

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2018/3145

Ward: Noel Park

Address: 22-42 High Road N22 6BX

Proposal: Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment to provide part 3-8 storey buildings providing mixed use development, comprising residential accommodation, flexible retail units, flexible workspaces, a hotel, and a public courtyard, with associated site access, car and cycle parking, and landscaping works.

Applicant: Lazari Developments Ltd

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Samuel Uff

Date received: 24/10/2018 **Last amended date:** 30/04/2019

1.1 The application is being reported to the Planning Committee as it is a major application.

1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed mixed use development would provide a suitable residential density, retail, commercial and business quantum, including a large hotel use.
- Implementation of the permission will be reliant on the safeguarding restriction of the site and shall not be developed unless the Cross Rail 2 Safeguard is revoked.
- The development would provide 40% affordable housing, with 64% of this provision for Social Rented and 36% for London Living Rent, (no option for occupier purchase). The Council will have first option to purchase the affordable units.
- A suitable housing mix of one, two, three and four bed units is proposed for both affordable housing tenure and the scheme as a whole. A total of 25% family housing will be provided within the development.
- The development will create a laneway between the High Road and Bury Road, in accordance with the aims of the Wood Green AAP and Site Allocation.
- The scale and massing would not stymie other development within the Site Allocation and has been designed with a contextual approach to these sites.

- The contemporary design and materiality would have a positive impact on the on the visual appearance of the area, would protect key local views and would not harm local heritage assets.
- The development would not have an adverse impact on surrounding amenity.
- The development would provide sufficient number of appropriately located car and cycle parking and would encourage sustainable transport initiatives in an area with excellent public transport links.
- Private amenity space would be provided for each flat, as well as access to generous communal amenity spaces and the public space created in the laneway courtyard.
- The development would achieve low carbon and renewables objectives.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-Committee.
- 2.3 That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 09/08/2019 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- 2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of this report)

1. Time limit – 5 years
2. In accordance with plans
3. Flexible Retail space floorplans
4. B1 / /D1 use
5. Materials
6. Commercial hours of operation

7. Accessibility
8. Ventilation of A3 uses
9. Site levels
10. Communal satellite dish only
11. Public realm landscaping
12. Internal landscaping
13. External lighting
14. Updated AQ assessment
15. Contaminated Land
16. Boilers
17. Dust management
18. NRMM regulations
19. Plant machinery
20. No infiltration
21. Piling method
22. Borehole investigation
23. Waste storage
24. Secured by design
25. London Underground asset protection
26. Water infrastructure capacity
27. Water main protection
28. Commercial fat traps
29. Bury Road gardens
30. Cycle parking
31. Delivery and service plan
32. Construction management / logistics plan
33. Parking management plan
34. EV charging
35. Plant noise limits
36. Internal noise protection
37. Commercial sound insulation
38. Re-radiated noise
39. Drainage scheme
40. Energy network quality
41. Commercial BREEAM objectives
42. Overheating study
43. Living roof details
44. Tree protection plan
45. Solar panels
46. Details of security gates
47. Opening hours of security gates
48. Base build blinds

Informatives

- 1) Positive / proactive manner

- 2) CIL liable
- 3) S106
- 4) Street numbering
- 5) Soil contamination
- 6) Piling
- 7) Asbestos
- 8) Hours of construction

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

1) Crossrail final sign off of conditions:

- No development unless either:
 - TfL consent;
 - Crossrail does not come forward or re-aligns;
 - The need for protection can be designed out
- Subject to confirmation from Crossrail the Secretary of State for Transport will be asked to resolve any disputes

2) Affordable Housing Provision

- 40% affordable by habitable room
- 64% social rent (with no sale) and 36% intermediate rent (London Living Rent)
- Occupier no option to buy Affordable / Intermediate rented
- LBH first option to purchase social rented affordable purchase

3) Public Realm and Highway Improvements on Bury Road

- Highway improvements including road crossing measures, reinstatement of a redundant access, pedestrian and cycle improvements and provision of three accessible parking spaces
- Financial contribution

4) Energy Statement Update and Review

- Assessment of the development's potential to integrate CHP
- Review of submitted Energy Statement prior to commencement
- Provision of financial contribution towards carbon offsetting of £276,372
- Sustainability review before occupation (plus any additional carbon offset if required)

5) Energy Centre

- Best endeavours to connect to Wood Green DEN energy centre

6) Considerate Contractor Scheme Registration

7) Sustainable Transport Initiatives

- Travel Plans provided for the residential and commercial uses
- Appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator
- Financial contributions towards travel plan monitoring (£2,000 per plan)
- Car club membership or bicycle purchase contributions for occupiers including enhanced provision for family dwellings
- Traffic Management Order amendment (£4,000)
- Controlled Parking Zone contribution (£15,000) towards design and consultation for implementation of parking management measures
- Other initiatives

8) Car Parking Management Plan

- Measures to include parking space unit allocations, details of vehicle circulatory movements, occupancy level monitoring and off-street permit allocation
- Parking priority plan
- Potential inclusion of a parking space for the commercial unit
- 20% active and 80% passive electric vehicle charging point provision, plus details of the threshold required for conversion from passive
- Monitoring (£3,000)

9) Employment Initiatives – Local Training and Employment Plan

- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents
- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees
- Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff)
- Support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship for recruitment
- Provision of a named contact to facilitate the above
- Local business preference within workspace units

10) Child Play Space Off-Site Contribution

- £28,918 off site provision

11) Shell and core fit out

- The courtyard workspace units will be fit out to shell and core with a landlord contribution to the fit out once a tenant has been secured.

12) Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value of contributions (max. £50,000)

2.5 In the event that member choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

2.6 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of onsite affordable housing, and in the absence of a legal agreement to review the provision of affordable housing in 18 months, the scheme would fail to foster balanced neighbourhoods where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy 3.12 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP2 of the Local Plan 2017, and Policy DM13 of the Development Management, DPD 2017.
2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligation to ensure that the site as Designated Crossrail 2 Safeguarding were complied with and not contravened, to jeopardise future transport connectivity within the locality and wider setting. As such, the proposal would be contrary to NPPF guidance, Policies 2.8, 2.10, 2.11, 2.18, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4 and 6.5 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP7 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM31 of the Development Management, DPD 2017.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations for mitigation measures to promote sustainable transport and address parking pressures, would significantly exacerbate pressure for on-street parking spaces in general safety along the neighbouring highway and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such the proposal is considered contrary to the requirements of Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, Policy 7.9 of the Local Plan 2017, Policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Haringey Employment Delivery Partnership, would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP8 and SP9 of the Local Plan 2017.
5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy SP4 of the Local Plan 2017.

- 2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.6) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
 - (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
 - (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

CONTENTS

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8. RECOMMENDATION
9. PLANNING CONDITIONS & INFORMATIVES

APPENDICES:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Appendix 1 | Planning Conditions and Informatives |
| Appendix 2 | Plans and Images |
| Appendix 3 | Consultation Responses – Internal and External Consultees and representations |
| Appendix 5 | QRP Reports |

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

- 3.1.1. This is an application for the demolition of the existing commercial buildings (former BHS store) and replacement with a three to eight storey, mixed use development, including residential. The site would contain a central laneway, with scheme for gating outside of business operation hours and associated courtyard behind. This would consist of an eight storey High Road frontage and courtyard blocks, transitioning to a five storey and three storey frontage on Bury Road.
- 3.1.2. The hotel block (C1 use class) would be located in the north-eastern corner of the site with a seven storey height along Whymark Avenue and five storey height on the junction with Bury Road.
- 3.1.3. First floor podium gardens would be set behind the High Road blocks and behind the courtyard and Bury Road blocks. These would be accessed from the main lobbies of the residential blocks and would be accessible for all residents.
- 3.1.4. The High Road frontages would accommodate a generously proportioned, high ceiling retail frontage. Basement provision for additional retail floorspace and back of house space would be sited below Block A on the High Road. This would amount to a total of 3,450sqm retail A1-A3 floorspace, with an emphasis on A1 retail functionality. The upper floors of this frontage would provide affordable housing in the first seven storeys, with private flats on the recessed top floor.
- 3.1.5. Ground floor use within the courtyard would be predominantly workspace and would provide approximately 525sqm of business (B1 use) and selected non-residential institutions (falling within D1 use). The Bury Road frontage would be primarily residential, other than the junction with Whymark Avenue.
- 3.1.6. The laneway and associated courtyard would provide a public space, with playspace, work space and public and restaurant seating areas. All flats would also be accessed off of this courtyard and both open and covered cycle parking would be provided off of this space. A large tree and soft landscaping would also be planted as a focal part of the courtyard.
- 3.1.7. The Bury Road frontage would have two vehicular accesses; one adjacent to the hotel and one adjacent to the rear of the neighbouring site at no.44-46 High Road. The first of these would provide a mix of accessible parking bays for the hotel and residential uses and the latter would be solely residential parking and integrated cycle parking and refuse stores.
- 3.1.8. The materiality of the High Road would create a glazed ground floor retail frontage, broken up with concrete frames and a fascia that would partially screen the first floor of residential flats. The two storey bays would have a mix of metal

railing balcony, screening aluminium fins, with textured coloured panels in the recessed parts. The recessed roof would be formed of metal cladding with balustrade screening for the top floor terrace.

- 3.1.9. The materials of the courtyard blocks include metal cladding with projecting balconies. Toward the rear of the site, the Bury Road blocks would be in tones of red brick, to reflect those of the residential dwellings in the vicinity. The hotel use along Whymark Avenue would also continue this materiality but would introduce a zig-zag metal clad roof.

3.2 Site and Surroundings

- 3.2.1 The site is located on the north-eastern side of High Road, Wood Green and contains an undistinguished set of buildings. The site covers a total of 0.8 hectares and has frontages on Whymark Avenue and Bury Road, as well as the main High Road elevation.

- 3.2.2 The site is currently occupied by a number of smaller retail uses since the BHS occupants vacated the site. The buildings contained within the site have a variable height of single storey to four storeys, with an active retail frontage along the High Road and back of house along Whymark Avenue and Bury Road. Throughout ground and first floor of the existing buildings there is a provision of underused and deteriorating floorspace of 6,888sqm, consisting predominantly of retail (A1) and restaurant (A3) use, with a modest amount of office (B1) use.

- 3.2.3 The character of the area varies between the retail high street functionality of the High Road and the residential character of Bury Road. The High Road has a varied design of buildings, especially in this part. Bury Road has a distinctly more residential character and forms part of the Noel Park Estate, but is not within the conservation area. These buildings have a more traditional red brick appearance and are of a lower scale than the High Road and those along Whymark Avenue.

- 3.2.4 The High Road is designated as a Primary Shopping Frontage in the Development Management DPD. The site is not within a conservation area and does not contain any statutory or locally listed buildings.

3.3 Relevant Policy Designations

- 3.3.1 The site is part SA14 (16-54 Wood Green High Road) in the Site Allocations DPD 2017, and is also within WGS13 (16-54 Wood Green High Road) in the emerging Wood Green Area Action Plan (WG AAP).

- 3.3.2 The two allocations broadly agree with regard to the development aims of the site. The latter is more detailed and the most recent, albeit that the former has considerably more planning weight. From Wood Green AAP SA13, the site

allocation is for the *“Comprehensive redevelopment of current buildings for mixed use development.”*

- 3.3.3 The Site Allocations DPD involve other buildings including the modern retail units that are not part of this development at nos. 16 - 20 High Road, with Tarshish restaurant above. At the other end of the site allocation are the Sainsbury's and M&S buildings, separated by a small anomalous building at no.42 (Kaspa's Desserts).
- 3.3.4 The site itself is located within an area designated as a Crossrail 2 Safeguarding Area, as an area of surface interest for the future delivery of Crossrail 2. This would mean that any development would be dependent on the safeguard is being amended.
- 3.3.5 The site is located within the London Plan strategic view from Alexandra Palace to Central London / St Paul's Cathedral (London Panorama 1), as well as the view of Alexandra Palace from Downhills Park Road, which is a Haringey Locally Significant View (Linear View 21).
- 3.3.6 The site is also designated as Wood Green Metropolitan Centre, Primary Shopping Frontage and Growth Area, as well as a Potential Location for Tall Buildings.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1. Planning Committee Pre-Application Briefing

- 4.2. The proposal was presented to the Planning Committee at a Pre-Application Briefing on 15 January 2018. The relevant minutes of the meeting are described below:
- 4.3. The Planning Officer and representatives for the applicant gave a short presentation on early plans for the scheme.
- 4.4. The Committee noted the following response to their comments and questions:
 - The developers had been mindful of not creating small pockets of spaces where it may encourage anti-social behaviour. It was hoped that the openness of the courtyard, the lighting, and the A3 unit would prevent this.
 - Part of the balconies would be dedicated as winter gardens to allow for better use. For the properties without balconies, there would be adequate shared amenity space.
 - There was already an operator interested in developing the hotel, which demonstrated the level of demand in the area.

4.5. Quality Review Panel

- 4.6. The scheme has been presented to Haringey's Quality Review Panel on 15 November 2017 and for a Chair Review on 9 May 2018.
- 4.7. The notes are set out in Appendix 5.
- 4.8. **Development Management Forum**
- 4.9. A Development Management Forum was held on 12 June 2018.
- 4.10. **Greater London Authority - Pre-Application Meeting**
- 4.11. This was held with GLA on 25 March 2018.
- 4.12. **Application Consultation**
- 4.9. The following were consulted regarding the application:
- 4.10. INTERNAL REPRESENTATION SUMMARY
- 4.11. Design Officer
- 4.12. This proposal is a well-designed redevelopment of a large and important part of an allocated site within the Wood Green Metropolitan Centre. The proposals would provide better quality, modern retail units in this important primary frontage and to an architectural design that would repair an important part of the High Road frontage comparable to the high quality Victorian and Edwardian retail parades nearby.
- 4.13. Conservation Officer:
- 4.14. No objection to development or impact on mediaeval and post-mediaeval moated manor (as raised by Historic England)
- 4.15. Transportation Officer:
- 4.16. No objection subject to condition and S106.
- 4.17. Housing:
- 4.18. The amended mix of tenure and affordable housing provision and type of affordable provision is acceptable.
- 4.19. Carbon Management:

- 4.20. No objection subject to conditions and S106. Details of future overheating modelling for Block A required and future retrofitting management plan.
- 4.21. Drainage Officer
- 4.22. No objection, subject to conditions
- 4.23. Pollution:
- 4.24. The development will be air quality neutral. No objection subject to conditions.
- 4.25. Noise:
- 4.26. No objection subject to conditions.
- 4.27. Licensing:
- 4.28. No objections subject to conditions regarding hours of operation.
- 4.29. EXTERNAL REPRESENTATION SUMMARY
- 4.30. Greater London Authority:
- 4.31. Development should not conflict with the Crossrail 2 safeguarding. Principal of development, affordable housing provision and quantum is acceptable. Minor design alterations suggested. Revisions for Carbon reduction required. Transportation issues to be addressed. Sustainable drainage and flood risk require further consideration.
- 4.32. Transport for London:
- 4.33. No objection subject to S106 obligation regarding no development until TfL approval of works on this designated safeguarded site and subject to conditions. More cycle parking required in line with draft London Plan.
- 4.34. London Underground Lines
- 4.35. No objection subject to condition.
- 4.36. Crossrail 2:
- 4.37. No objection subject to S106 obligation regarding no development until TfL approval of works on this designated safeguarded site and subject to conditions.
- 4.38. Historic England:

- 4.39. Attention drawn to the mediaeval and post-mediaeval moated manor of Dovecote House/Ducketts and is unlikely to affect buried remains associated with it, subject to Conservation consideration.
- 4.40. Thames Water:
- 4.41. No objection subject to conditions.
- 4.42. London Fire Brigade
- 4.43. None received.
- 4.44. Metropolitan Police
- 4.45. No objection subject to Secure by Design conditions.
- 4.46. Environment Agency
- 4.47. No objection subject to conditions.
- 4.48. National Grid
- 4.49. No objections

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following were consulted:

2 Neighbouring properties
Residents Association
8 site notices were erected close to the site
Press notice posted on 02/11/2018

5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 1
Supporting: 2
Others: 0

5.3 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

- Support the new homes and businesses in the area. (s)
- Beneficial for local businesses (s)

- Height of development (o)
- Overcrowding (o)
- Impact on highways congestion and safety (o)
- Parking (o)

6.1 Principle of the development

6.1.1 Policy Framework

6.1.2 The application is for the demolition of an existing commercial premises and its replacement with a development of featuring a double-height commercial unit at ground floor level with two residential buildings projecting above a first floor residential podium, plus a hotel.

6.1.3 Given these proposals, the following strategic policies are considered to be of relevance in assessing this application.

6.1.4 *National Policy*

6.1.5 The National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF) establishes overarching principles of the planning system, including the requirement of the system to 'drive and support development' through the local development plan process and support 'approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay'. The NPPF also expresses a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.'

6.1.6 The NPPF encourages the 'effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed'. In respect of applications that include provision of housing, the NPPF highlights that delivery of housing is best achieved through larger scale development. The NPPF is also committed to ensuring the vitality of town centres partly through promoting competition and a diverse retail offer.

6.1.1 *The Development Plan*

6.1.2 For the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the Development Plan consists of the London Plan (consolidated 2016), Haringey's Local Plan (consolidated 2017), the Development Management Policies DPD (2017), Site Allocation DPD (2017). The emerging Wood Green AAP and the draft new London Plan are also material considerations. The decision must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.1.3 *Regional Policy*

- 6.1.4 The consolidated London Plan (2016) sets a number of objectives for development through various policies. The policies in the London Plan are accompanied by a suite of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) that provide further guidance.
- 6.1.5 Wood Green is situated within an Intensification Area (Haringey Heartlands/Wood Green) as designated by the London Plan 2016. The Mayor identifies Intensification Areas (IAs) as being 'built up areas with good existing or potential public transport links' that can 'support redevelopment at higher than existing densities'.
- 6.1.6 Annexe 1 to the London Plan states that Wood Green town centre may be developed for 'high-density, mixed use schemes'. The IA sets a minimum target for new homes of 1,000, with an indicative employment capacity of 2,000 jobs.
- 6.1.7 Furthermore, the emerging draft London Plan identifies the site as being within the Wood Green/Haringey Heartlands Opportunity Area, demonstrating greater targets for home building and job creation in this area of 4,500 new homes and 2,500 jobs, further developing the potential of Wood Green as a Metropolitan town centre.
- 6.1.8 Wood Green and Turnpike Lane underground stations have been identified for siting on the proposed Crossrail 2 rail link, whilst increased capacity to the Piccadilly Line is also expected in future as part of scheduled improvements to London Underground services.
- 6.1.9 *Local Policy*
- 6.1.10 Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) highlight the importance of growth areas within the Borough and states that the Council will promote development in Wood Green due to its designation as a key future growth location. The Local Plan has recently been updated to reflect a more challenging position in respect of overall borough-wide housing targets and affordable housing delivery.
- 6.1.11 The Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2017 (SADPD) gives effect to the Local Plan spatial strategy by allocating sufficient sites to accommodate the development needs of the borough. Developments within allocated sites are expected to conform to the guidelines of the relevant allocation unless there is strong justification for non-compliance.
- 6.1.12 For proposals in Wood Green, the SADPD is supported by the emerging Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP), which provides further site specific and area based policies that underpin the delivery of the Local Plan vision. The AAP aims to articulate the spatial vision for growth in this particular part of the Borough and it is anticipated to be adopted in late 2018.

6.1.13 The Council's Streetscape Manual and draft Streetscape Design Guide provide further detailed guidance on the layout and appearance of the borough's public realm areas.

6.1.14 Finally, the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 (DMDPD) supports proposals that contribute to the delivery of the planning policies referenced above and sets out its own specific criteria-based policies against which planning applications will be assessed.

6.1.15 Site Allocations

6.1.16 The site is positioned to the north-western side of the High Road in Wood Green and lies between the prominent local transport nodes of Wood Green and Turnpike Lane underground stations.

6.1.17 This part of Wood Green has been identified for comprehensive redevelopment in both the Site Allocations DPD and the emerging Wood Green AAP and as such the application site forms part of a site allocation in both of these documents. The site allocations are referenced SA14 in the Site Allocations DPD and WG SA 13 in the Wood Green AAP and they both cover all properties from 16-54 High Road.

6.1.18 SA14 envisages the comprehensive redevelopment of the current High Road frontages for mixed use development consisting of town centre commercial uses at ground and first floor level with residential properties above and a potential Crossrail 2 station entrance onto High Road.

6.1.19 The site specific requirements of SA14 are as follows:

- Indicative development capacity of 334 residential units and 2,597sqm of town centre floor space;
- Provision of a site allocation-wide masterplan showing how individual proposals do not compromise co-ordinated development on the other land parcels within the allocation;
- No buildings need to be retained;
- Ground and first floor town centre uses are required on High Road;
- Height limited facing the High Road (except close to Whymark Avenue);
- Secondary shop frontages supported on potential east-west laneways;
- Standard of architecture and urban realm on High Road should be of the highest quality;
- Building lines on High Road should be set back to increase pavement width and circulation space;
- Location of a Crossrail station entrance on High Road will be supported.

6.1.20 In addition, the following development guidelines also apply to SA14;

- Heights of buildings at rear should be sympathetic to residential properties on the east of Bury Road;
- Private open space shall be provided in internal courtyards, balconies and roof gardens;
- Parking should be minimised due to excellent public transport access;
- Victorian shopping parade immediately north of the site should be retained and enhanced;
- Landowners must show how individual piecemeal schemes affect other future developments within the site allocation;
- Potential exists for connection to a decentralised energy network;
- Piccadilly Line runs in a shallow tunnel below this area so Transport for London should be consulted prior to development;
- Contamination studies should take place prior to development;
- Piling statement is required prior to piling taking place;
- Flood risk assessment is required;
- Site is in a groundwater Source Protection Zone;
- Thames Water must be consulted prior to submission of a planning application in respect of wastewater and water supply capacity;
- Proposed uses must contribute positively to the vitality of Wood Green Metropolitan Centre.

6.1.21 The requirements of site allocation WG SA 13 are similar in that it envisages the comprehensive redevelopment of the current buildings for mixed use development consisting of town centre uses at ground and first floor level with residential properties above.

6.1.22 The site specific requirements of WG SA 13 are also similar to SA14 but would differ to that earlier site allocation in the following respects:

- Indicative development capacity of 487 residential units, 4,432sqm of employment uses and 4,432sqm of town centre floor space;
- High Road shall form a primary shopping frontage;
- Mixed residential and commercial floor space is sought above the active (ground floor) frontages. New office floor space will be sought;
- A laneway aligning with Westbeech & Coleraine Roads should be considered;
- One or two laneways shall be created running east-west off High Road, providing secondary shopping frontages at ground floor level, with suitability for evening economy activities;
- Part of this site is safeguarded for the construction of Crossrail 2;

6.1.23 Furthermore, the development guidelines have also evolved as follows:

- Principles of High Road South Character Area should guide development;

- This area within the AAP is less suitable for family housing;
- Development should not affect a protected viewing corridor from Downhills Park to Alexandra Palace;
- A podium fronting onto High Road may be suitable to respect character of terraced properties on eastern side of High Road;
- Materials palette should complement properties to east on High Road as well as Noel Park Conservation Area;
- If net loss of employment floor space occurs then a financial contribution may be required.

6.1.24 The proposed development should address these adopted objectives unless material considerations dictate otherwise. These matters will be assessed in the relevant sections below.

6.1.25 Land Use Principles

6.1.26 The proposed development would replace the existing ground floor retail activities with new commercial space at ground floor and residential properties above.

6.1.27 *Retail and Employment Provision*

6.1.28 The London Plan 2016 states, in Policy 4.8, that a successful, competitive and diverse retail sector which promotes sustainable access to the goods and services that London needs should be supported.

6.1.29 SP10 of the Local Plan 2017 states that within Town Centres the Council will promote retail growth. Policy DM41 of the Site Development Policies DPD states that proposals for new retail uses in Town Centres will be supported where they are consistent with the size, role and function of the centre and its catchment, and where they sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre.

6.1.30 The High Road frontage of the site is within a Primary Frontage and Primary Shopping Area, as designated in the DPD. Whymark Road is not designated as a shopping frontage but the land is designated as part of the Primary Shopping Area.

6.1.31 The existing four storey building provides 6,888sqm of internal floor space in retail use although not all of this is tradeable area, as this would include administrative, staff recess and plant areas and is in a undesirable form for modern retailers. As part of this application the commercial floorspace would reduce marginally to 6,721sqm but be of high quality, modern floorspace.

6.1.32 It is relevant to note that the host building was purpose-built no later than the late 1950s for a department store-style retail business that is no longer operating

from the site. The site is no longer operational above ground floor level with much unused space.

- 6.1.33 It is accepted that current retailers require more flexible floor plates over a single floor. The age and quality of the existing buildings is also a concern for retailers. Analysis of the local market demonstrates that a high quality modern and flexible retail space would likely be attractive to a large number of retailers. The WG AAP refers to large units as being over 550sqm, which could be accommodated within the development. Therefore the scale of the site would allow the opportunity for larger comparison retailers to occupy the site.
- 6.1.34 The applicant investigated the possibility of creating first floor retail use as well, but considered that larger retailers would not be attracted by these secondary spaces. Provision and access to these first floor spaces would also have required a loss of desirable ground floor retail space for the additional core requirements, as well as potential loss of first floor affordable housing.
- 6.1.35 The desirable High Road retail frontage would provide a generous floor to ceiling headroom and the development as a whole would provide a secondary activated frontage in the proposed courtyard. A basement provision has been included under part of the retail use, which would also create additional retail floorspace if required by retailers.
- 6.1.36 The return frontages of the retail uses would create an entrance way to the courtyard and would also be activated through glazed display. The rear of Block D would create an external seating area, to be associated with a potential restaurant use. The WG AAP identifies that seating levels in Wood Green are currently poor and often privately controlled, so this provision within the courtyard would be another positive feature. The seating within the wider courtyard area would also provide public outside seating opportunities.
- 6.1.37 By designing the hotel use along Whymark Avenue the development would also create a more active frontage along this previously inactive part of the site. For the majority of this floorspace the use would be as an ancillary restaurant for the hotel, but not exclusively for hotel guests. The activation of this part of the site and transitional area between the retail frontage to the residential rear of the site is welcomed.
- 6.1.38 It is considered that the contemporary layout, updated facilities and improved street frontage design would provide significant benefits to the appearance of the retail frontage, and has the potential to attract high quality retail occupiers back into the area.
- 6.1.39 Fascia provision and window arrangements are such that the replacement space could be occupied as either large units with multiple windows or smaller subdivision should a large unit prove not to be in demand. The development can

then respond to changes in the retail market. The application form refers to approximately 2650sqm of A1 retail and 2850sqm of A3 use but, given the flexible use proposed, the exact quantum of each would be scrutinised more fully through condition.

- 6.1.40 DPD Policy DM42 refers to the total percentage of a primary shopping frontage not exceeding 35% unless it can be demonstrated that this would significantly enhance the vitality and viability of the centre. The quantum and layout of retail uses would be conditioned to ensure that a suitable level of A1 retail use would be provided and that active frontages would be created, thus ensuring a balance between A1 and A3 uses.
- 6.1.41 As well as the improved ground floor frontage the scheme would also create an additional retail space in the basement. In the broader consideration of the development the scheme would have strategic importance in improving the frontage, thus having a positive impact on vitality and viability of these primary shopping frontages. It is considered that the resultant activities would be suitable for a busy main road and primary shopping frontage location and therefore achieving the regeneration of this part of the High Road.
- 6.1.42 The use of the Whymark Avenue and rear of Bury Road for hotel provision is considered to enliven this corner of the site, whilst providing a transition of uses from the retail frontage and commercial courtyard. The presence of the restaurant at ground floor and hotel's office on the corner will aid this transition between the differing characters of the frontages.
- 6.1.43 The introduction of the hotel would diversify the employment and commercial functions of the site and this part of the Metropolitan centre. Likewise the permeable courtyard would activate the site as a new and desirable frontage. As such, the modernised and flexible floorspace would compensate for the minor reduction in commercial floor space in this part of High Road and would positively impact the viability and vitality of the town centre
- 6.1.44 Site allocations SA14 and WG SA 13 state that either town centre (SA14) or commercial/office (WG SA 13) activities are required above ground floor level. Only residential units are proposed on the upper floors as part of this development.
- 6.1.45 In terms of demand for office space, the submission notes that Wood Green is not currently an established office market and the existing office stock is dominated by local authority and small business spaces. Whilst there is some demand for small office space in the Borough these should be modern flexible office spaces for small and medium businesses provided in mixed-use developments and they should generally have a street presence in the form of dedicated and spacious reception and lobby spaces at ground floor.

6.1.46 In this regard, the provision of B1 uses within the new courtyard frontage is considered a suitable siting for business and work space use. As with the end user of the retail units, the exact business uses within the work space courtyard units and size of these units has not been determined at this stage. The application originally proposed a proportion of community facilities within the work space units, but the broadness of this use class could be problematic. A condition is recommended that would restrict the uses within the D1 use class.

6.1.47 The scale of the units would lend themselves to a variety of business uses and the applicant has stated that these would be completed to shell and core specifications for the end users. Specific details of shell and core fit out would be required via condition and an obligation captured with the S106 legal agreement. This could be from anything from office to light industrial workshops, which all fall within the B1 use class and a modest amount of D1, non-residential institutions. Floor plans for these end users will be required by condition to ensure active frontages are created.

6.1.48 As such, the proposal and its resultant regeneration of retail uses within the area and creation of a vibrant courtyard and laneway is considered to be of an appropriate size, role and function for its location, and would promote, sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Wood Green Town Centre and assist with employment. Therefore, the re-provision of the existing retail and commercial space and business provision in this location is acceptable in principle.

6.1.49 *Residential Use*

6.1.50 London Plan Policy 3.3 recognises there is a pressing need for more homes in London and Policy 3.4 states that housing output should be optimised given local context. The Haringey Heartlands/Wood Green Intensification Area sets a minimum target for new homes of 1,000, with an indicative employment capacity of 2,000 jobs, and these figures are expected to increase as a result of the draft new London Plan.

6.1.51 Policy DM10 of the DPD states that the Council will support proposals for new housing on sites allocated for residential development, including for mixed use schemes.

6.1.52 The site allocation SA14 describes 16-54 High Road as suitable for mixed use development including the provision of housing. The application site forms a part of this allocation. SA14 describes an indicative development capacity for the site allocation as being for 334 residential units and the emerging Wood Green AAP identifies an increase in residential provision of 487 units, reflecting increased housing targets.

6.1.53 In providing 197 residential units this development would contribute proportionally towards the Council's overall housing targets in a sustainable and appropriate location. This is the largest site within the site allocation and provides a suitable density of housing and provision of mixed use activity. As such, it is considered that the provision of residential units on this site is acceptable in principle.

6.1.54 It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in land use terms, subject to consideration of all other elements of the scheme also being acceptable including impact on local character and appearance, impact on neighbouring residents, scheme layout, transport and highways matters, and all other relevant considerations.

6.1.55 *Hotel Use*

6.1.56 Policy DM53 of the DPD refers to hotels being appropriate where located within existing town centres, well served by public transport. As such the siting of the hotel is supported within Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre and an intensification Area, with excellent PTAL of 6b.

6.1.57 The siting of the hotel along the Whymark Road return frontage from High Road is considered an appropriate siting. This frontage is less residential in character, so the active frontage of the restaurant and hotel lobby would create a transition from the commercial High Road frontage to the residential character to the rear.

6.1.58 Planning policy does not dictate the internal living space of a hotel nor the amenity for these occupants, beyond stating that they be of an adequate level. The layout of the hotel has been designed in consultation with an established hotel operator and details are considered to provide higher than adequate standards throughout and 10% of rooms will be wheelchair accessible.

6.1.59 The hotel will have a semi-public front of house, which could be utilised by the public, but primary function would be as a hotel use.

6.1.60 As such, the provision of a 134 room hotel is considered to be a suitable use and a beneficial addition to the site, local employment and wider area.

6.1.61 Masterplanning

6.1.62 DPD Policy DM55 requires applicants to prepare a masterplan where development forms only part of a larger site allocation, in order to demonstrate that the proposal would not prejudice development on nearby sites, including demonstration of an appropriate degree of consultation with neighbouring land owners.

6.1.63 The site is the largest land ownership parcel within of site allocation SA14 and WG SA13 (16-54 High Road). Pre-application discussions on this and the

neighbouring site at no.44-46 High Road (referred to as former M&S site) accepted that the various land owners would mean a comprehensive development of the entire site allocation would be problematic. However, development of the entire site allocation must consider how the entire site could be developed.

- 6.1.64 Officers consider that a varied approach to design, without uniformity between the two main parts of the site allocation, would be acceptable and could add a desirable variation to the street, whilst ensuring a contextual relationship and that the design suitably addresses the frontage.
- 6.1.65 The applicant has provided an indicative masterplan and cumulative townscape and visual impact assessment for the entirety of the site allocation. This masterplan indicates the most significant adjoining site at nos.44-46 High Road (referred to as former M&S site) broadly as per the recently refused application HGY/2018/1472. Although that proposal was refused in part due to the design, the potential for a form of development of that site remains a policy aspiration and any development would not be unduly affected by this proposal. The design of the current application site is considered to be a different approach to that of the refused application.
- 6.1.66 Incorporation of a laneway connecting the High Road frontage and that of Bury Road is a key part of the site allocation and thus, this masterplan. This is a key benefit of the proposed development in this application, which was not incorporated within that of the recent refusal for the M&S site.
- 6.1.67 The separation distance between the podium serving the adjacent block to the M&S site is such that the future development of an improved design on that site could still be fully achievable. Key features such as the established shop fascia and window material palette arrangement would have a contextual relationship with that scheme and any future submission for that site would be required to respect that relationship.
- 6.1.68 The adjoining building (Kaspa's) between the M&S site and the application site, at no.42a, contains a smaller retail building with residential above. This does not form part of either of the applications and could act as a transition between two variable heights and styles between the sites. Should a future application for that smaller site be submitted then this transitional approach would be further encouraged.
- 6.1.69 View 9 of the TVIA shows the cumulative impact of the proposed development and indicative form of the M&S site, as well as the southeast corner of the site (currently three storey retail with restaurant above). No submission has been forthcoming for this corner of the site allocation and future massing of that site has not been submitted, other than showing the existing three storeys. However, any future development of that site would not be stymied by the proposed hotel

or blank flank wall of the High Road corner of the residential use. As such the masterplan is considered satisfactory in this regard.

6.1.70 The site allocations require a number of objectives to be met through the overall development of the indicated land area including, notwithstanding land use objectives referenced previously in this section above, the provision of east-west laneways from High Road to Bury Road and limited building heights directly onto High Road.

6.1.71 The submitted *Design and Access Statement* includes details of a masterplan that demonstrates accordance with these site allocation objectives, including the provision of a laneway and associated secondary frontages. No first floor town centre use has been provided, but the ground floor is a storey and half and has basement facilities, whilst the courtyard would provide a more suitable location for B1 uses than a first floor would provide.

6.1.72 As such, the proposals would not adversely affect or prejudice the long-term strategic aims of the site allocations SA14 and WG SA 13.

6.2 Taller Buildings

6.2.1 London Plan Policy 7.7 is the key London-wide policy for determining tall building applications. The policy requires that tall buildings 'should generally be limited to sites in opportunity areas, areas of intensification or town centres that have good access to public transport'.

6.2.2 Local Plan Policy SP11 requires all new development to 'enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings of high quality'. SP11 states that, in Haringey, tall buildings are considered to be those substantially taller than their neighbours, have a significant impact on the skyline or are greater than ten storeys in height. The context to SP11 states that the core area of Wood Green Town Centre is characterised by buildings of between four and nine storeys.

6.2.3 Policy DM6 of the Site Development Policies DPD identifies the local area (as per Figure 2.2 'Potential Locations Appropriate for Tall Buildings) as being suitable for a tall building.

6.2.4 As such, it is considered that parts of this site would have potential to be an appropriate location for a tall building of over ten storeys. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development would be for a maximum eight storey building on the High Road and therefore is considered to be a structure that is taller than its immediate surroundings, rather than being defined as a 'tall' building.

6.2.5 *Assessment of Siting, Scale and Height of a Taller Building*

- 6.2.6 SP11 of the Local Plan defines this building as a taller, rather than a ‘tall’ building due to it standing below ten storeys in height. However, tall building policies can still form a useful guide for developments of greater height than their immediate surroundings.
- 6.2.7 DM6 states that buildings should represent a landmark that is a way-finder or marker drawing attention to key locations such as areas of high visitation, and should be elegant, well-proportioned and visually interesting from any distance or direction, as well as positively engaging with the street environment. It also states that taller buildings must be justified in urban design terms by being of a high standard architecturally, by having a good relationship with the street including through providing quality public realm, must preserve locally and regionally important views and must also respect local heritage considerations.
- 6.2.8 The emerging Wood Green AAP and Site Allocations DPD both identify the whole of Wood Green as a highly accessible Metropolitan Town Centre and identified growth area suitable for tall buildings. The Site Allocations DPD in particular indicate that a network of tall buildings can potentially be formed in a zone between the four key points of Turnpike Lane and Wood Green underground stations, Wood Green Library and Penstock foot tunnel.
- 6.2.9 It is also noted that the Wood Green-Turnpike Lane axis has the potential to form a ‘strip’ of taller buildings on the eastern side of High Road between the two stations, taking in existing taller buildings such as The Mall. Many existing buildings on that side of High Road are allocated for redevelopment within both the Site Allocations DPD and emerging Wood Green AAP documents.
- 6.2.10 Associated neighbouring site allocations refer to the vision of heights within these sites, with SA13 (Bury Road Car Park) abutting the north-western boundary and SA15 (Land between Westbury & Whymark Avenue) on the other side of Whymark Avenue, to the south. A collective reading of these site allocations represents an envisaged transition of the lower scale three storey Victorian parade of SA13, into this site (SA14) and the siting for a tall building at SA15, which is identified as a suitable site of potential for a tall building. In this regard, the seven storeys and recessed eighth floor of this proposal would help create this transition.
- 6.2.11 Wood Green has been consistently identified and designated in regional and local planning policy as suitable for both intensifying development and the siting of buildings that are generally taller than the existing built form, as described in the sections above.
- 6.2.12 The siting of an eight storey ‘taller’ building in this High Road location would provide a visual indicator of the existing commercial centre. The only places where there is an eighth storey element, it is substantially recessed, reducing the perceived height. The transitions between larger High Road and courtyard blocks

to smaller Bury Road heights and a corner bookmarking on Whymark Road are welcomed.

6.2.13 Furthermore, the existing context is of buildings up to eight storeys in height (such as Page High and The Mall) as these are visible from this part of High Road. The very good and rapidly improving public transport connections provide a future basis for increased height and intensification of activities and built form in this location.

6.2.14 The proposals would replace existing buildings of a poor architectural quality, that are of a low height, even lower than the better 3-4 storey Victorian / Edwardian buildings on the opposite side of High Road. The buildings opposite are not allocated for change, whereas this side of High Road has become viewed as non-efficient use of land given the need for housing and improved town centre opportunities. The proposal represents a step up in scale compared to existing buildings on the site and its immediate vicinity, but this is to be expected on a busy high street, in a site identified as suitable for comprehensive development, in a designated Metropolitan Centre.

6.2.15 As such, it is considered that there is strong and consistent policy support for buildings in this location that rise above the existing three storey street frontage, subject to a respect of the appearance of the existing street frontage, a high quality detailed design, impact on local views, and all other relevant material considerations also being acceptable, as discussed in the sections below.

6.2.16 Townscape

6.2.17 A *Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (TVIA), submitted with the application, has been carried out in order to assess the potential impact of the development on existing townscape character, local heritage and on views towards the site.

6.2.18 Key representative views within the local area have been selected with the advice of Council officers. Heritage impact will be considered in detail later in this report in the relevant section below.

6.2.19 The cumulative impacts of this application in the context of the potential long-term development proposals for Wood Green have also been assessed.

6.2.20 The TVIA identifies High Road as a primary route and Bury Road as a secondary route. The visual and townscape quality of the High Road is noted to be mixed. The application site is noted to contain an 'unexceptional post-war commercial' building that gives the surrounding part of High Road a 'run-down character and appearance'.

6.2.21 That document also states that redevelopment of the application site provides an opportunity to enhance the individual experience of the High Road and surrounding residential streets by establishing a positive presence on the local skyline through the development of a high quality piece of architecture, by providing enhanced public realm to High Road and by improving the appearance and experience of Bury Road, as well as increased permeability between these areas. The TVIA has assessed the development in accordance with these ambitions.

6.2.22 The more residential character of Bury Road would be repaired with this development, replacing the existing service yards and blank facades with an active residential frontage, front gardens and residential front doors. This revived active frontage and passive surveillance to this currently ill-overlooked section of street would be in a sympathetic character and scale similar to that of the Noel Park Estate. This would also block views of the unattractive service elements of the development; the refuse stores, vehicle and bicycle parking, and will vastly improve the character of the street

6.2.23 At the centre of the site, the proposed new “laneway” and new public square provides the fourth streetscape contribution of the development and a new piece of public realm, with the significant public benefits this will bring. The laneway, consisting of the through route from the High Road to the square, the square itself, and the passageway from the square through to Bury Road, would make a significant contribution to improving the interconnectivity and permeability of the local street network to town centre facilities. This would remain open throughout trading hours but would be gated at night for safety reasons.

6.2.24 Furthermore, there are public realm improvements proposed for Bury Road, including the installation of shared surfacing, tree and other planting, and drainage improvements. Financial contributions towards this shall be secured as part of this development proposal, secured by legal agreement. This would improve the appearance of the local environment further.

6.2.25 As such, it is considered that the impact on local townscape is acceptable.

6.2.26 Key Views

6.2.27 Policy DM5 of the Development Management DPD identifies Locally Important Views and Vistas as set out in Figure 2.1 of the DPD. These designated views have been evaluated according to their interest as panoramas, vistas, landmarks and townscapes.

6.2.28 The application site falls within the Mayor’s London View Management Framework Assessment Point 1A (Alexandra Palace) and local Linear View No. 21 (Downhills Park Road to Alexandra Palace).

- 6.2.29 Key views have been assessed in the context of existing local character, the context of the proposed building and also the emerging context of the future development of the site allocations. Views include those from both the north and south on High Road, from Green Lanes, from local residential areas including Noel Park Conservation Area, and from the protected Local View 21 from Downhills Park Road.
- 6.2.30 Fifteen views have been assessed by the TVIA. Images of the development have been provided that show how the proposal would appear in those views. These demonstrate that the proposed development would, where visible, appear as a beneficial and appropriate element within the local townscape. From many of the designated views the impact of the proposed building is assessed by the TVI as being negligible.
- 6.2.31 The development would not feature prominently in long distance views. It is only very partially visible above the rooftops within protected Local View 21 and then only just above the tree line. This would be located outside of the defined viewing field for the Mayor's London View Management Framework Assessment Point 1A (Alexandra Palace).
- 6.2.32 The development would be visible only from limited points within the Noel Park estate. View 13 shows the proposal entirely screened by an existing row of housing and through trees. View 4 shows the perpendicular view from Westbeech Road and the articulated and varied rear elevation of the buildings. The masonry and bronze material of the saw tooth hotel roof would positively reflect the prominent materiality of the existing built form. The stepped outline can also be seen in View 5 from Whymark Road.
- 6.2.33 Views 1, 9, 10 and 12 show the main impact of the development as seen in views of the High Road and into Whymark Avenue. These show a step up in height, with an active frontage and blank side elevations, which would create an acceptable relationship with existing development and allow for future development of the sites in the foreground. The setback upper floor of High Road elevation and Whymark Avenue create a welcomed breaking up of the frontage and continue the gradual stepped up approach. The window reveals in both views also create and articulation of that frontage.
- 6.2.34 The proposals would replace the existing lower buildings with a high quality design and stepped scale that would improve the general appearance and not unduly interrupt views through the site.
- 6.2.35 Therefore, it is considered that the proposed taller building would not have a detrimental impact on the townscape and visual amenity of Wood Green, and would not harm identified local or strategic protected views.

6.3 Housing Provision

6.3.1 Affordable Housing

- 6.3.2 The NPPF states that where it is identified that affordable housing is needed, planning policies should expect this to be provided on site.
- 6.3.3 London Plan Policy 3.12 states that boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes.
- 6.3.4 Local Plan Policy SP2 requires developments of more than 10 units to provide a proportion of affordable housing to meet an overall borough target of 40%, based on habitable rooms, with tenures split at 60:40 for affordable (and social) rent and intermediate housing respectively. This approach is reflected in Policy DM13, which also sets out the preferred affordable housing mix as set out in the Council's Housing Strategy.
- 6.3.5 The Mayor of London's Affordable Housing and Viability (AHV) SPG provides detailed guidance to ensure that existing affordable housing policy is as effective as possible. The SPG includes guidance for all developments not meeting a 35% affordable housing threshold to be assessed for financial viability through the assessment of an appropriate financial appraisal, with early and late stage viability reviews required where appropriate and LBH have adopted this approach in its Section 106 SPD.
- 6.3.6 As the development would be eligible for grant funding the proposed offer has been raised from 35% to 40.13% based on habitable rooms. The affordable housing would be predominantly located within Blocks A and D on the High Road, which would contain sixty-two units, as well a single unit located in each of Blocks C and F, on Bury Road.
- 6.3.7 The breakdown of affordable units would comprise 64% (45 units) Social Rented and 36% (29 units) London Living Rent (LLR) with no option to buy. The Council, rather than a housing association, will have the first option to buy these units.
- 6.3.8 Following negotiation in this planning application, the Social Rented provision has replaced the London Affordable Rent (LAR) originally proposed within the Affordable Housing Assessment, which was submitted in support of the application.
- 6.3.9 The affordable housing negotiation has been undertaken with regard to the borough's Housing strategy and resultant conclusions detailed within Appendix C of this review. Social rented housing should be owned by local authorities or private registered providers, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime.

Social Rented Housing breakdown:

Type of units	No. units	%	Average unit size (sqm)
<i>One Bed</i>	4	9	55
<i>Two Beds</i>	26	58	88
<i>Three Beds</i>	11	33	166
<i>Four Beds</i>	4	9	132
<i>Totals</i>	45	100	

6.3.10 The London Living Rent form of housing proposed has been tailored specifically to the site, as this would be a more localised form of the LLR product, whereby there would be no future purchasing option for occupants. This would always be available for rent and is referred to as Discounted Market Rent, as set out in the housing strategy.

6.3.11 In general terms the LLR is considered to be one of three types of ‘genuinely affordable’ homes funded by the Mayor. This is normally a part-buy part-rent product for those taking their first step onto the property ladder.

6.3.12 The low rental prices will still encourage tenants to save but the lack of buying option will mean that thus ensuring the retention of these units for future low rent opportunity. The homes will be offered on tenancies of a minimum of three years. Tenants will be supported to save and given the option to buy a home elsewhere on a shared ownership basis and given extra priority for other shared ownership homes across London.

6.3.13 London Living Rent Breakdown:

Type of units	No. units	%	Average unit size (sqm)
<i>One Bed</i>	6	21	54
<i>Two Beds</i>	16	58	83
<i>Three Beds</i>	7	24	112
<i>Totals</i>	29	100	

6.3.14 In Noel Park the rent levels in 2018/19 are set as follows:

Unit type	LLR (Bounds Green Ward)	Estimated Annual Household Income Required
<i>One Bed</i>	£190	£35,198
<i>Two Beds</i>	£211	£39,109
<i>Three Beds</i>	£232	£43,019

<i>Four Beds</i>	£253	£46,930
------------------	------	---------

- 6.3.15 The proposed mix of affordable units provides 33% of affordable dwellings as family-sized housing, consisting of three or more bedrooms. The provision of affordable housing would comply with local and regional requirements.
- 6.3.16 Furthermore, the affordable housing proposed is in line with the amended Housing Strategy and Intermediate Housing policy (January 2018) which prioritises social and affordable rents. The Council's Housing team supports the proposed level, tenure and mix of affordable housing at this site.
- 6.3.17 As such, given that a desirable level of affordable housing would be provided, with a high proportion of family-sized units and with all units available in genuinely affordable rental tenures, it is considered that the amount of affordable housing provided for this development complies with housing policy at all levels. Despite the fact that this is eligible for the Mayor's Fast Track route, there will be a trigger for an early stage review secured in the section 106 agreement, as requested in consultation with GLA. This is to be triggered if an agreed level of progress is not made within 2 years of permission being granted, with other requirements as stated for the Fast Track Route as set out in the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.
- 6.3.18 Housing Tenure and Mix
- 6.3.19 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan 2016 states that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford. To this end the policy recommends that: new developments offer a range of housing choices.
- 6.3.20 Policy DM11 requires proposals for new residential development to provide a mix of housing with regard to site circumstances, the need to optimise output and in order to achieve mixed and balanced communities.
- 6.3.21 The emerging Wood Green AAP indicates that high density development in Wood Green is likely to be provided with a high proportion of one and two bedroom units.
- 6.3.22 The overall mix of housing within the proposed development would be 25% 1 bed, 51% 2 bed, 22% 3bed and 2% 4 bed units. There would be no studios.
- 6.3.23 There is a significant proportion of family units provided, especially with the affordable housing provision. The mix is welcomed, especially within this high-density urban setting. This is in part achievable due to the unconventional scissor design of the High Road elevation and duplex design along Bury Road.
- 6.3.24 It is considered that the proposed tenure and mix of housing provided within this development is acceptable.

6.4 Density and Appearance

6.4.1 Density

6.4.2 The application site is considered to be within an 'Central' setting (Metropolitan Town Centre, wide mix of uses, four to six storeys, large building footprints) and has an excellent and improving access to public transport including underground stations and a range of bus routes. The Mayor's density matrix (Table 3.2 of the London Plan 2016) gives the range of 215-405 units/hectare for a development with an average of 3.01 hr/ha, of which the total of 246 units per hectare is well within.

6.4.3 The policy also sets an indicative maximum threshold of 1100 habitable rooms per hectare for residential developments in this type of location. The development has a density of 741 habitable rooms per hectare would be well within the density matrix. The draft new London Plan removes the density matrix and instead indicates a design-led approach to finding a site's optimum density.

6.4.4 The final paragraphs of Policy 3.4 refer to density calculations within mixed use development. No assessment has been submitted by the applicant or GLA regarding the mixed use nature of the proposed site. However, in such vertically mixed use developments it can be appropriate to calculate density by subtracting the non-residential floorspace before calculating density.

6.4.5 The final paragraphs of Policy 3.4 refer to density calculations within mixed use development. A calculation on this basis would give a revised density of 342 units per hectare and 1029 habitable rooms per hectare. In both criteria the development would be within acceptable density ranges, as well as a site with excellent PTAL and design.

6.4.6 Therefore, the proposed density of the development is acceptable.

6.4.7 Detailed Design

6.4.8 The NPPF 2018 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that developments should be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character and history, and maintain a strong sense of place.

6.4.9 DM Policy DM1 states that all new developments must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character of the local area.

6.4.10 *Quality Review Panel (QRP)*

6.4.11 The proposal has twice been assessed by the QRP prior to the application being submitted. The final Chair’s review took place on 9th May 2018 and the Panel’s summarising comments are provided below:

6.4.12 *“The Quality Review Panel is generally supportive of the scheme, and feels that the feedback from the previous review has been very well addressed. It particularly welcomes the changes to internal planning, both at ground floor level and above, and the evolving architectural expression.”*

6.4.13 Below is a summary of key points from the most recent review, with officer comments following:

Panel Comments	Officer Response
Summary	
Panel is generally supportive of proposals, which would provide good quality scheme	Comments noted.
Massing / Development Density	
Previous advice regarding massing reflected in current proposal, with improved articulation and different rooflines.	Noted – proposal no greater than presented at pre-application stage.
Broken up massing of Bury Road and long views from Whymark Road are more convincing.	Noted and shown in the TVIA submission.
General layout	
Internal changes within the scheme welcomed, as is the 41% affordable.	This remains as per the pre-app submission.
Improvements in the circulation spaces, levels of daylight and extra fenestration have overcome concerns of the length of the corridors.	This concern of corridor / number of units per core was raised by GLA as well, but the attenuation and unconventional scissored floors create an appropriate balance of units per floor throughout the core in its entirety.
Agree with design team that the courtyard space should remain open.	There have been ongoing discussions regarding closing off the area after hours for the public spaces. Whilst the level of passive surveillance combined with lighting strategy could justify this remaining

	open there is a concern that the secluded nature of the site could create concerns late at night. As such a well designed and suitable scale gate has been agreed and details of entrance gates (Bury Road and High Road) are conditioned. These will operate only outside of commercial operating hours, so will retain an open feel throughout the day.
Place-making and landscape design	
Duckett's Yard name supported in creating unique sense of place that should be emphasised.	The naming and associated signage of the yard will consider this place making provision.
Interface between the private and affordable housing should encourage social cohesion.	The courtyard would be open to the public and all residents of the development would have access to the large podium garden spaces. This would encourage social cohesion in that regard.
Architectural Expression / Roofline	
General architectural expression of High Road frontage works well. Visual proportions of ground and first floors could present a more resolved façade and emphasising retail use.	These were minor concerns regarding the finer detailing of the façade and have been considered in detail in this application, as well as details submitted following the granting of permission.
Consideration of white band in the elevation in relation to darker fascia could help.	Thicker framing of the commercial fascias and frontage has been incorporated in this design.
Understand the aspirations of the materiality but question the combination of architectural metalwork and bush hammered concrete.	The proposed materials are not bush-hammered concrete, but smooth, pigmented concrete; flat and light coloured in the case of the fins, ribbed, in a curved, sinusoidal profile, in the case of the coloured panels.
Consideration of planters and benches to soften living environment.	These have been provided and full landscaping will be conditioned.

Refinements to Bury Road elevation through varying rhythm and fenestration in lower levels are welcomed. Set back and materiality of top floors are convincing.	Noted and retained in this submission.
Solid brick wall at the rear corner of the hotel building questioned.	Additional glazing has been added, whilst still seen as an appropriate transition between the two street frontages.
Question if ground floor windows abutting road can be attenuated in design.	These are the hotel bedroom windows. Given the use, this is acceptable.
Hotel design is inoffensive but may work as a more exuberant feature.	The zig zag roof is considered to be suitably distinct from the lower block and other roof designs

6.4.14 As set out above, the applicant has sought to engage with the QRP during the pre-application stage, and the development proposal submitted as part of this application has evolved over time to respond to earlier panel advice.

6.4.15 *Scale, Bulk and Massing*

6.4.16 The High Road frontage would have a height of seven floors, with a recessed eighth floor, which would continue into the courtyard blocks. The varying heights of the buildings and reduction towards the rear and sides of the site are welcomed as are the podium gardens and laneway, as a form of relief between buildings.

6.4.17 The TVIA accurately demonstrates that the only viewpoints from which the development would appear significant in scale are those from the High Road itself or from other adjacent or parallel roads in very close proximity to the application site.

6.4.18 The scale and massing of the development would be in line with the aspirations of the emerging WG AAP and Site Allocations DPD - SA14. The similarity in podium design and fascia levels and floor heights between this and development expected for the M&S site would have a suitable contextual relationship, which would have a coherent relationship with the neighbouring site, whilst any future

application on that site would be expected to respect the relationship with the application site.

6.4.19 It should also be noted that the smaller building between the two sites would also act as a transition between these two complimentary designs. Any future submission for this difficult adjoining site would be expected to respond positively to the design proposed in this application.

6.4.20 *Street Scene Impacts*

6.4.21 The development would have three street frontages with each one displaying a different character. The High Road frontage would reinforce the strong retail parade established by Cheapside, the short terraces either side of Dovecote Avenue and the longer terraces on the opposite side of the High Road. This would incorporate a high ceilinged ground floor retail frontage along the High Road with residential maisonettes, set behind large recessed and screened balconies, with a set-back eighth storey. The proposals would also have set-back elements adjacent to the immediately adjacent buildings to create a distinction and transitional relief.

6.4.22 The proposal responds to the distinct character of the Whymark Road return frontage and Bury Road frontages, with suitable design. Both sides of the development would be treated with an appropriate articulation and material finish that respects the street scene and local character.

6.4.23 Comments received from GLA have suggested that the High Road frontage could be reviewed in terms of the integration with the low rise streetscape and to explore solid to void ratios of the upper floors, whilst also accepting that the architectural approach is generally well considered. The design of balcony and the solid surrounds of these have been amended to reduce the requirement for glazed balustrade and to subtly address the solid to void ratio, which is considered to be acceptable.

6.4.24 The design has been reviewed by QRP and officers and the detailed design, with recessed and partially screened balconies, is considered both desirable in design terms and practical and liveable for future residents.

6.4.25 The comments regarding design from the GLA should be considered as suggestions rather than objections and the alterations to the balcony screening of the High Road blocks is considered to have suitably considered these comments. It is important to note that the scale and massing of the building and the transition between the relative heights of the frontage and aspirations for scale and massing in the area are for higher, denser development have been considered as positive elements of the scheme by both QRP and GLA. The minor façade alterations suggested at QRP, including the vertical and horizontal banding have been incorporated.

- 6.4.26 On Bury Road, the street frontage would be repaired by replacing the existing four storey bland frontage with an active residential elevation featuring stepped façade elements on the upper floors, front gardens and front door access, activity and passive surveillance to this part of the street. The lower height of this frontage represents a transition from the taller parts of the development toward the dwellinghouses on Bury Road.
- 6.4.27 The hotel frontage along Whymark Road would be taller and heavily glazed for the public parts of this building, with a glazed corner returning into Bury Road. The bedroom floors are arranged as groups of two floors, with the top two roof-like structure, set back, in contrasting light-weight metal cladding and zig-zag profile. This will have a distinctive form, which would distinguish from surrounding residential and commercial blocks, whilst mediating to some degree between the High Road and residential side streets. The roof would also be partially visible from the adjacent Noel Park conservation area and is considered a suitable design in this regard.
- 6.4.28 It is noted that QRP comments had initially suggested a more radical form of hotel design, but the design has been largely dictated by the requirement of the hotel layout and the requirements of the prospective hotel end user, who have expressed an interest in the site. The design of the roof has been altered to create a saw tooth effect of articulated roof, which is considered to be a positive design and creates enough distinct character without being over imposing in a design style.
- 6.4.29 Comments received from the GLA have referred to the lack of an active frontage in the corner of the Bury Road and Whymark Avenue part of the ground floor. The suggestion that this should be a continuation of the restaurant would be contrary to the requirement of the hotel use and is also considered to be unnecessary on this predominantly residential part of the surrounding area. The large office window for the hotel was added following preapp concerns raised and this is considered to be an attractive transition from the commercial frontages to residential and would be appropriately active in that regard.
- 6.4.30 The proposed "laneway" and new public square provide the fourth streetscape. The improved interconnectivity and permeability of the site between the residential character of Noel Park and the busy commercial character of the High Road. The courtyard would include less retail focussed town centre uses and an open space for public and residents between these two areas, as well as playspace for residents and the wider community to convene. This is reflected in the commercial frontages of the ground floor and hard landscaping layout within. For reasons of safety, the courtyard would be closed off to the general public outside of trading areas for the commercial units. The materials and design of this gate shall be conditioned, as will the hours of use.

6.4.31 Overall the proposed development is considered to have a much improved street design, which will relate positively to each of the corresponding parts of the site.

6.4.32 *Materiality*

6.4.33 There is a variation of high quality materials between the elevational treatments, including materials, fenestration and balcony distribution, which have been determined by a specific response to different contexts. The distinct strategies for the High Road, public courtyard, Whymark Avenue and Bury Road blocks is welcomed. Each elevation is treated with a distinct character in itself, and elements meet the ground or the sky, turn corners and form links that are further distinguished, with distinct bases, tops and links. Functions are also expressed in this way, with a distinct elevational treatment and material palette for retail and commercial units and the hotel.

6.4.34 The varied palette responds to the varied design of immediately surrounding buildings with the brick materials palette and scale of fenestration relating to the domestic context of the Noel Park Estate and the Edwardian terraced houses further down Whymark Avenue and onto the corner of High Road. A distinct window design for the hotel, with a repetition of identical windows, largely glass ground floor base and block scale elevational composition expresses the hotel function and relates more to the scale of a town centre location.

6.4.35 The High Road elevations would create a modern and urban identity, as would be expected for proposal within the remainder of this frontage, as envisaged in the WG AAP. Therefore, contextualism to the existing buildings in this parade is less important than accommodating functions and, as per the comments from the Design Officer, this has been achieved *“elegantly and effectively, and in this, the elevational treatment of this part of the proposal is exemplary.”*

6.4.36 Materials in this frontage would incorporate aluminium vertical fins, precast corrugated concrete panelling, and precast concrete framing of this frontage. The colour of the recessed corrugated concrete element has been provisionally detailed as a subtle green, but exact detailing will be considered as condition. The use of a robust and pigmented concrete will ensure a longevity and favourable appearance over time. Grey metal fascia detailing and metal clad recessed top floor would represent a coherent design approach throughout the building.

6.4.37 The retail frontage is distinct, creating a lofty, highly transparent shopfront base, with a strong frame that clearly provides and distinguishes a signage zone that also acts as a clear separation of retail from residential above, as well as incorporating screening of these recessed balconies. The residential floors clearly express the duplex flat layout, whilst setting accommodation back from the street frontage of recessed balconies, bay windows behind a screen.

6.4.38 Elevationally the design forms a gridded façade, of an urban scale and orderly repetition, containing within the frame more varied domestically scaled elements contained by the frame. These comprise a projecting bay window, with an upper level balcony behind, screened by a "curtain" of aluminium fins, a central panel of pigmented, textured concrete and balancing floor to ceiling windows, with access to the main lower level balcony from both sides. The concrete panel provides warmth and colour to the overall elevation and for residents using their balcony, whilst the screen in front of the bay/upper balcony and the fins that from the sides of the frame provide privacy and a softening of the prominence of the coloured palette.

6.4.39 The use of balconies on both High Road and Bury Road frontages represent a new form within these frontages but the recessed design, suitable screening and material would create desirable and functional space that would complement the existing style. The level of screening and higher ground floor ceiling height ensure that these do not detract from the retail functionality of the high street setting and create an articulation and character to the street frontage.

6.4.40 The courtyard blocks would have more prominent balcony arrangements, whilst continuing the contemporary style of the High Road frontage, with fenestration and detailing more akin to that of the High Road than the more modest and traditional brick palette of the Bury Road frontage. The opening up of this laneway and creation of new frontages results in a new character distinct from either of the abutting roads, which would be a successful design and layout.

6.4.41 *Summary*

6.4.42 The Council's Design Officer has summarised their assessment of the development overall, as follows:

6.4.43 *"This proposal is a well-designed redevelopment of an important part of an allocated site within the Wood Green Metropolitan Centre. The proposals would provide better quality, modern retail units in this important primary frontage and to an architectural design that would repair an important part of the High Road frontage comparable to the high quality Victorian and Edwardian retail parades nearby. Above this it would provide a significant amount of good quality new housing, designed to compliant space and amenity standards, notably including no north or south facing single aspect flats, very high daylight and sunlight levels for a higher density scheme, designed to appear as a sculptural cluster, well set back from street frontages, and despite being a taller building, having no detrimental impact on local views and microclimate. The proposals also include new townhouses fronting Bury Road, providing well designed new family sized affordable housing with private amenity space and reinstating a calm, convivial residential character to this section of this street."*

6.4.44 Whilst adding: *“Finally, these proposals have been masterplanned and engaged in collaborative design with immediate neighbours to ensure it would complement and be coordinated with future developments, as part of improvements to Wood Green as a vibrant town centre that people can live, work and shop in safely, comfortably and amidst architectural delight.”*

6.4.45 Conditions will be included to ensure the finishing materials of the development are of a high quality.

6.4.46 As such, it is considered that the proposed development would be a distinctive building of a high quality design that would have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and therefore it is acceptable in design terms.

6.4.47 *Public Realm*

6.4.48 The site allocations identify a number of public realm improvements that should be provided as part of either this development or through other relevant schemes within the allocation boundaries. These improvements include the provision of laneways running east-west through the allocated site and increased circulation space on High Road.

6.4.49 The proposal would create two recessed shop frontages, separated by a glazed walkway through to the public courtyard and to the residential setting to the rear. The development would also bring positive impacts to surrounding streets through increased residential activity, natural surveillance and street planting onto this part of Bury Road. A public realm improvement scheme for Bury Road is being developed by the Council and the applicant would provide a financial contribution to this scheme secured through legal agreement.

6.4.50 Heritage Impact

6.4.51 *Case Law and Relevant Policy*

6.4.52 The legal position with respect to heritage assets is pursuant to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and as per relevant planning case law, which is set out below.

6.4.53 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case indicates that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise." The Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks District Council case indicates that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a

Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit.

- 6.4.54 When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in *Barnwell*, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted.
- 6.4.55 The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrefutable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.
- 6.4.56 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given 'considerable importance and weight' in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
- 6.4.57 The NPPF states that the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset should be considered in the context of great weight being given to that asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Furthermore, any harm to, or loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
- 6.4.58 Policies 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan 2016 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings are required to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 of the Local Plan 2017 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Policy DM9 of the Development Management DPD reflects this approach.

6.4.59 *Heritage Assessment*

- 6.4.60 The site lies within the vicinity of a number of heritage assets. These include Noel Park Conservation Area, which is situated to the north east of the site: a late Victorian planned housing estate comprising residential streets of terraced houses, a school, community hall and St Mark's Church. The Church and adjacent hall are listed at Grade II.
- 6.4.61 The development would not be visible from most of the conservation area, aside from some views to the south-west above roof line.
- 6.4.62 Turnpike Lane underground station and bus station are Grade II and Locally Listed respectively and located to the south of the site. The Grade II* Listed Gaumont Cinema is located to the north on High Road. The development would be visible in views of and from some of these buildings.
- 6.4.63 Consideration has been given to the potential to impact on the strategic view from Alexandra Palace towards Central London and St Paul's Cathedral, and therefore could potentially impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Palace and Grade I Listed Cathedral. The view of the Palace from Downhills Park Road (Haringey's Locally Significant View 21) could also be affected.
- 6.4.64 The development would have a significant visual impact on both the High Road and Bury Road, which could affect the Victorian houses on Bury Road. The proposed building would be considerably higher than much of the surrounding context and would not be in keeping with the scale of the historic buildings. However, the presence of the additional height is considered acceptable in light of the improved appearance of the site and the wider benefits of the proposal.
- 6.4.65 The Council's Conservation Officer stated the following with regard to the proposed demolition and proposed Bury Road frontage: *"Featureless rear walls and servicing entrances would be replaced by new maisonettes with entrances on the street - a considerable improvement that would restore some of the street's original layout and residential character."*
- 6.4.66 Although this part of Noel Park is not within the conservation area, policy dictates that the setting of this heritage asset is protected and in this regard the improvements are welcomed.
- 6.4.67 The additional height of buildings would be visible within the High Road and Cheapside setting. The existing large buildings on High Road (including Shopping City) and views within the setting are assessed as being negligible, as represented in the TVIA analysis, which show this in the context of these other large buildings.

- 6.4.68 The other historic buildings in the area are located significantly away from the development, and within a mixed streetscape context, so that the proposed building would have a negligible impact on their appearance or setting.
- 6.4.69 To the south-east of the site is Turnpike Lane underground station (Grade II Listed) and bus station (Locally Listed). It is prominently located on an open island site opposite Duckett's Common and is of considerable architectural interest.
- 6.4.70 Comments from the Conservation Officer refer to the visibility of the building in the TVIA views 6 and 7, from Green Lanes and Duckett's Common but states that *"they would be in the background of both views and would not impinge upon the open setting of the station or obscure it from view. The distinctive square towers with Underground signage would still be clearly visible."* Comments also state that the interior of the station would not be effected.
- 6.4.71 The proposed buildings would be within the strategic view corridor from Alexandra Palace to St Paul's Cathedral but would not appear as particularly prominent or out of scale from the wide panoramic view on offer from the Palace. As such, the setting of those heritage assets would not be adversely affected.
- 6.4.72 As such, there is no objection to the development in terms of its impact on local heritage assets.
- 6.4.73 A response from Historic England refers to a mediaeval and post-mediaeval moated manor of Dovecote House / Ducketts, but noted that the development is unlikely to affect buried remains. The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that this is a non-designated asset and the development is considered to outweigh any consideration of this land, as per the adopted site allocation and consideration of that document.

6.5 Residential Quality

6.5.1 Layout

- 6.5.2 The Mayor of London's Housing SPG sets out a range of detailed design requirements for new dwellings in London. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan states that development proposals should make provision for play and informal recreation. Policy 3.8 of the same document states that 90% of units should be 'accessible and adaptable', with 10% 'wheelchair user dwellings' being provided according to Building Regulations Parts M4(2) and (3).
- 6.5.3 Policy DM1 requires developments to provide a high standard of privacy and amenity for its occupiers.

- 6.5.4 All properties would comply with London Plan Minimum floorspace requirements and have been designed with reference to the requirements of the Mayor's Housing SPG. The majority of the SPG policy targets have been met.
- 6.5.5 Single aspect units have been minimised and where they exist they are not due north or south facing. Furthermore, balcony access to these units often creates a partial secondary aspect, thus allowing these to receive good quality daylight. Where partial single aspects are unavoidable, such as within the courtyard blocks, they are for smaller, non-family units. The scissor design of the flats on the High Road frontage have the benefit of generally avoiding single aspect layout through this innovative design.
- 6.5.6 Amenity Space
- 6.5.7 In terms of amenity space provision, all properties have balconies of at least 5sqm but often larger and / or have secondary aspect balconies as well. These therefore meet and exceed Housing SPG requirements. All units within the development would benefit from the use of the public open courtyard, which creates a communal area for the wider community too. In addition, the generous podium level amenity spaces would provide a wide expanse of amenity provision for the affordable units. These areas also have the majority of playspace associated. The properties within Blocks B, C, E and F would have access to smaller amenity areas on higher level gardens, which are directly accessed from the cores within these blocks and located on the fifth and seventh floors.
- 6.5.8 The High Road balconies would be above the height of buses travelling this route and would be suitably recessed and screened so as to avoid loss of privacy. Within the duplex design of these flats there are balconies at lower and higher level, many of which would be on a secondary aspect at the rear.
- 6.5.9 The scissor / duplex form of the flats on the High Road has the benefit of generally avoiding single aspect layout through this innovative design. In the 1b2p units located between first and sixth floor there are partial dual aspect units facing High Road but the recessed balcony creates an additional aspect and the recessed window help mitigate the impact associated with this. Provision of the option of balcony use is considered preferable to not having this option.
- 6.5.10 It is noted that a total of four of the 3 bed duplex flats within Blocks A and D have both their balconies onto the High Road, rather than on both sides, due to the layout of these corners and the provision of smaller personal elevators. It would be preferable for these family units to have access to a rear balcony, but this shortcoming is not a significant quantum in the scheme as a whole, especially given the high number of family units provided. It should also be noted that these units have the option of using a private balcony at first and second floor level and are in close proximity to the podium garden spaces.

6.5.11 The communal and private amenity spaces would all be considered reasonably sunlit as half of each amenity space would receive at least two hours of direct sunlight on 21st March, which meets BRE guidelines for such spaces. Although the podium gardens would be partially overshadowed these shall be suitably landscaped and of a desirable layout to ensure a positive visual amenity.

6.5.12 The indicative landscaping of these spaces is acceptable and further details of the designs would be secured by condition.

6.5.13 Outlook

6.5.14 In terms of outlook and privacy all new units would be separated from existing residential properties to the east and west by at least 18 metres, which is a substantial separation distance for a highly-urbanised location, especially given that these are across communal amenity spaces. Existing residences in Bury Road, Whymark Road and High Road would also predominantly have at least a separation of 18 metres.

6.5.15 Secondary balconies in the proposed courtyard have been omitted where they would have caused overlooking between these blocks (B and E) and the rear of the High Road and Bury Road blocks (A and D), in part in response to GLA comments. Additional screening has also been proposed and the solid to screened ratio of the balconies has been amended to preserve privacy between these spaces and residential windows and users of the courtyard. There is not considered significant overlooking between balconies or windows.

6.5.16 This separation and the greater height of the proposed building compared to nearby residential properties means that the new units on the outer faces would benefit from acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight.

6.5.17 Daylight and Sunlight

6.5.18 Daylight and sunlight levels to the proposed residential accommodation generally meet the BRE standard. In particular, 501 of 597 rooms (84%) would receive daylight of or over the BRE Guide recommended levels. Overall, 10 of 39 living rooms (25%) fail to meet the BRE sunlight standard, but 9 of those fall only marginally below the total standard (common in town centre and higher density schemes) and meet the winter target. The provision of balconies to provide overall improved living standards does partially restrict light to these rooms, which partially explains these modest shortfalls. The shortfall resultant from the balconies does in turn represent a desirable feature for these flats and allows residents of the affected flats to have access to external amenity space receiving good levels of sunlight.

6.5.19 It is noteworthy that this is a high density, centrally located development, so is considered to be relatively high in overall levels, which generally meet the BRE

standard. The BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should be reasonably applied to more urban locations, as acknowledged in the Mayor of London's Housing SPG. In particular, the 27% VSC recommended guideline is based on a low density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, whilst VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable. Paragraph 23.29 of the GLA Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city.

6.5.20 As such it is generally accepted that full or near full compliance with the BRE Guide is not to be expected. Regardless of these caveats, the proposal, even when the cumulative effect of those with the neighbouring M&S site are taken into account, does achieve near full compliance with the BRE Guide, thus would achieve a high quality of day and sunlight access.

6.5.21 Air Quality and Pollution

6.5.22 There are a number of measures included within the proposed building that are designed to minimise potential exposure of future occupants to air pollution, including providing predominantly two balconies to units on High Road where air quality is lowest quality and by limiting window openings. In the few instances where these double balconies / dual aspects are not provided they are at second floor or above and are for smaller units. Properties with balconies onto High Road would have alternative access to the communal courtyard and gardens should they not wish to use the private balcony at any time.

6.5.23 It is also noted that windows and doors would open onto a recessed area rather than flush to a front elevation, thus providing improved likelihood of openable windows on this street frontage.

6.5.24 In addition, excessive noise disturbance to occupiers of the proposed flats would be unlikely to occur, as confirmed by the Council's Noise Specialist, subject to conditions controlling the quality of glazing and insulation between floors. Noise from the courtyard and hours of operation of the commercial elements of the site would be controlled through condition.

6.5.25 The Council's Licensing Team have referred to the hours of operation of the neighbouring site at nos.16-20 (Tarshish restaurant) and advised on similar hours of operation. This would encourage the ideal of improved night time economy, whilst protecting residential amenity.

6.5.26 Lighting

6.5.27 A draft Lighting Strategy is included within the submission, which would ensure the internal courtyard, new public realm and shared garden areas would be suitably illuminated and this shall be controlled by condition.

6.5.28 Internal Access

6.5.29 Standard 12 of the Mayor's Housing SPG outlines that each residential core should have no more than 8 units on each floor. The proposed units in Block A and D would have a shortfall in this regard and this has been raised as an issue in GLA response. In Block D there would be up to 13 flats but in Block A this would be only one unit over, with 9 units per floor.

6.5.30 The two blocks in question have the distinct scissor design, to allow for dual aspects and to minimise the impacts of the High Road frontage. The reason for the number of cores is due to the duplex design and layout of these units, which results in residential entrances on alternate floors only (1st, 3rd and 5th floors) rather than on each individual floor. Although the number of units per core is higher than Mayor's guidance outlines, the design does have significant other benefits for improving liveability of these flats.

6.5.31 Both of these blocks would be served by a centrally located stairwell and two lifts. The siting of these entrance points would mean that no resident would be required to travel the entire length of the corridor to access their flat. The halls in Block D would be longer but have had a window inserted into the end of each floor to further mitigate the size and number of units served by the corridor.

6.5.32 The issue of units per floor was raised at pre-app and a study of alternate core configurations indicated that it would have led to significant loss of residential floorspace, altered tenure mix, loss of ground floor retail floorspace and irregular retail layouts, contrary to the aims of the large floor plate requirement. The additional daylight from the openings at the end of the block will further mitigate concerns regarding these corridors.

6.5.33 Secure by Design consultees have raised no concerns regarding the length of corridor nor number of units within these cores. Daylight is available to the corridor through the communal staircase void and glazed access doors, bringing further amenity benefits to the overall residential circulation. Fob access and suitable lighting of these corridors would further ensure safety and security of residents.

6.5.34 Officers and QRP comments reflect that although the recommended 8 units per core would be exceeded, the unique layout, exceptional design and merits of the layout would, on balance, make these longer than ideal corridors acceptable in this instance.

6.5.35 Child Play Space

6.5.36 London Plan Policy 3.6 and draft London Plan Policy S4 consider the requirements for child play space provision and expand on the Mayor's Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012).

6.5.37 Current policy and the GLA calculator for playspace (2012) require a total playspace of 810sqm, as detailed below.

	Studio	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	Total
Social rented/affordabl	0	4	26	11	4	0	45
Intermediate	0	6	16	7	0	0	29
Market	0	39	59	25	0	0	123
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Proportion of children		
	Number of children	%
Under 5	37	46%
5 to 11	27	33%
12+	17	21%
Total	81	100%

6.5.38 It is noted that a new version of GLA calculator for playspace has been created (however greater weight is given to the adopted calculator above), which considers density of the development and classifies intermediate housing within market for the purposes of playspace. On that basis, the site would provide a total child yield of 95 children and a total playspace requirement of 946.1sqm. The breakdown of total number of anticipated residents and their age groupings is given below:

	Market	Social	Total
0-3	13.5	20.8	34.2
4-10	13.2	22.3	35.5
11-15	3.7	13.8	17.5
16-17	1.6	5.8	7.4
18-64	275.9	78.2	354.0
65+	6.6	1.8	8.4
Total Yield	314.5	142.6	457.0

Total Children	95
----------------	----

	Benchmark	Total play space
GLA benchmark	10	946.1 m ²
Alternative local benchmark	0	0.0 m ²

6.5.39 Haringey's Planning Obligations SPD refers to all Major applications having a provision for on-site child play space and that where this cannot be accommodated solely within the site there should be an off-site provision for sites within 200m of the development site.

6.5.40 In both scenarios, there is a shortfall of on-site child playspace provision. Although full on-site playspace provision may be suitable in those developments classified as 'large' (over 500 units), it is accepted that in smaller, town centre schemes provision off-site may be more appropriate. This site is well below the Mayor's definition of a large site in playspace terms and as such a generous provision of play space on-site and some off-site contribution is considered to be a reasonable approach in this instance and the approach is recognised in guidance.

6.5.41 The scheme would provide a total of 630sqm of playspace provision, largely located within the courtyard and the two podium garden areas, as well as 19sqm in the upper level amenity spaces. As the upper levels are not available to 40% of the residents, the pro rata figure for that is 11.7sqm. As such, this would have a shortfall of 168.3sqm on the 2012 calculator and 304.4sqm in the updated (Unadopted) calculator.

6.5.42 The courtyard would provide a series of sculpted play spaces and raised platforms, which would largely be considered as doorstep provision for under 5s, although could be enjoyed through all age ranges. This is a shared space for residents from all blocks to convene as well as mixing with the wider community.

6.5.43 The podium gardens would allow for less supervised play areas, sand pits, timber stepping stones and astroturf, aimed more at the 5-11 age range. These play spaces would largely be set away from the residential units to minimise disturbance. Landscaping strips would also create a buffer in this regard.

6.5.44 Provision of play equipment for older children is not the focus of the onsite provision, as these age ranges can be more independent and require less supervision. The proximity to the multi-use sports equipment in Ducketts Common in particular is in close proximity to the site and would not exceed 200m

distance, which would be well within the 800m maximum walking distance outlined in GLA guidance.

6.5.45 The off-site provision would need to mitigate 168.3sqm (or 304.4sqm depending on which calculator is used), which would equate to a requirement for financial contribution of £15,988.5. Given the amended figure that has arisen from the new calculator, the applicant has agreed to the revised figure of £28,918. This will be secured via S106 legal agreement.

6.5.46 Overall, the proposals are capable of delivering high quality private amenity space and play space providing children with access to good quality, well designed, secure and stimulating play and informal recreation space.

6.5.47 Accessibility

6.5.48 Twenty flats would be wheelchair accessible or adaptable in accordance with part M4(3) of the Building Regulations, which is more than the 10% required. Five of these are family-sized units, fourteen are 2-bed and one is a 1-bed. Of these units eight (40%) would be affordable units.

6.5.49 Each core has two lifts so a back-up is available if one breaks down. Mobility scooter parking space is available within the cycle store. Entrances and their lobbies would be a generous size and wide enough for wheelchair access,

6.5.50 Security

6.5.51 The development would increase natural surveillance onto local streets, particularly Bury Road, and would provide active frontages on both sides.

6.5.52 Access to the building, private and communal area would be through the appropriate provision of key fobs. Building entrances would be well-lit at night and video entry systems would be provided. Letter boxes are located internally.

6.5.53 The Metropolitan Police is satisfied that the development would be able to gain Secured by Design accreditation, subject to conditions.

6.5.54 The provision of active frontages and commercial activity, in conjunction with balconies and numerous windows in the upper floors, would provide excellent passive surveillance of the public courtyard.

6.5.55 The wide entrances to the courtyard from High Road and Bury Road would be visible through the glazed frontages of the ground floor commercial units on High Road and residential and workspace windows adjacent to Bury Road.

6.5.56 Whilst it has been a design preference to leave these accesses open, there is a concern regarding the late night safety of these areas and potential for anti-social

behaviour. Accordingly, a gated access, to be closed outside of the operation of the commercial units, shall be required via condition.

6.5.57 As such, the residential quality and future safety and security of residents with the proposed development is considered acceptable.

6.6 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

6.6.1 London Plan Policy 7.6 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. DM Policy DM1 continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours.

6.6.2 The Mayor's Housing SPG indicates that BRE guidelines on assessing daylight and sunlight should be applied sensitively to higher density development particularly in central and urban settings, recognising the London Plan's strategic approach to optimise housing output and the need to accommodate additional housing supply in locations with good accessibility, as outlined in Policies 3.3 and 3.4 of that document.

6.6.3 The SPG also states that quantitative standards on daylight and sunlight should not be applied rigidly within built up urban areas, without carefully considering the location, context and standards experienced in broadly comparable housing typologies in London, particularly as the BRE guidelines were developed with low density suburban patterns of development in mind.

6.6.4 The applicant has submitted a *Daylight and Sunlight Report* in support of the application, which is analysed and referred to in the paragraphs below. The report analysed properties on the other side of the High Road, Whymark Avenue, Westbeech Road and Bury Road. All other properties are considered to be located sited sufficiently far away from the site so that no significant negative impact from loss of day or sunlight would be possible as the result of this proposed development. This report is assessed against the following criteria.

6.6.5 There are three detailed methods for calculating daylight, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), the No-Sky Line Contour (NSC) and the Average Daylight Factor (ADF). For sunlight the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) method is detailed. The VSC method calculates the amount of visible sky available to each window or to points on the façade of a building where windows have not yet been designed.

6.6.6 The guidelines suggest that, post-development, properties should enjoy at least 27% VSC or that VSC is reduced to no less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. loss is greater than 20%).

- 6.6.7 The NSL method describes the distribution of daylight within rooms by calculating the area of the 'working plane' which can receive a direct view of the sky and hence 'sky light'. The working plane height is set at 850mm above floor level within a residential property. The BRE does not state a required amount of no-sky line but merely suggests a recommended reduction within which changes are not considered noticeable, generally considered to be at 0.8 times its former value.
- 6.6.8 The ADF seeks to measure daylight within a room and accounts for factors such as number and size of windows, as well as transmittance off walls floor and ceiling. The measurement is taken from the level of light hitting the window and then the light accessing the room. BRE guidelines for these values are 1% for a bedroom, 1.5% for a living room and 2.0% for a kitchen.
- 6.6.9 For sunlight the APSH test calculates the percentage of statistically probable hours of sunlight received by each window in both the summer and winter months. March 21st through to September 21st is considered to be the summer period while September 21st to March 21st is considered the winter period. For properties neighbouring a development only those windows orientated within 90-degree of due south and which overlook the site of the proposal are relevant for assessment.
- 6.6.10 The guidelines suggest that windows should receive at least 25% total APSH with 5% of this total being enjoyed in the winter months. The guidelines also allow for a 20% reduction in sunlighting when compared to the former value with total reductions of less than 4% APSH not being considered noticeable.
- 6.6.11 In respect of overshadowing impacts to amenity space, such as neighbouring gardens, the BRE guidelines set out a sunlight amenity assessment to ensure the space remains adequately sunlit throughout the year. This is achieved by plotting a contour of the area which receives at least 2 hours of direct sunlight on the 21st March. An amenity space with at least 2 hours of sunlight across at least 50% of its area, or if the area retains 0.8 times or greater its former value, can be said to see acceptable levels of sunlight.
- 6.6.12 Daylight Impact
- 6.6.13 The report refers to the impact on certain windows in Bury Road as suffering a reduction below the 0.8 (20%) recommendation, but confirms that this would be limited to 20-30%. This has been rationalised in examples of other similar urban growth and opportunity areas in London as being a minor impact. Only one ground floor window is between 18-21% ranges, with upper floors being higher, which would represent a good level of VSC.
- 6.6.14 The building immediately to the south of the site at York House, Whymark Road would experience acceptable VSC for almost half the windows. Of the 12/20

outside the range, there would be losses between 25-30% but these would be windows that retain values of between 19-26%, and thus considered an acceptable range in a growth and opportunity area, where higher density is encouraged.

6.6.15 Similar assessment can be applied to the impact on Whymark House but 22 windows would not meet the target although would retain reasonable levels. The BRE guidance makes reference to VSC reductions being unavoidable if projecting wings have windows on the side. As such the modest reduction above the standard levels is acceptable, especially in this setting.

6.6.16 The existing VSC levels for the High Road are uncharacteristically high and the relative change of levels to these windows is considered to be acceptable, as is the NSL assessment.

6.6.17 The windows in no.42a (Kaspa's) were raised as a point of contention in preapp discussions, where windows were unlawfully installed but have become immune from enforcement procedures through the passage of time. A legal Deed of Release has been signed between the relevant parties for the removal of these windows and these are therefore excluded from assessment.

6.6.18 As such, it is considered that neighbouring properties would not be adversely affected in terms of a loss of daylight.

6.6.19 Sunlight Impact

6.6.20 There is a very high level of compliance with only a small number modestly below BRE guidance. A single room that would not comply is on Whymark Avenue and is only marginally beyond the range. Likewise, the two rooms referred to on Bury Road.

6.6.21 All other windows would comply with BRE criteria for annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) and found to be accordance with these guidelines.

6.6.22 Therefore, it is considered that the proposed impact on the access to sunlight for neighbouring properties would be acceptable.

6.6.23 Overshadowing

6.6.24 Few private amenity spaces are located close to this site due to the commercial nature of High Road. Properties on Bury Road may experience some loss of direct sunlight to their amenity spaces during late periods of the day but this impact would not be a significant loss.

6.6.25 Therefore, it is considered that the degree of overshadowing of neighbouring amenity spaces would be acceptable.

6.6.26 Outlook and Privacy

6.6.27 The proposed development would be predominantly located at least 18 metres from the proposed development.

6.6.28 The most sensitive relationship would be to no.87 Bury Road, as this corner property projects beyond the predominant terrace of which it is a part. This would still have a separation of 16.5m to the inset balconies of the units within Block C and separated by a road, thus avoiding significant overlooking.

6.6.29 On the other side of High Road there would be at least 20 metres separation and at least 18m on the hotel fronting Whymark Road. High Road would be separated by approximately 20 metres.

6.6.30 Therefore, it is considered that nearby residential properties would not be significantly affected by the proposal in terms of loss of outlook or privacy.

6.6.31 The north-western elevation of Block E has a separation of 18 metres to the side boundary, which would allow for sympathetic development of the neighbouring M&S site.

6.6.32 Noise, Light, Dust and Air Quality

6.6.33 London Plan Policy 7.14 states that developments should address local problems of air quality. Policy 7.15 of the same document requires proposals to avoid significant adverse noise impacts.

6.6.34 Policy DM23 states that developments should not have a detrimental impact on air quality, noise or light pollution.

6.6.35 An *Air Quality Impact Assessment* has been submitted with this application that concludes the number of vehicle movements in the area would not be substantially increased as the result of this development, due to the adoption of a range of sustainable transport initiatives and restrained car parking provision.

6.6.36 The Assessment indicated that negligible air quality impacts are anticipated. In order to help minimise emissions from vehicles both active and passive electric vehicle charging points must be installed to the off-street parking spaces. This would be secured through the legal agreement to any grant of planning permission.

6.6.37 Subsequent comments have confirmed that there is a preference for side windows and balcony openings into the recessed opening rather than directly onto the road in ensuring preferable air quality levels and those levels would

likely improve the higher up the flats are. Likewise that the screening through the recessed balconies and aluminium fins would aid in this regard.

6.6.38 Whilst balconies are encouraged away from the most polluted / noise sensitive elevations, the mitigation and dual aspect nature of these balconies is considered to be a mitigating circumstance in this instance. The majority of flats with balconies to the High Road also have a rear balcony and therefore have a choice of which to use. As such, this is considered to be an advantage of the dual aspect nature of these apartments.

6.6.39 Plant machinery will be located at the basement and details of centralised energy centre will be secured via condition.

6.6.40 It is considered that the increase in noise from occupants and light from internal rooms that would occur from this proposed development would not be significant in the context of this densely populated urban area with a busy commercial centre.

6.6.41 Comments from the Licensing Team have confirmed hours of use for the Tarshish use adjacent to the south eastern corner of the site. These allow for operation until 01:00 and 02:00 at the weekends. Similar hours of operation are suggested for the restaurant use within the hotel and for any restaurant within the courtyard. The courtyard seating area will be further restricted to avoid undue disturbance. The hours of use for the uses will be conditioned.

6.6.42 The use of the workshop units has been variously described as B1(a), B1(b) and D2, but the application form is for B1(a). The use of these units would be restricted to B1 and selected D1 uses (clinics, health centres, and non-residential education and training centres) and the floor plate and layout for these is recommended as condition, to ensure that they are suitable for these uses.

6.6.43 Any disturbances that may arise from dust and noise relating to demolition and construction works would be temporary nuisances that are typically controlled by non-planning legislation. Nevertheless, the demolition and construction methodology for the development would be controlled by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission.

6.6.44 Therefore, it is considered that the proposed impact on neighbouring properties from noise, light and dust pollution would be acceptable.

6.7 Transport and Parking

6.7.1 Local Plan Policy SP7 states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking

to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This approach is continued in DM Policies DM31 and DM32.

- 6.7.2 London Plan Policy 6.13 states that new development should demonstrate a balance between providing parking and preventing excessive amounts that would undermine cycling, walking and public transport use. It also states that electric vehicle charging points, disabled parking spaces, cycle parking should be provided at appropriate levels.
- 6.7.3 A major restriction on the site is that it is partially within a designated safeguarded area of surface interest for Crossrail 2. Therefore the development would be contrary to the safeguarding direction unless a suitable condition / legal agreement wording can be agreed. Such wording is included.
- 6.7.4 Aside from the safeguarded designation, the site has a very high public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a. There are thirteen bus routes and two underground stations within a short walk of the application site.
- 6.7.5 The site is located within the Wood Green Inner Zone controlled parking zone (CPZ), which restricts parking from Monday to Sunday, between 8am and 10pm.
- 6.7.6 The Council's Transportation team have considered the potential parking and highway impact of this proposal in detail. Their comments are referenced in the assessment below.
- 6.7.7 Car Parking and Highway Impact
- 6.7.8 Fourteen wheelchair-accessible car parking spaces would be provided at ground floor level within a secure parking area. Eleven of these would be dedicated for residential use and three for the hotel. These would be accessed from Bury Road.
- 6.7.9 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan requires that 19 wheelchair user dwellings are provided within a development of 197 residential units. 10% wheelchair adaptable dwellings would be provided which meets the requirements of this policy. Policy T6 of the emerging new London Plan indicates that car-free is the starting point for all developments which are (or will be) well-connected.
- 6.7.10 The Mayor of London's Housing SPG standards states that all designated wheelchair accessible units should have a car parking space. If all wheelchair adaptable dwellings are occupied by disabled occupants the policy requirement for accessible car parking spaces would be thirteen.
- 6.7.11 However, it is accepted that not all wheelchair adaptable units would usually be occupied by disabled occupants at any one time and therefore the demand for accessible parking spaces is likely to vary over time. The provision of the

required ground floor retail and workspace provision, detailed within the accompanying transport assessment, are constraints to the proposed parking provision.

- 6.7.12 In addition, it is understood that demand for accessible parking spaces is likely to be significantly lower than usual for a development largely consisting of new flats within a highly urbanised location with very good public transport access. Therefore, it is accepted that not all wheelchair adaptable dwellings would require a car parking spaces at all times. As such, a provision of 11 residential car parking spaces is acceptable, with an obligation for a Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) to respond to requirement.
- 6.7.13 Three additional wheelchair-accessible car parking spaces would be provided on-street as part of the public realm improvements proposed to Bury Road. These would be secured through legal agreement. They would not be privately allocated to the future occupiers of this proposed development, but would be accessible by any eligible 'blue badge' holders, potentially including future residents.
- 6.7.14 Other than for occupants with disabilities, the proposed development would be 'car-free', where no parking spaces are provided off-street and access to on-street parking is restricted by limiting access to parking permits for future occupiers (but not for occupants of the wheelchair accessible units). This approach is considered acceptable in this highly accessible location. The arrangement would be supported via a range of sustainable transport methodologies secured through legal agreement including a residential travel plan and car club membership provision, amongst other measures.
- 6.7.15 As the scheme is car free the applicant must contribute £4,000 towards amending the traffic management order to prevent applicant's applying for car parking permits. This would be secured by condition.
- 6.7.16 TfL have requested an additional disabled accessible parking bay for the workspace and retail units. These will not be specifically designated but can be considered in the finalised designation of spaces within the management plan.
- 6.7.17 A request for the pay and display residential bay to be a taxi drop off point has been made from TfL but Transportation officers consider this to be unnecessary. Sufficient dropping off and picking up space is provided. The predicted taxi trip generation does not warrant a dedicated taxi bay.
- 6.7.18 There are some roads to the south and east of the site which are subjected to lesser parking controls hours than the Wood Green Inner Controlled Parking Zone and may suffer from some residual car parking pressures, to that end we will be request that the developer contributes a sum of £15,000 (fifteen thousand

pounds) towards the design and consultation on parking control measure in these locations.

6.7.19 Due to the car-free nature of this development it is anticipated that overall vehicle movements from the development would not be significantly different in comparison to the existing situation. The transport survey outlines a modest potential net increase, but this would be outside of peak traffic periods and of an acceptable level.

6.7.20 Electric vehicle parking would be provided with a minimum of 20% active and 20% passive spaces provided. Effective management of the parking arrangements is required through a detailed car parking management plan that is to be secured by legal agreement in advance of the first occupation of the proposed development.

6.7.21 The development is close to three local cycle routes (nos. 54, 79 and 56). The Council's aspiration is to improve the cycle environment in Wood Green, in support of the anticipated intensification of Wood Green, as set out in the Wood Green Area Action Plan. Improve cycle and pedestrian routes and linkages within the Wood Green area is a key transport priority.

6.7.22 The Council is seeking to develop a shared surface scheme for Bury Road, in line with its objectives to enhance the public realm and provide improve pedestrian routes and cycle route linkages through Wood Green.

6.7.23 Improvements to the management of traffic on Bury Road is required as this street is anticipated to become a fully residential street over time rather than its current character as a partial service road. In addition to the provision of disabled parking bays as referenced above these amendments would be secured by legal agreement.

6.7.24 The provision of two new vehicle accesses from Bury Road would be acceptable.

6.7.25 Cycle Parking

6.7.26 The proposal includes a total of 350 long stay and 38 short stay visitor cycle parking spaces. The 38 short stay spaces would consist of Sheffield cycle stands located in the proposed courtyard. Parking for the residential units would be predominantly located in the ground floor and basement levels of the cores. Smaller cycle parking provision would be created on upper floors. The retail parking provision is anticipated to be within the back of house areas. The provision for the hotel is at the rear of that site. 5% of the total spaces are proposed to accommodate larger cycles.

6.7.27 The proposed cycle parking provision is above the minimum requirements as described in the London Plan. It is noted that TfL have requested an uplift of

cycle parking provision based on the draft London Plan. There is scope for additional cycle parking within the site and reconfiguration of these stores as well as within the car park areas and on public realm. The draft London Plan does not have the same requirement for accommodating larger cycles and a layout plan for cycle parking, which can allow for more spaces or provision for accommodating larger bicycles as required.

6.7.28 The locations of the proposed cycle parking spaces are shown but further information is required relating to the design and exact location of the cycle parking spaces, in addition to information on how some of the spaces would be accessed. This information shall be provided by condition.

6.7.29 Servicing and Construction

6.7.30 All domestic refuse collections will be from Bury Road, as per the existing arrangement. This would be from a proposed loading bay or within existing parking restrictions. The parking bay is to be agreed via the public realm improvement works. The management company will be responsible for bringing bins for kerbside collection and details of how this arrangement will be operated shall be contained within the Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP).

6.7.31 The Council's Cleansing team has assessed the proposed waste collection arrangements in detail and raised no objections since the refuse store is of an appropriate size and located close to the street. This will be controlled by the management company and is deemed to be acceptable subject to details of this arrangement.

6.7.32 Deliveries to the commercial elements of the site would be principally from the existing High Road bays, as is the case with many of the retailers on the High Road. Changes were made to the High Road in its recent improvement scheme to accommodate additional loading. The capacity of these loading bays has been detailed in a loading bay survey and have ample capacity for the additional use. Further details are required in respect of proposed timings, number and length of service visits. All deliveries and other servicing should avoid the morning peak times. These matters will be secured by condition within the DSP.

6.7.33 Exact details of the construction methodology for this development are yet to be agreed. High Road must not be blocked during works and works vehicles should follow existing on-street parking restrictions. This will be secured by condition as part of a construction management plan in the event of an approval. The financial contribution towards the monitoring of the plan will also be required.

6.7.34 Transport for London (TfL) broadly concur with the opinions of the Council's Transportation team and also request similar conditions relating to cycle parking, a delivery and servicing plan and construction management.

6.7.35 TfL and GLA response have suggested an additional condition requiring a pedestrian comfort zone assessment. However, LBH Transportation officers have responded in stating that the development will not materially affect pedestrian comfort on the High Road. The improvements to Bury Road will also attract some pedestrians from High Road, which will in turn benefit these pedestrians. As such, no comfort zone assessment is required.

6.7.36 Public Transport Infrastructure

6.7.37 London Underground do not object to this development in principle beyond the Crossrail Safeguarding reference in the S106. Further information will also need to be provided in respect of potential impacts on their tunnels and other infrastructure. This shall be secured by condition.

6.7.38 As such, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of parking provision, its impact on the local highway and its impact on other transport infrastructure.

6.8 Sustainability

6.8.1 Carbon Reduction and Overheating

6.8.2 The NPPF, Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 of the London Plan, and Local Plan Policy SP4 set out the approach to climate change and require developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design.

6.8.3 The applicant has submitted an *Energy and Sustainability Assessment* in support of this application. This shows that the development would be lean in terms of passive carbon reduction methods.

6.8.4 *Be lean*

6.8.5 The development would provide on-site carbon reduction through energy efficiency measures such as triple glazing and high quality building insulation and the installation of solar photovoltaic panels. As such, the scheme would meet the required 37.7% carbon saving target against 2013 Building Regulations (with 2016 amendments).

6.8.6 The commercial elements of the development would achieve a 'very good' rating against BREEAM Non-Domestic New Construction (2014). This would also be secured by condition and it should be noted that the site is already registered with BREEAM 2018.

6.8.7 The demand for cooling and the overheating risk will be minimised through purge ventilation, a window g-value of 0.4 and MVHR units.

6.8.8 There is a risk of overheating on this development due to its location close to a busy main road, which may limit its potential for passive cooling through window ventilation. The use of aluminium fins and recessed openings will be beneficial in this regard. It is noted that modelling has been undertaken on the courtyard block and further assurance of future proofing and modelling of High Road blocks will be required. GLA comments refer to compliance in overheating being achieved through the introduction of blinds in the base build. Details of blinds to be included are recommended by condition.

6.8.9 Additional information has been submitted to support the methods for reducing overheating in future, but the applicant must submit a further overheating study to assess this issue and the concerns raised regarding the future modelling. These have since been clarified and the provision of a suitable futureproofing model will be assessed by condition, with mitigation measures, such as use of mechanical ventilation, installed at a later date if required.

6.8.10 *Be Clean*

6.8.11 The scale of the site, at less than 500 units, raised concern regarding the potential to connect to CHP on-site and potential cost implications for the end user, so the applicant was advised to consider the feasibility of combining energy with the neighbouring sites. However, it has since been acknowledged that this would not be feasible, given the likely timeframes for implementation.

6.8.12 Given the issues of combining a larger CHP unit between this and the neighbouring schemes, it is recommend that the proposed heating system must meet the Heat Trust scheme requirements or those of an equivalent industry approved customer protection scheme. This shall also be secured by condition.

6.8.13 In this instance CHP will be acceptable due to the hotel complex which will require hot water throughout the day. The site network will be conditioned to show the operating parameters of the network, and how at a future date it could be connected into the wider Wood Green District Energy Network. This wider network will deliver further efficiencies and carbon reduction. This site wide network will deliver a further 30% reduction in carbon. The application will be conditioned to secure connection to the DEN should it come forward before the energy centre is fitted out in the development.

6.8.14 *Be Green*

6.8.15 An on-site reduction of 93 tonnes of CO₂ per year in regulated emissions compared to a 2013 Building Regulations will result in a compliant development for the domestic buildings, equivalent to an overall saving of 38%.

6.8.16 A range of renewables have been considered and heat pumps and PV Solar panels have been included in the development. Additional PV use is required on-

site and this strategy will set out how the development will maximise opportunities for renewable energy generation and work towards the delivery of the policy requirement of a minimum of 20% carbon reduction through the use of renewable technologies on site. A condition to this affect is recommended.

6.8.17 The remaining carbon for this development must therefore be offset by way of a financial contribution, which for this proposal is estimated to be around £276,372. This would be secured by legal agreement.

6.8.18 The Council's Carbon Reduction Officer is content with the measures secured as part of this development, subject to conditions and legal agreement requirements as described above.

6.8.19 Electric vehicle charging would be provided to support this 'car-free' development, as described in the Transport section above. These shall be installed in line with the 20% initial installation and 20% passive provision for future use.

6.8.20 Biodiversity

6.8.21 Policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan require developments to meet sustainable construction, passive cooling and green roof requirements and Local Plan Policy SP13 is also concerned with biodiversity.

6.8.22 The proforma submission has been amended to refer to a 40% climate change sensitivity, following consultation response from GLA and LBH officers.

6.8.23 Appropriate drainage strategy amendments have been received, along with and amended below ground drainage masterplan. This has been reviewed by the LBH SUDS officer who is satisfied with the level of detail submitted.

6.8.24 Green roof elements would be provided across the development, which is appropriate for this site and provides biodiversity improvements on the existing building. Further information is required in respect of access restrictions, substrate depth, planting and invertebrate habitats, but this can be secured by condition.

6.8.25 As such, the application is acceptable in terms of its sustainability impact.

6.9 Tree Protection

6.9.1 London Plan Policy 7.21 requires existing trees of value to be retained and the planting of additional trees where appropriate. Local Plan Policy SP13 seeks the protection, management and maintenance of existing trees and the planting of additional trees where appropriate.

- 6.9.2 There are no existing trees within this new development site but there are existing street trees located on High Road in close proximity to the existing shop frontage. This tree must be adequately protected with hoarding to prevent any damage during the demolition and construction phases. Protection measures can be adequately provided by condition.
- 6.9.3 A large feature tree would be sited within the courtyard and would be a prominent feature of that landscaping plan. It is proposed to plant three new trees on Bury Road and will be required as part of the public realm and landscaping condition. The plans also demonstrate another self-grow beds and vegetation within the communal spaces within the development.
- 6.9.4 As such, the application is acceptable in terms of its impact on and adequate provision of trees, subject to conditions.

6.10 Drainage and Water Management

- 6.10.1 Local Plan Policy SP5 makes clear that development shall reduce forms of flooding and implement Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity. Policies DM24 and DM25 of the DM DPD also call for measures to reduce and manage flood risk and incorporate SUDS. London Plan Policies 5.12 and 5.13 also call for measures to reduce and manage flood risk.
- 6.10.2 The applicant has provided a *Sustainable Drainage Strategy* document, which has subsequently been revised, in addition to completing the Council's *SuDS Flows and Volumes* pro forma.
- 6.10.3 Surface Water Management
- 6.10.4 The GLA response has referred to the site inaccurately refers to the site as being over 1 hectare, but is actually 0.8 hectares. The application site is located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore is considered to have a low risk of flooding. As such, no specific flood risk mitigation is required. A response to GLA has clarified this and an updated strategy has been forwarded to advise of this oversight.
- 6.10.5 The site contains an existing commercial building and will not increase the impermeable area. A proposed below ground management plan has been submitted, which shows suitable levels of tanking and attenuation. An amended Sustainable Drainage Strategy has also been submitted.
- 6.10.6 Green roofs are provided to the various roof areas of the proposed structure and these would adequately attenuate surface water run-off in combination with an underground tank. Given the lack of available surface space for further drainage measures this arrangement is considered acceptable by the Council's SUDS

Officer. Exact details of the proposed measures in addition to details of their maintenance and management would be secured by condition.

6.10.7 Other methods of re-using stored rainwater, infiltration techniques and storm / peak flow attenuation has been included.

6.10.8 As such, the proposed surface water and flood risk mitigation arrangement provided is acceptable.

6.10.9 Ground Water Protection

6.10.10 The site is in a Source Protection Zone 1 relating to public water supply. However, the proposal is not expected to impact negatively on groundwater sources.

6.10.11 The Environment Agency has been consulted on this application and raised no objections to the proposals subject to conditions in respect of land contamination works monitoring and remediation, prevention of surface water infiltration, restrictions on piling and other groundworks such as borehole creation, in order to ensure groundwater is adequately protected.

6.10.12 Water Infrastructure

6.10.13 The site is close to Thames Water strategic water mains. Thames Water has stated that the impact of the proposed development on the existing water network infrastructure capacity must be assessed further. However, Thames Water have raised concerns regarding the ability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the development. Subsequent discussion between the applicant and Thames Water has confirmed that it is not possible to fully investigate at this stage, due to the existing use and occupation of the site, but that conditions requiring a pre-occupation condition for this information to be provided when the site is vacant.

6.10.14 As such, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its provision for water management.

6.11 Pollution

6.11.1 Air Quality

6.11.2 London Plan Policy 7.14 states that developments shall minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality, make provision to address local problems of air quality and promote sustainable design and construction.

6.11.3 An *Air Quality Impact Assessment Report*, as well as a *Transport Impact Assessment Report* have been submitted with the application. The report states

that the development would incorporate an energy centre with 3 CHP units and 2 boilers, whilst the hotel energy centre includes 2 water heaters.

6.11.4 The report also demonstrates that the development would have a negligible effect on local air quality from vehicle movements, especially given as this is proposed as a car-free development.

6.11.5 Concerns were raised by the Sustainability officer with regard to the potential opening of windows onto the High Road, but it is accepted that these are largely secondary amenity spaces and that rear windows, balconies and side access to the balconies are provided. The windows facing onto the road are non-openable and protected by aluminium fins, or recessed.

6.11.6 As such, the Pollution Officer considers the proposal to be air quality neutral. An updated Air Quality Assessment, plus dust and boiler emission controls, can be secured by condition.

6.11.7 Land Contamination

6.11.8 Policy DM23 requires development proposals on potentially contaminated land to follow a risk management based protocol to ensure contamination is properly addressed and to carry out investigations to remove or mitigate any risks to local receptors. London Plan Policy 5.21 supports the remediation of contaminated sites and to bringing contaminated land back in to beneficial use.

6.11.9 An initial contamination report and model was submitted with the application. The report indicated potential on-site links to low-to-medium risk contaminants. As such, a further site intrusive investigation should be conducted. The Council's Pollution Officer considers these next steps to be appropriate and they can adequately be secured by condition.

6.11.10 Therefore, the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on pollution and land contamination.

6.12 Employment and Training

6.12.1 Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9 aim to support local employment, improve skills and training, and support access to jobs.

6.12.2 This application would re-provide existing retail premises and a widened employment base in the hotel and workspace provision. There would be opportunities for borough residents to be trained and employed as part of the development's construction process.

6.12.3 The Council's Planning Obligations SPD requires all major developments to contribute towards local employment and training. The Council requires the

developer (and its contractors and sub-contractors) to notify it of job vacancies, to employ a minimum of 20% of the on-site workforce from local residents (including trainees nominated by the Council).

6.12.4 The applicant has agreed to provide employment and training opportunities during the construction of the development and this would be secured by legal agreement.

6.12.5 There is a desire to secure local employment within the workspace units provided and a desire to try to secure some local occupiers within these units. A requirement to consult the Council on an occupation strategy will be included in the Section 106 agreement.

6.12.6 As such, the development is acceptable in terms of employment provision.

6.13 Wind and Micro-Climate

6.13.1 London Plan Policies 7.6 and 7.7 state that buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to wind and microclimate. This is particularly important for tall buildings. Development Management, DPD Policy DM6 states that proposals for tall buildings should consider the impact on microclimate. Policy DM3 more broadly requires improvements to the public realm for pedestrians and cyclists in Haringey.

6.13.2 The size of the building in relation to existing buildings is deemed not to require wind tunnel assessment or attenuation, given the proximity to The Mall and other taller buildings within the broader vicinity. The application is supported by a Preliminary Impact Assessment, which confirms that this would not have a significant wind tunnelling impact.

6.14 Fire Safety

6.14.1 Fire safety is not a planning matter and it is usually assessed at Building Regulations stage along with other technical building requirements relating to structure, ventilation and electrics, for example.

6.14.2 There will be a sufficient number fire-fighting shafts and dry riser outlets in each residential block to meet Building Regulations 2013 requirements. Dry riser main inlets are clearly indicated at the front of each block.

6.14.3 The London Fire Service has therefore raised no objections to the proposal.

6.15 Section 106 Heads of Terms

6.15.1 Policy DM48 permits the Council to seek relevant financial and other contributions in the form of planning obligations to meet the infrastructure requirements of developments, where this is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

6.15.2 Planning obligations are to be secured from the development by way of a legal agreement, in the event that planning permission is granted, as described below:

6.16 Other Issues:

6.16.1 The standard permission has been extended in this recommendation for approval on the basis that the site has the restriction of the Crossrail 2 Safeguarding. Given the delays to the CR2 schedule, a five year permission, rather than the standard three years, is considered reasonable.

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

Planning obligations are to be secured from the development by way of a legal agreement, in the event that planning permission is granted, as described below:

- 1) Crossrail final sign off of conditions:
 - No development unless either:
 - TfL consent;
 - Crossrail does not come forward or re-aligns;
 - The need for protection can be designed out
 - Subject to confirmation from Crossrail the Secretary of State for Transport will be asked to resolve any disputes

- 2) Affordable Housing Provision
 - 40% affordable by habitable room
 - 64% social rent (with no sale) and 36% intermediate rent (London Living Rent)
 - Occupier no option to buy Affordable / Intermediate rented
 - LBH first option to purchase social rented affordable purchase

- 3) Public Realm and Highway Improvements on Bury Road
 - Highway improvements including road crossing measures, reinstatement of a redundant access, pedestrian and cycle improvements and provision of three accessible parking spaces
 - Financial contribution

- 4) Energy Statement Update and Review

- Assessment of the development's potential to integrate CHP
 - Review of submitted Energy Statement prior to commencement
 - Provision of financial contribution towards carbon offsetting of £276,372
 - Sustainability review before occupation (plus any additional carbon offset if required)
- 5) Energy Centre
- Best endeavours to connect to Wood Green DEN energy centre
- 6) Considerate Contractor Scheme Registration
- 7) Sustainable Transport Initiatives
- Travel Plans provided for the residential and commercial uses
 - Appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator
 - Financial contributions towards travel plan monitoring (£2,000 per plan)
 - Car club membership or bicycle purchase contributions for occupiers including enhanced provision for family dwellings
 - Traffic Management Order amendment (£4,000)
 - Controlled Parking Zone contribution (£15,000) towards design and consultation for implementation of parking management measures
 - Other initiatives
- 8) Car Parking Management Plan
- Measures to include parking space unit allocations, details of vehicle circulatory movements, occupancy level monitoring and off-street permit allocation
 - Parking priority plan
 - Potential inclusion of a parking space for the commercial unit
 - 20% active and 80% passive electric vehicle charging point provision, plus details of the threshold required for conversion from passive
 - Monitoring (£3,000)
- 9) Employment Initiatives – Local Training and Employment Plan
- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents
 - 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees
 - Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff)
 - Support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship for recruitment
 - Provision of a named contact to facilitate the above
 - Local business preference within workspace units

10) Child Play Space Off-Site Contribution

- £28,918 off site provision

11) Shell and core fit out

- The courtyard workspace units will be fit out to shell and core with a landlord contribution to the fit out once a tenant has been secured.

12) Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value of contributions (max. £50,000)

6.17 Conclusion

- The proposed mixed use development would provide a suitable residential density, retail, commercial and business quantum, including a large hotel use.
- Implementation of the permission will be reliant on the safeguarding restriction of the site and shall not be developed unless the Cross Rail 2 Safeguard is revoked.
- The development would provide 40% affordable housing, with 64% of this provision for Social Rented and 36% for London Living Rent, (no option for occupier purchase). The Council will have first option to purchase the affordable units.
- A suitable housing mix of one, two, three and four bed units is proposed for both affordable housing tenure and the scheme as a whole. A total of 25% family housing will be provided within the development.
- The development will create a laneway between the High Road and Bury Road, in accordance with the aims of the Wood Green AAP and Site Allocation.
- The scale and massing would not stymie other development within the Site Allocation and has been designed with a contextual approach to these sites.
- The contemporary design and materiality would have a positive impact on the on the visual appearance of the area, would protect key local views and would not harm local heritage assets.
- The development would not have an adverse impact on surrounding amenity.
- The development would provide sufficient number of appropriately located car and cycle parking and would encourage sustainable transport initiatives in an area with excellent public transport links.
- Private amenity space would be provided for each flat, as well as access to generous communal amenity spaces and the public space created in the laneway courtyard.

6.17.1 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

6.18 Community Infrastructure Levy

6.18.1 Based on the information submitted with the application, the Mayoral CIL charge would be £974,460 (16,244sqm x £60) and the Haringey CIL charge would be £2,479,038 (12,097sqm x £165 x 1.242).

6.18.2 This is based on the following figures derived from the applicant's CIL form:

- Existing floor space demolished – 13,028sqm;
- New residential floor space – 12,097sqm;
- New commercial floor space – 8,392sqm;
- Net additional floor space – 16,244sqm;

6.18.3 This will be collected by Haringey after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

6.18.4 No social housing relief or other relevant exemptions have been applied to the figures at this stage.

6.18.5 An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1.1 GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to s.106 and s.278 Legal Agreements.

7.1.2 Applicant's drawing No.(s): EXA_1724_101/D; 102/B; 103/B; 110; 201; 202; 203; 204; 501; 502; 503; 511; 512; 515 601; 602; 603; 604; 610; 611; 612; 613; 614; 615; 650; 651; 652; 701; 702; P_901/C; 5865-00-005; 006; 007; 008; 101; 02-101/B; 5865-20-001/N; 002/N; 003/N; 004/N; 005/N; 006/N; 007/N; 008/N; 009/E; 010/E; 011/E; 012/E; 017/F; 018/C; 019

7.1.3 Supporting documents also approved: J2291 (Energy & Sustainability Report); J2291/02.0 (Overheating Report- 22 March 2019); J2291 (MWL BREEAM Pre-Assessment- March 2019); WHIT/16/3508/DSP01/B (Delivery and Servicing Management Plan); WHIT/16/3508/TP01/A (Framework Travel Plan- September 2018); WHIT/16/3508/TA01/A_September2018; Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment- Peter Stewart Consultancy- September 2018; SuDS Flows and Volumes – LLFA Technical Assessment Proforma; J10352/NGR/CKE/SHIN (Planning Statement- September 2018); 17020/500/P1; 1702/SUDs_R01/RS_P2

(Sustainable Drainage Strategy - February 2019);
17020/R01/RS_September2018 (Structural Engineers Report);
17020/BIA_R01/RS_September_2018 (Basement Impact Assessment);
J10352/NGR/CKE/SHIN (Affordable Housing Statement) with addendum
G6780/JAKI/FKI-300419 dated April 2019; 7669/AQ/final/Rev3 (Air Quality
Assessment- September 2018); ExA-1724-901/C (Design and Access Statement
– Landscape Statement- September 2018); P1081/June18/1.1 (Noise
Assessment Report- September 2018); P1244/1 (Daylight & Sunlight Report);
Geotechnical Consulting Group- Preliminary Impact Assessment on Lu
Tunnels_Rev2_September2018; C14174A (Site Investigation Report); Newgate-
Statement of Community Involvement_September2018; JLL Wood Green North
Side – Construction Management Plan; JLL Wood Green South Side –
Construction Management Plan; JLL- Planning Stage Construction
Methodology_June2018; J2291/P2 (MWL Utilities Report- September 2018)