest of the sites assessed. As with any large scale development within an urban environment, there are conflicting requirements and ultimately any development of this size shall have impacts on its surrounds. There are inherent difficulties in finding an ideal location for a school of this size, in a built-up London suburb,

which can accommodate a development which meets all planning policies and fulfils all of the educational requirements of the community.

The site has clear advantages in that it is well-placed for access to bus and rail transport, its catchment area would complement rather than overlap with those of other Secondary schools in the Borough, and because the site is not so close to residential properties as to result in loss of amenity due to overlooking, effect on daylight, or noise disturbance.

No objection is raised on grounds of loss of employment, or on Transportation issues (subject to conditions), or on interruption of views from Alexandra Palace or Park.

The location does place particular demands on the design of the school; in particular its proximity to the main railway line has required special measures to provide acoustic insulation, and special site preparation measures are also required to deal with contamination.

The main identified drawbacks of the scheme are (1) that it does interfere with the continuity of the Ecological Corridor and result in tree loss on the embankment; this is somewhat mitigated by a comprehensive landscaping scheme; and (2) the height of the two 'wings' fronting Wood Green Common Conservation Area is substantial and is not conducive to preserving the character of the Conservation Area.

Whilst there have been objections from the Environment Agency and the GLA, it is considered that these either have been or will be overcome by the provision of further details.

On balance, the scheme is therefore recommended for approval.

## **7.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **GRANT PERMISSION**

Registered No. HGY/2008/1431

S5227 D0001 P1, S5227 D0050 P3, S5227 D0051 P2, S5227 D0400 P1, S5227 D0401 P1, S5227 D0402 P1, S5227 D0403 P1, S5227 D0404 P1, S5227 D0405 P1, S5227 D0406 P1, S5227 D0100 P2, S5227 D0101 P2, S5227 D0102 P2, S5227 D0103 P2, S5227 D0104 P2, S5227 D0105 P3, S5227 D0200 P3, S5227 D0201 P3, S5227 D0202 P3, S5227 D0203 P3, S5227 D0300 P3, S5227 D0301 P3, S5227 D0302 P3, S5227 D0500 P1;

HED.770.501 Rev A Green (Sheet1), HED.770.501 Rev A (Sheet2), HED.770.502 Rev A, HED.770.101 Rev A, HED.770.201, HED.770.202, HED.770.301, HED.770.302, HED.770.303 (1 of 2), HED.770.304 (2 of 2), HED.770.305, HED.770.401 (Sheet 1 of 1), HED.770.402 (Sheets 2 of 2), HED.770.601, CBA6931.01B, CBA6931.04

**Subject to the following condition(s):**

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

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

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

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

4. Prior to the commencement of work the following details and information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority;

- Samples Panels of all facing materials;
- Plans and elevations, fully annotated and dimensioned, showing the proposed detailed design, facing materials, colour and finishes, of the new front entrance gates in the existing brickwork boundary wall, at a scale of 1; 20,

Reason: To ensure a high quality development to preserve the character and appearance of Wood Green Common Conservation Area;

5. The proposed planting scheme hereby authorised, shall be fully implemented by the end of the first planting season, after completion of the development, as per drawing HED.770.302.

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate landscaping is undertaken in the interest of biodiversity and visual amenity.

6. All protective measures must be installed as specified and protective fencing as shown on drawing CB6931.04. All works that impact on the Root Protection Area (RPA) of trees to be retained must be supervised by the Consulting Arboriculturalist (CBA Trees).

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

7. Tree protection fencing must be erected as specified in the Arboricultural Development Statement tree report and installed in accordance with the tree protection site plan (drawing CB6931.04.)

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

8. A pre-commencement site meeting must take place with the Architect, the local authority Arboriculturist, Consulting Arboriculturist, the Planning Officer and the Construction Site Manager, to confirm the protective measures to be implemented, not less than 28 days prior to commencement of development;

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

9. A three-year tree programme to include regular maintenance must be implemented as a minimum requirement to ensure successful establishment. Any new trees or shrubs that fail to establish within a three-year period must be replaced.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory implementation of the landscape strategy hereby permitted.

10. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0730 or after 1830 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1300 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

11. Prior to the commencement of work a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the construction period of the development does not result in unreasonable disturbance for neighbouring properties and to minimise vehicular conflict at this location.

12. The level of noise emitted from the wind turbines / Air Handling Units, hereby approved shall be at least 5dB(A) below the background level, as measured from any point 1 metre outside the window of any room of an existing neighbouring property at the time of this decision notice. The wind turbines shall be serviced regularly in accordance with manufacturer's instructions, and as necessary to ensure that the requirements of the condition are met; if the requirements of the Condition are not met, then the turbines shall not operate until such time as necessary remedial works have been undertaken to comply with the Condition.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

13. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

14. No development shall be commenced until precise details of the design and materials to be used in connection with the proposed railing / fencing along the footpath on the west side Wood Green Common have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of Wood Green Conservation Area.

15. Prior to construction of the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), details of the proposed, operation, location and specification of the floodlighting shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by LBH and Network Rail.

Reason: To ensure the proposed floodlighting shall not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties / foraging and commuting bats and to ensure the floodlights meet Network Rail Health and Safety Standards.

16. A recognised Bat Specialist shall require to be consulted in the preparation of the detailed floodlighting proposals for the Multi Use Games Area's, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To avoid a detrimental impact on foraging / migrating bats.

17. Prior to the commencement of development, a dawn Bat Survey shall be undertaken by a recognised Bat Specialist, to assess whether there are bat roosts present in any of the trees identified as having some potential for bat roosts within the Entec Phase 1 Habitat Survey (June 2008) (namely no's: 9, 11, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 31, 36, 37, 42, 47, 48 and Group 11).

Reason: To avoid damage or disturbance of possible nesting sites.

18. Development should not be commenced until 'Impact Studies' of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the/this additional demand;

19. A Green Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to commencement of development. This shall specifically address public transport capacity, Controlled Parking Zone, cycle parking and pedestrian / cycle movement.

Reason: To ensure sustainable transportation measures are put in place prior to occupation and to minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads.

20. The commencement of the development authorised by this permission shall not begin until highway/improvement works have been agreed in writing by the LPA and completed in accordance with those agreed drawings.

Reason: To ensure the required highways works are identified and put in place prior to occupation of the development and to improve the traffic capacity/highway safety of the site access junction and improve pedestrian conditions at this location.



21. No development shall be commenced until precise details of the proposed 'Green Roof' and 'Green Wall' are submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To ensure the opportunities for biodiversity enhancement are maximised through the proposed development.

22. Confirmation of the BREEAM 'excellent' rating shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, in the form of a BREEAM pre-assessment, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure the proposed energy efficiency targets are achievable.

23. Prior to occupation, details of energy efficient design and consideration of on-site equipment, to demonstrate at least a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from on-site renewable energy generation, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and maintained thereafter for the life of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development incorporates energy efficiency measures including on-site renewable energy generation, in order to contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance

24. Teaching sessions or other organised events shall not be held within the outdoor amphitheatre area before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0900 or after 1400 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays, unless approved writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

25. The use of amplified sound equipment within the amphitheatre area shall not be permitted unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

26. Details of design, specification and operation of the proposed LED Media Screen require to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the installation and operation of this feature.

Reason: To protect the character and setting of the Conservation Area and to avoid detrimental impact on residential amenity.

27. An Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To maximise the ecological and biodiversity opportunities onsite.

28. Details of boundary fencing, external lighting and landscaping adjacent to the railway shall be submitted to and approved by LBH (in conjunction with Network Rail's Territory Outside Parties Engineer), prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure the integrity and health and safety of the adjacent railway is not compromised.

INFORMATIVE: 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.

INFORMATIVE: A Training and Employment Strategy must be prepared and submitted to LBH for approval prior to commencement of development.  
Reason: To ensure a plan of action is prepared for Local Community training and employment benefits from the development.

INFORMATIVE: Pursuant to condition no. 28, Network Rail require details of the proposed access road adjacent to the railway, the collection and diversion of surface and foul water, the Development Method Statement (including fail safe procedures) and details of excavations and earthworks adjacent to the railway, to be submitted to Network Rail for approval, prior to commencement of development.

## REASONS FOR APPROVAL

1) The proposed development is considered consistent with Site Specific Policy 4, Policies AC1, EMP1 and CW1 of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006), and is considered consistent with Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (2005). It is considered the proposed development shall create visual interest and shall be a landmark building within Haringey Heartlands, in line with the objectives of Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (2005) and as such, is also considered acceptable in relation to Policy UD4 of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006). It is considered, on balance, the provision of the facility, with the proposed mitigation measures and conditions, outweighs the impact on the Ecological Corridor (Policy OS6) and the Conservation Area (Policy CSV1), as identified within Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006).

2) It is considered sufficient mitigation measures and conditions have been proposed as part of the development, in relation to impact on residential amenity and proposed tree loss. As such the application is considered consistent with Policies UD3, ENV6, ENV7 and OS17 of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006). It is considered there shall not be a detrimental impact on the public and private transport networks. As such the proposed development is considered consistent with Policies M2, M3 and M10 of Haringey UDP (2006). It is considered there shall be no detrimental impact on Strategic Views from

Alexandra Palace and as such, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of Policy UD5 of Haringey UDP (2006).