

APPENDIX 1 – Plans and application documents

- Plans:
- Location Plan 1:1250 P/EQ/053
- Existing plan P/EQ/054
- 439_P_EQ_119-Basement level_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_120-Ground Floor level_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_121-Level 1_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_122-Level 2_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_123-Level 3_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_124-Level 4_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_125-Level 5_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_126-Level 6_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_127-Level 7_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_128-Level 8_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_129-Level 9_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_130-Level 10_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_131-Roof level_RevA
- 439_P_EQ_132-Level 11
- 6578-L-GA-00-102
- 6578-L-GA-00-102
- 6578-L-GA-01-202
- 6578-L-GA-01-202
- 6578-L-GA-02-302
- 6578-L-GA-02-302
- P_EQ_210-D3+D4 Gable Elevations_RevA
- P_EQ_211-D3+D4 Long Elevations_RevA
- P_EQ_254-Building D4_RevA
- P_EQ_310-Building D3 and D4_RevA
- PHA_439_RMA_D3&D4_Addendum_190925_compressed
-

Documents:

- Covering letter. Quod – June 2019;
- Planning Application Form, Quod – June 2019;
- CIL forms, Quod – June 2019;
- Design & Access Statement Buildings D4 and D4 (including Landscaping and Statement of Compliance with

Design Code and Parameter Plans, Pantor Hudspith & LDA
Design – June 2019, updated September 2019.

- Planning Statement (including Energy Centre Statement),
Quod - June 2019;
- Environmental Statement Addendum/Further Information
Report (incl. Air Quality Assessment, Drainage
Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment), Quod – June
2019;
- Daylight & Sunlight Statement, Anstey Horne – June 2019;
- Transport Statement, Vectos – June 2019, updated
September 2019.
- Accommodation schedule Building D4
- Accommodation schedule Building D3

APPENDIX 2 – Summary of Consultation Responses

Stakeholder	Representations	Officer comments
Internal:		
Transportation	<p>The principle of the proposed revised servicing arrangement / traffic management is acceptable. Vehicular swept paths for buses (with 300mm error margins) are required.</p> <p>A condition will be required for detailed design of proposals to be further developed with stakeholders and for safety audits to be undertaken.</p> <p>The original s278 agreement (which is pending), will need to be amended to include all highway works required / related to the revised servicing proposals.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A transport condition is attached to the reserve matter application and the original S278 agreement will be varied.</p>
Design	<p>Principle of Development</p> <p>The proposed “Clarendon Square” development on the former gasworks at Haringey Heartlands is a large and complex masterplanned development that has been under preparation since 2008. An earlier scheme by different architects (Make) was approved in outline in 2012 (HGY/2009/0503). The applicants, National Grid, then entered into a joint venture with Berkeley Homes, as St William, and commissioned new architects (Panter Hudspith) to improve the masterplan and progress to development. The replacement hybrid planning application (HGY/2017/3117) was approved in April 2018, with full planning permission for what is being referred to now as “The Southern Quarter”, and outline permission, with an indicative scheme, parameter plans and a Design Code for the rest. One part of the development, known for now as “Block C”, has the same footprint as in the original Make approval, so its revised design has been approved as a separate reserved matters approval and minor amendment (HGY/2017/0821). The</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

first Reserved Matters application for detailed design of an area in the outline approval was for Blocks D1 & D2 (HGY/2019/0362), approved earlier this year. *This* application (HGY/2019/1775) is the second reserved matters application for a part of the Panter Hudspith masterplan approved hitherto in outline as part of HGY/2017/3117.

Outline Permission and Neighbouring Sites

This application is for two blocks of the seven that make up what is being known as “The Eastern Quarter” of the Clarendon Square development. This “quarter” will sit to the east of the main north south street through the development (Mary Neuner Way / Clarendon Road / “the spine road”) and to the north of the central “Community Park” that will stretch from Hornsey Road to the east to the railway embankment to the west; the Southern Quarter sits to the south of the park and Block C to the north of the park on the west side of the spine road, whilst there will be further, later phases for the remaining outline parts of the masterplan north and north-west of the Eastern Quarter. The eastern quarter will eventually comprise seven residential blocks, known for now as “Blocks D1 to D4” and “Blocks E1 to E3”, along with vehicular, energy and landscaping infrastructure; in the masterplan & hybrid approval this includes underground parking and further associated landscaping. The section that previously received Reserved Matters Approval, D1 & 2, included some of the associated landscaping. This Reserved Matters Application includes the energy centre under Building D4 and some more of the landscaping around both blocks.

The two blocks of this proposal, Blocks D3 & D4, are at the north-eastern edge of the Eastern Quarter, D3 therefore faces Block D2 directly across its private communal amenity space, Block E3 across a courtyard space opening off Brook Road to the north of Block D4 and what is proposed to be the “Moselle

Walk”, a gated public footpath and linear ecological park, also part of this application, to the east.

Across Brook Road to the north is a low rise industrial estate known as "Bittern Place"; it is in separate ownership & subject to separate Site Allocations, SA 21: “Clarendon Square Gateway” in the adopted Site Allocations DPD (July 2017), and WG SA 18: Bittern Place” in the latest draft of the emerging Wood Green AAP (February 2018). The Moselle Walk, the southern half of which was approved in the D1 & 2 Approval, will separate the Eastern Quarter from the back gardens of existing houses on Hornsey Park Road to the east; the culverted River Moselle runs underneath the Moselle Walk. Opposite the northern end of the Moselle Walk is the back of the car park of "Iceland" supermarket; this site has planning permission (HGY/2017/2886) for a major mixed-use development for retail, commercial and a health centre on the ground and 1st floor, with 160 residential units above, in a terrace of connected mansion blocks of seven storeys next to this site, rising to nine storeys at it's far, eastern end, at the corner of Mayes Road. Separating the Iceland site from the back gardens of the houses on Hornsey Park Road, and also backing onto a short stretch of the proposed Moselle Walk, is a third adjoining potential development site in another's ownership, a small industrial unit, who's address is 157-159 Hornsey Park Road. All three are part of SA 21, but in the most recent draft Wood Green AAP Iceland is WG SA 11: “Iceland Site” & the third site is WG SA 19: “Land R/O Hornsey Park Rd”. The allocation requirements in the draft AAP include investigating the possibility of creating a new public pedestrian routes through WG SA 19, emerging onto Brook Road via the boundary between *this site* and Iceland.

Masterplan & Design Code

	<p>The northern side of the Eastern Quarter generally will have more an urban character, with greater density and height, and with workspace (use class B1) and town centre retail uses on much of their ground floors, and with active non-residential uses (town centre, including retail, or workspace) on all of the main street frontages, connected via further continuous active frontage including the approved ground floor of the Iceland site back to Wood Green High Road and the designated Metropolitan Town Centre, which it is intended will be extended into the heart of Heartlands. The Brook Road frontage of D4 therefore forms an important part of an extended active town centre frontage. As it is intended also to be the end point of the Moselle Walk, forming an attractive pedestrian connection between the park at the heart of Clarendon Square (and the extensive new housing to its south) and Brook Road, beside the Health Centre and providing a connection to the High Road, as well as potentially the end point of a second pedestrian link, through WG SA 19, connecting Hornsey Park Road, and the extensive existing residential streets beyond, with the extended commercial centre and Cultural Quarter beyond the north-east corner of D4 will also form an important, vibrant corner, ideal for a bust active retail frontage.</p> <p>The open space on the west side of D4, between it and projected block E3, and to the north of D3, will act as a pedestrian street, a largely hard paved court providing pedestrian and emergency (including fire tender) access to D3, D4 and eventually E3. It will align with the north-south line of the existing Silsoe Road, which currently ends by meeting the end of Brook Road at a right-angled corner, and which in the masterplan will continue into Clarendon Square between E3 and the Northern Quarter, forming a crossroads. It will also connect to the central space of the Eastern Quarter, which will be a landscaped garden square bounded by Blocks D2, D3, E1 and E3. In the hybrid permission this was to be a</p>	
--	--	--

private communal amenity space for those blocks, but this is now to be a public open space, accessible to all. It will also create a new pedestrian public route, connecting via the space between D1 and E1, a similar street-like space, to the main north-south spine road through Heartlands and through the heart of the Clarendon Square development. Therefore D4 will form the corner of crossroads on both its' north-east and north-west corners, so ideally it should have a vibrant, active retail frontage turning around both corners.

However, D4 also has to accommodate ventilation grills for the Energy Centre (DEN) in its basement. The details of how the ventilation grills are to be designed is to be secured by conditions, with the intention that artwork be incorporated into grills in more prominent locations, as artwork is currently proposed for the ground floor north-western corner where a plant room is shown. It is to be hoped that the precise final layout of ground floor uses and ventilation grills for the DEN maximises the active (preferably retail or other town centre uses) frontage, and minimises grills, especially on the northern half of the ground floor footprint of D4. The potential for ventilation to the DEN being located on other floors, at plenum / fascia level above ground floor shopfronts, incorporated into the landscaping or even as a free-standing sculptural object, could possibly be explored as part of discharging these conditions.

The footprints and maximum heights of D3 & 4 are as defined in the outline permission at between 6 and 8 storeys, with maximum and minimum heights above datum and the detailed proposals fall within these limits. These Reserved Matters proposals slightly increase the height of Block D4 on the illustrative scheme with the outline approval but are just within the maxima of the parameter plans (excluding lift overruns). This is not considered detrimental to the overall The Design Code further defines the development parcels, including

the requirements for gaps between the for D blocks, and in this proposal the gaps between D3 and 4 and between D2 and 3 are secured as private communal amenity spaces for Blocks D4 and D2 respectively. These gaps ensure the built form of the Eastern Quarter as a whole will not appear as a continuous solid built mass when viewed from the back gardens of the neighbouring houses on Hornsey Park Road, even when the whole of the hybrid application has been built, and this detailed proposal confirms that.

Elevational Treatment, Materials & Fenestration, including Balconies

The main modelling move across the whole Clarendon Square development is to break blocks down into a series of vertical elements, separated by set-backs and deep recesses, often containing balconies and in a contrasting darker material; this has been followed in Block C currently under construction, in the southern quarter (Blocks A1-4 and B1-4) where they face onto the street or their entrance courts, and in Blocks D1 and 2 recently granted Reserved Matters Approval. D1 and 2 are particularly relevant to this application, as to some extent they form “mirror pairs” of D3 & 4, with D3 sharing many similarities with D2 and D4 sharing many similarities with D1. Their place in the wider masterplan and the way that is translated into their massing and elevational treatment reflect each other; D1 and D4 will be pivotal, taller buildings, occupying prominent corner positions and having active commercial ground floors, whilst D2 and D3 will be more background, “mid-block” buildings, lower, wholly residential, surrounded by and relating more to garden courts and the Moselle Walk.

The elevational treatment and massing of D4, like D1, follows this closely; it is designed as a cluster or collage of 4 blocks of 9, 10 (twice) and 11 storeys, varied parapet heights and complimentary but differentiated brick and stone detailing. The corners onto

Brook Road are designated in the Design Code to be the most richly detailed, vertical element, with the north-east corner a “primary” corner, where Moselle Walk comes out onto Brook Road, the Moselle Walk and courtyard elevations as secondary facades and the southern facades onto the private amenity space as the least richly detailed, “tertiary” element. This modelling and composition extends into each vertical element having different heights, and will serve to reduce the apparent bulk of D4.

These detailed proposals maintain and further refine the brick-based architecture and materials palette of the hybrid permission and design code, with a sophisticated composition of primary, secondary and tertiary facades and corners, distinguished by greater degrees of brick modelling. Two primary brick tones distinguish the four vertical elements, with projecting reconstituted stone courses at every other floor, giving the building a grand, civic scale, with a higher two storey ground floor base in a third, further contrasting to the western half of the Brook Road frontage. The introduction of stone for these alternating floor strong courses represents a deliberate gradual introduction of greater use of stone to the wider development towards the more “civic”, more “town centre”, north of the wider development. At roof level extensive rooftop plant is hidden behind extended parapets to two of the vertical elements; these are further embellished with recessed panels and openings to give the building a distinctive “top”

Block D3 is differently treated, as a more “mid-block” building, of lower height, and more horizontal emphasis; it has no face onto a street except a distant one down the length of the courtyard, albeit that that has the character of a more private pedestrian street. In this respect it is planned that Block D3 will have a similar relationship, language and emphasis, with D4 being more similar to D1.

Details for both blocks are provided showing that windows will have deep reveals, giving the proposals richer modelling, stronger shadows externally and softer light to rooms, with less harsh contrast around windows internally. Balconies, which are mostly recessed, are detailed with a mixture of solid brick and partially open metal balustrades, the balustrading detail on the latter designed as deep metal fins, angled to prevent long views into the balcony from the Moselle Walk, to provide privacy and hide residents' clutter. Cills, parapets, corners and soffits are indicated to be soundly detailed in quality, durable materials, but will have to be secured by condition.

Residential Quality, including flat, room and balcony sizes

All flat and room sizes comply with or exceed minima defined in the Nationally Described Space Standards, as is to be routinely expected. Similarly, all residential units are provided with private amenity space in compliance with or better than London Plan and Mayoral Housing SPG requirements, in the form of balconies or roof terraces. Balconies are generally inset and located on corners benefiting from daylight from and views in two directions, and usually benefit from direct sunlight.

All flats would also be able to use a variety of private communal external amenity spaces; one for each block, to D3 a roof terrace, to D4 (like those for D1 and 2) a secluded ground level garden adjacent to the Moselle Walk, each private to all residents of that block. These private gardens are proposed to be predominantly naturally landscaped and equipped with informal doorstep playable equipment suitable for under 5s, meeting at least half of the under 5s doorstep playspace requirement defined in the Mayors Playspace SPG for the block concerned as well as garden amenity space for other residents of all ages.

Benefiting from a predominantly north-south alignment, there are *no* single aspect north facing or south facing flats in these two blocks D3, with a higher proportion of smaller units, due to being for private sale, accessed off a central corridor, has a large number of single aspect east and west facing flats, but that alignment is not considered problematic and it is difficult in higher density, higher rise developments to avoid one bedroom and studio flats being single aspect; given that dwelling size needed to be part of the overall mix, D3 is probably the best block to put them in! All the flats in D4, which are for affordable and generally larger, benefit from dual aspects.

In general, the quality of residential accommodation proposed is consistently high, and notably with no external visual distinction or difference in quality between housing of different tenure or affordability.

Daylight, Sunlight and Privacy

Of relevance to this section, Haringey policy in the DM DPD DM1 requires that:

*“...D Development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development’s users and neighbours. The council will support proposals that:
Provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity spaces where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land; Provide an appropriate amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and residents of the development...”*

The applicants have prepared a Day and Sunlight Statement broadly in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment’s publication “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide

to Good Practice” (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011), known as “The BRE Guide”. Following earlier concerns with their assessment of Blocks D1 & 2, it is pleasing to note that the assessment with this application is now mostly in accordance with the methodology in the BRE Guide, allowing us to assess the proposals against our policy.

Daylight and sunlight levels to the proposed residential accommodation within this proposal generally meet the BRE standard, a good result for a higher density scheme. For daylight, 36 of the sample of 43 rooms assessed in D4 (84%) and 24 of 33 in D3 (73%) would receive daylight of or over the BRE Guide recommended levels. Many of the rooms that do not meet the BRE guidance levels are Living/Dining/Kitchens or Studios that would meet the levels recommended for Living/Dining Rooms but don’t meet the higher levels for Kitchens, although the kitchen is at the darker back of the room. Others are in rooms opening off a recessed balcony. However, the proportion in compliance is comparable to or better than the illustrative scheme at outline application and given the higher density nature of this development area, the result is considered a good daylighting performance.

For sunlight, the applicants’ consultants tested *all* habitable rooms facing within 90° of due south. Their assessment found that in D4, 14 living rooms meeting the BRE Guide recommended annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) and 16 meeting the winter probable sunlight hours (WPSH) recommendation, out of 29 (48% & 55% respectively), whilst for D3, 9 meet the APSH and WPSH recommendation out of 21 (43%). In a flaw in their methodology, 5 of the rooms tested and falling short in D4 are bedrooms, which are not relevant for sunlight tests. The remaining living rooms to not achieve either the annual or winter sunlight test are mostly off inset balconies again. Given the high-density nature of the

	<p>development, this is again considered a good sunlight achievement.</p> <p>The two private communal amenity spaces for each block and the central shared, publicly accessible garden square, all exceed the BRE Guide recommended access to sunlight, of at least 2 hours at the solstice. All flats also benefit from a private balcony or roof terrace, most of which also receive more than the recommended sunlight. It is generally recognised, in the applicants own marketing research and in published reports such as “Superdensity” (Recommendations for Living at Superdensity - Design for Homes 2007), that residents value sunlight to their amenity spaces more highly than to their living rooms, valuing the ability to sit outdoors in the sun, and to have a view from their living room, and if possible, from their flat entrance hall, onto a sunny outdoor space, whilst excessive sunlight <i>into</i> living rooms can create overheating and television viewing difficulties. Given that all residents will have access to sunny private communal amenity space, most with sunny private amenity space, and a reasonable number sun to their living rooms, the sunlight levels are considered acceptable.</p> <p>The impact of their proposals on neighbouring dwellings was generally addressed satisfactorily in the Hybrid Application and does not need to be changed for this. However, there was a condition on the Outline Approval that reserved matters for this (and other adjacent) parcels must confirm their impact on a reasonable illustrative scheme on the Bittern Place site. The applicants’ consultants’ study on pages 172-3 of the Design & Access Statement shows that the areas of the illustrative scheme that would not get access to good daylight are not significantly increased with the modest additional height of D4, only affecting a part of the ground floor and a very small part of the first floor, with the expectation being these floors would be in non-residential use, to meet the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Site Allocation Requirements for town centre and employment uses on that site. It was accepted, when the Outline Application was granted, that a development of matching height and setback to the illustrative scheme and parameter plans of that Outline Application on the Bittern Place side of the Silsoe Road frontage, north of site of this application, would not benefit from great daylight.</p> <p>Normally in the case of higher density developments it is necessary to note that the BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations; as in London, the Mayor of London's Housing SPG acknowledges. In particular, the 27% VSC recommended guideline is based on a low-density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable. Paragraph 2.3.29 of the GLA Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city. This proposal therefore achieved a high quality of day and sunlight access.</p>	
<p>Regeneration</p>	<p>Support the space is being made for the DEN, and sprinkler system.</p> <p>Clarification of the reallocation of commercial space, and whereabouts in the masterplan this now sits.</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>The Hybrid consent requires a range of commercial and non-residential accommodation to be provided across the masterplan area. Most of this space is proposed to be located in the more urban northern quarter of the site. A mix of smaller commercial accommodation are</p>

	<p>The frontages on nearly all sides on these building are plant rooms and therefore uninhabited and provide no active frontage, passive surveillance or positive contribution to the for the public spaces which they are adjacent to. I think this could create a concern with regard to safety and quality or public realm</p>	<p>interspersed with serviced workspace for local businesses. There are also lager units suitable as HQs for more established businesses.</p> <p>A condition (52) is attached to the Hybrid consent requiring a Commercial and Workspace Strategy to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any commercial floorspace. This Strategy must complement the existing and emerging cultural and economic offer in and around the site and demonstrate how new workspace meets the needs of commercial undertakings.</p> <p>The layout of the ground floor is subject to detailed design and where appropriate will seek to make provision for active and attractive frontages.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Public Health</p>	<p>Background: Public health have reviewed the Clarendon Gas Works site planning application and development proposals of this scale should consider the impacts of health and wellbeing on communities in line with national, London and Haringey planning policy. This document describes the policy context and provides comments on how the development addresses health impacts. The planning application seeks the approval for reserved matters (scale, layout, appearance, landscaping and access) pertaining to buildings D3 and D4, forming Phase 2 of the Easter Quarter located at Haringey Heartlands Hornsey Park Road, Mayers Road, Clarendon Road and the Kings Cross / East Coast Mainline / Western Road. This construction comprises of 101 residential units, 113m² of commercial floorspace, and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning application HGY/2017/3117.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider mature trees in open spaces and private amenity spaces to maximise community cohesion and address climate change. 2. Clarity on the seating plans for the landscaping of the roof gardens and open spaces (London Plan Policy 7.5) 3. Align the compliance for hours of operation of any restaurant (A3), public house and wine bar (A4) with the Haringey’s statement of policy (2016-2021). 4. Public Health would like to have an informal chat with the developers to explore new innovative opportunities around health <p>Access to open space and nature</p> <p>In the developer’s proposals, we are pleased to see the developer has incorporated good mix of plants, amenity roof spaces, public</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>Public Health to have an informal chat with the developers to explore new innovative opportunities around health</p>

	<p>spaces, informal play area, and have demonstrated awareness on the importance of community integration.</p> <p>We really like the developer’s idea of incorporating green roofs for blocks D3 and D4, which will encourage all residents to use outdoor space. We like the plans for the landscaping of the green roofs and the developers might like to consider seating plans for residents (London Plan Policy 7.5).</p> <p>We would also like to see mature trees in the public spaces and private amenity spaces to act as a natural canopy, provide shelter from intense sun, wind and rain, and protect children from harmful UV rays of the sun. People with the poorest health would be worst affected by the impacts of climate change and trees might address some of these issues.</p> <p>Public Health would be delighted to welcome an informal chat with the developers on potential innovative opportunities around health.</p> <p>Access to social infrastructure</p> <p>In the planning statement we have noted the compliance for hours of operation for any restaurant (A3), public house and wine bar (A4) shall not be operated before 0700 or after 0000 hours on any day of the week. This should align with Haringey’s statement of licensing policy 2016-2021.</p> <p><i>“While the Council will treat each case on its individual merits there will be a presumption that permitted hours for the sale of alcohol will be restricted to between 8am and 11.30pm on Sunday to Thursday and 8am to midnight on Friday and Saturday in respect of premises in residential areas and areas being adversely affected by street drinking issues”.</i></p>	
<p>Waste Management</p>	<p>No comments further to the Hybrid consent.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The waste management aspects relating to this</p>

		phase are covered by provisions in the Hybrid consent.
Environmental Services – Pollution, Air Quality & Contaminated Land	No comments further to the Hybrid consent.	Noted. Pollution and land contamination aspects relating to this phase are covered by provisions in the Hybrid consent.
Carbon Management	<p>These comments are focussed on the energy centre proposed under building D4. The energy centre is critical to the council’s plans to deliver a decentralised energy network (DEN) in Wood Green.</p> <p>The review considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the planning documentation including a number of revised documents submitted to address concerns raised by the Carbon Management Team b. separate reports and drawings issued to the DEN team (notably the report ‘CGW – DEN2 Strategic Design Parameters – V6 – Final’ (the SDP report) and the drawing CGW DEN2 Draft Layout V7_14-06-19’ (DEN2 layout drawing) <p><i>Note the application documents include a shortened version of the reports/drawings issued to the DEN team. The summary report provided in part 8 of the Planning Statement is shorter and less detailed (the summary report includes less detailed drawings and does not include the full acoustic and ventilation analysis reports provided separately to the DEN team – the acoustic report has been provided as an addendum to the application)</i></p> <p>General The Carbon Management Team identified a number of serious concerns about the usability of the proposed energy centre based on the initial submission.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Conditions are attached to the reserve matter application.</p> <p>The applicants will either have to agree a revised specification for the energy centre or a suitable letter is required from the developer confirming progress to date and committing to finalising the revised specification would be sought</p>

	<p>The Developer has worked proactively with the Carbon Management Team to review and amend the submission in order to address many of these concerns.</p> <p>Through this process it was also identified that there are shortcomings within the specification for an energy centre within the original s106.</p> <p>The Developer has agreed to amend the energy centre specification within the s106. Considerable progress has been made but a final revised specification is yet to be agreed.</p> <p>Key items within the revised specification are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The revised specification will include a requirement for the Developer to provide additional space to address the shortcomings in the original specification subject to the Council agreeing a mechanism to fund this before the Developer commences construction;2) The revised specification will include a design review process where the parties will collaborate to finalise a design for the energy centre. This requires the Council to develop a more detailed fit-out design and provides a mechanism where the Council may require the developer to amend the energy centre design to accommodate the fit-out design (at the Developer's cost) if it is shown to be necessary to do so;3) The revised specification gives far more detail on the expected roles and responsibilities for different aspects of the energy centre to clarify boundaries and areas of collaboration.	
--	--	--

	<p>Although the revised specification is yet to be agreed, substantial progress has been made on a draft.</p> <p>The principles in the first and second bullets which give the Council the ability to revise the energy centre design to be fit for purpose are substantially agreed and these are the key items to allow us to recommend approval of the scheme.</p> <p><i>Note: it is considered unlikely that the revised specification will be agreed before committee but it is expected the developer will provide a letter to confirm the progress to date and give suitable commitment to finalising the specification.</i></p> <p>Ground Floor Layout and Servicing</p> <p>The Ground floor layout of Block D4 is critical for the Energy Centre as it will enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Ventilation of the basement plant room – this is one area where the fit-out design needs to be progressed before the spatial requirements to accommodate ventilation can be 100% signed off. The current GF layout includes a conservative allowance for ventilation, and it is anticipated that through the design review process, a more efficient spatial layout can be determined which will reduce the amount of louvres at GF and free up space to allow a more active frontage.b. Utility connectivity – one of the main areas where the energy centre specification in the original s106 was lacking is the provision of utility connections. The Developer has agreed to address this (subject to Council funding). Doing so substantially increases the space take for utilities at GF. The current GF design allows for this but there are potential inefficiencies in the layout.	
--	--	--

	<p>c. Access and egress to the basement for day to day operations – a performance specification for the access has been largely agreed within the revised energy centre specification and this is expected to be sufficient. The current drawings show fire egress from the basement via an adjoining basement which is yet to receive planning approval. If this basement does not come forward in time, the developer will need to agree a revised fire exit which will be at GF.</p> <p>d. The energy centre requires regular servicing and while progress has been made to develop vehicle access and loading bay design, detailed design and road safety analysis have not been completed yet – a condition may be required</p> <p>Although the developer has begun to address the layout of the GF to facilitate the above, it is clear that more work is required to develop the design, and this will also impact on the GF elevations.</p> <p>The work to date has addressed many of our concerns but additional work is still to be done to finalise a design.</p> <p>We therefore recommend the use of conditions as follows:</p> <p>a) <i>Pre-Commencement – Energy Centre Layout</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of the development, excluding demolition and site preparation works, a ground floor plan showing layout of energy centre areas in Block D4 is submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p>Reason</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><i>To ensure opportunities for incorporating decentralised energy into the development are given full consideration in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.6.</i></p> <p><i>The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the pre-commencement requirements of the condition is so fundamental to the development permitted that it would have been otherwise necessary to refuse the whole permission</i></p> <p>b) <i>Pre-Superstructure – Elevations</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of superstructure works, elevations taking into account the revised ground floor and roof-top layouts of Block D4 are submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reason</i></p> <p><i>To ensure opportunities for incorporating decentralised energy into the development are properly considered in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.6. To secure appropriate design and protect public amenity.</i></p> <p>c) <i>Pre-Superstructure – Energy Centre Fire Strategy</i></p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of superstructure works on the approved buildings, a plan showing the exact location of means of escape from the energy centre areas is submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reason</i></p> <p><i>To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for health and safety.</i></p>	
--	--	--

	<p>A further condition may be required regarding the vehicular servicing of the energy centre, loading bay and TMO.</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Carbon Management is supportive of the proposals subject to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Either agreeing a revised specification for the energy centre or receiving a suitable letter from the developer confirming progress to date and committing to finalising the revised specification; and 2) The proposed conditions above 	
Conservation	<p>These buildings are part of a wider masterplanned development that already has outline planning permission. The wider site doesn't contain any listed or locally listed buildings and isn't in a conservation area. However, it is close to several conservation areas and will form part of their setting and general context. The scale of the wider development is such that it will be widely visible, including from Alexandra Palace and Park where there are panoramic views across the borough.</p> <p>The buildings that are the subject of this application are among the smallest in the masterplanned development. Their height, massing and appearance are largely in accordance with agreed parameters and their visual impact would be as expected. The detailed design also includes measures to interpret the cultural history of the area in line with the agreed cultural strategy. I have no objection to consent being granted.</p>	Noted.
Drainage	There are no issues arising that will affect the drainage proposal for this development as a result of the minor amendments	Noted.
Nature Conservation	Comments to be reported to committee	

Environmental Services – Noise Pollution	Comments to be reported to committee	
Housing Development	Support proposals	Noted.
External:		
Transport for London (TfL)	As the bus driver facility for the future has been secured, TfL have no objection to the approval of this application.	Noted.
Environment Agency	No objections.	Noted.
Metropolitan Police (Crime Prevention)	<p>With reference to the above application I have now had an opportunity to examine the details submitted and would like to offer the following comments, observations and recommendations. These are based on available information, including my knowledge and experience as a Designing Out Crime Officer and as a Police Officer. At this stage, whilst I have met with the architects on phase D1 and D2, I have only had initial discussions regarding D2 and D3 and have specific concerns which I wish to draw your attention to Appendices 3</p> <p>1.0 It is my professional opinion that crime prevention and community safety are material considerations, because of the proposed use, design, layout and location of the development proposed.</p> <p>1.1 To ensure the delivery of a safer development in line with Local Development Framework policies CP17, DC33 and DC63 (See Appendix for details of these policies), I have highlighted some of my main areas of concern in Section 3 and in Section 4 have recommended the attaching of a suitably worded condition.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>2.0 I can confirm that I have met with the project architects, but have been advised that they will not be carrying the design forward to the next stage of</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Condition 51 (Secure by Design) attached to the hybrid consent requires the developer to achieve Secure by Design Accreditation for the entire proposed development</p>

the development and a new architect will assist in its progress.

I have reviewed the planning application and due to specific areas of concern (See 3.0 below) the Metropolitan Police request a specific condition requiring the developer to achieve Secure by Design Accreditation for the entire proposed development.

Concerns:

3.0 In summary, officers from the design out crime team have a number of site specific concerns in relation to this application, specifically the ground floor layout (relationship between the commercial and residential) compartmentation and cycle stores, these are outlined in Appendix 3.

However, a condition requiring the developer to engage with both the police and the local authority to achieve 'secured by design' accreditation/status, would reassure police and mitigate a many of these concerns.

Community Safety – Secured by Design Conditions:

4.0 Crime prevention and community safety are material considerations. If the L.B. Haringey are to consider granting consent, I would ask that the conditions detailed below be attached. This is to mitigate the impact and deliver a safer development in line with national, regional and local planning policies. I would also like to draw your attention to Section 17 CDA 1988 and the NPPF, (See appendix) in supporting my recommendations.

4.1 (1) I request that prior to carrying out above grade works of each building or part of a building, details shall be

submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building and development site will achieve full 'Secured by Design' Accreditation.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(2) Prior to the first occupation of each building or part of a building or use, a 'Secured by Design' accreditation shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or use and thereafter all features are to be permanently retained.

Note - The applicant must seek the continual advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) for each building or phase of the development and accreditation must be achieved according to current and relevant Secured by Design guide lines at the time of above grade works of each building or phase of said development.

The services of MPS DOCOs are available free of charge and can be contacted via docomailbox.ne@met.police.uk or 0208 217 3813.

Crime Figures:

5.0 Crime and disorder is a factor for consideration with this application. Crime data affecting this application are highlighted in appendix 2 below.

Legislation & SBD Guidance:

6.0 SP11: Design All new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built

	<p>environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. To achieve this all development shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate solutions to reduce crime and the fear of crime, such as promoting social inclusion; creating well-connected and high quality public realm that is easy and safe to use; and by applying the principles set out in ‘Secured by Design’ and Safer Places; ▪ Seek the highest standards of access in all buildings and places; <p>For a complete explanation of certified products please refer to the Secured by Design guidance documents which can be found on the website. www.securedbydesign.com .</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>I would ask that my interest in this planning application is noted and that I am kept appraised of developments.</p> <p>Additionally, I would welcome the opportunity of sitting in on any meeting you might have concerning this proposal.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority require clarification of any of the above comments please do not hesitate to contact me at the above office.</p>	
Thames Water	Based on the list of proposed amendments Thames Water would not issue any further comments.	Noted.
London Fire Brigade	London Fire Brigade is satisfied with the proposal as revised	Noted.
Network Rail	With reference to the protection of the railway, Network Rail has no objection in principle to the development, but below are some requirements which must be met, especially	In response to representation received from Network Rail made in respect to planning application

	<p>with the close proximity to the development of an electrified railway.</p> <p>Abnormal Loads/Construction Traffic From the information supplied, it is not clear if any abnormal loads will be using routes that include any Network Rail assets. We would have serious reservations if during the construction or operation of the site, abnormal loads will use routes that include Network Rail assets. In this instance, there may be an issue if haulage/construction traffic for the site is to be routed via Mary Neuner Road. Network Rail would request that the applicant contact our Asset Protection Project Manager to confirm that any proposed route is viable and to agree a strategy to protect our asset(s) from any potential damage caused by abnormal loads. I would also like to advise that where any damage, injury or delay to the rail network is caused by an abnormal load/construction traffic (related to the application site), the applicant or developer will incur full liability.</p> <p>Glint and Glare We have experienced issues in the past with glare from glazing and reflective surfaces from developments adjacent to the railway causing a distraction for train drivers and obscuring railway signals (see attached photo) and we need to be certain that this is not the case in this instance. The application does not include a specific glint and glare study to ascertain the effect the proposed scheme and any glazing/reflective surfaces/materials will have on the operation of the adjacent railway particularly in terms of signal sighting and driver distraction. The applicant should supply further details on this point before we can comment further.</p> <p>Network Rail is required to recover all reasonable costs associated with facilitating these works</p>	<p>HGY/2019/1775, the applicants have provided the following responses to the points raised:</p> <p>1. Abnormal Loads / Construction Traffic</p> <p>The planning conditions attached to application reference HGY/2017/3117 requires the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan prior to the commencement of construction of each phase. The submission of these documents will include any details relating to abnormal loads and the routes taken by vehicles. The Council have approved these documents for construction phases 1 & 2 and no concerns have been raised regarding potential abnormal loads and works are underway with no impact on the adjoining Network Rail land.</p> <p>2. Glint and Glare Blocks D3 & D4 are c.200m metres from the railway tracks. Separating the tracks and proposed D3 & D4 are the existing Network Rail shed and approved buildings C1, A4 and D1 – all of which are taller than D3 & D4. St William therefore do not believe that a glint and glare</p>
--	--	---

	<p>In response to St Williams comments Network Rail has made the following comments: In view of the developer's response, we are happy to withdraw our comments relating to glint and glare and routing of construction traffic. However, I would be grateful if you could make the developer aware that if the situation relating to construction traffic does change and large/heavy construction vehicles are to be routed over or under railway bridges, they must liaise with our Asset Protection Team (assetprotection@networkrail.co.uk) in advance to ensure that there is no issue for operational railway safety such as risk of bridge strike or structural damage</p>	<p>issue will be created through the construction of these two buildings and that a specific study is required in support of this application.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Public:</p>		
<p>Neighbouring occupier</p>	<p>Object –</p> <p>No social rented accommodation is proposed even in the 2nd phase of the development;</p> <p>One block is designated as entirely private ownership (Block D3) and the other (D4) is designated as affordable rent;</p> <p>The proposal is not consistent will policy for mixed communities as tenures should be mixed/integrated in the blocks;</p> <p>Giving the amount of development coming forward in the first two phases a proportion of social provision should be included;</p>	<p>The affordable accommodation within this phase forms part of a wider provision to deliver no less than 32.5% affordable housing (site-wide on habitable rooms basis) on a tenure split of 48.3% Affordable Rent and 51.7% Shared Ownership by habitable rooms.</p>

	<p>Where on the site are the social dwellings and when are they programmed in the development timetable;</p> <p>Will the social dwellings have their own distinct identity with separate access points and approaches to the doors;</p> <p>The developer should demonstrate their intention for the whole site in such a way that the immediate phase under consideration as submitted can be assessed in relation to subsequent phases and the overall site development;</p>	
<p>Neighbouring occupier</p>	<p>Noise from the construction, dust and the hours of works should be covered in the risk assessment</p> <p>Concerns with pedestrian safety of children, special needs and the elderly who use Coburg Road due to vehicles speeding;</p> <p>Road humps along Coburg Roads to slow drivers should be provided to avoid accidents;</p>	<p>Construction on site is subject to Building Regulations and guided by a series of technical requirements and guidance including a Construction Environment Management Plan, Groundwater management Plan, Piling Method Statement and Drainage Strategy. These provisions are designed to ensure the development is constructed in a robust, safe and responsible manner.</p> <p>All relevant planning obligations and conditions attached to the Hybrid consent relating to highways/transport remain valid to address these concerns</p>
<p>Neighbouring occupier</p>		<p>The developer, St. William has made the</p>

	<p>Impact on privacy from balconies, windows of the development and from pedestrians along the Moselle Walk into the rear gardens of Hornsey Park Road;</p>	<p>following response to assist with the concerns raised.</p> <p>The proposed footprint of Block D3 is 43m from the western elevation of 147 Hornsey Park Road which is double the length of the Haringey policy target of 21m separating between buildings.</p> <p>Page 66 of the submitted Design and Access Statement in support of Blocks D3 & D4 details the proposed 2-metre-high fence that St William will install along the boundary between the former gasworks site and the back gardens of the existing Hornsey Park Road properties. The purpose of this fence is to provide a hard boundary between the properties to provide security for all landowners.</p> <p>Feedback received at the public consultation event from neighbouring residents on Hornsey Park Road was that the preference for this boundary fence was for it to be visually permeable. This will enable insect life to pass through the fence and also prevent the introduction of a hard-boundary line to the owners on Hornsey Park Road. The proposed fence treatment is</p>
--	---	---

		<p>shown on page 66 of the DAS statement. St William will be required to submit further landscape details in order to discharge the landscape condition that will be attached to the reserved matters decision notice. Ahead of this submission, St William are committed to engage with the impacted properties on Hornsey Park Road to further determine the treatment of this fence line. As part of the landscaping we shall also be investing in low- and high-level planting that will provide additional screening between the Moselle Walk and Hornsey Park Road properties. Occupants of Block D3 shall have access to a shared amenity space at roof level. In response to previously received concerns about overlooking a planting zone is shown on the roof plan that will restrict occupants from standing at the edge of the roof space. This will restrict overlooking also.</p> <p>Prior the submission of the reserved matters, St William engaged with the Secure by Design officer on the proposals for securing the Moselle Walk. Feedback received has been incorporate through the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Security concerns regarding the rear gardens of Hornsey Park Road during the development phase;</p> <p>Concerns with contamination of the existing perimeter land between the garden of No. 147 and the land that was once owned by the gas board with materials which is potentially dangerous to human health;</p> <p>The developers should provide a more detailed plan regarding the de-culverting of the Moselle River and how it will impact the</p>	<p>proposed boundary fence (see point 1 above) and the north and south entrance gates to the Moselle Walk. The Moselle Walk will be secured at nighttime. During construction works, St William will erect the necessary boundary treatment to secure the site. The fence line will be positioned to prevent access to either the construction site or the rear gardens of Hornsey Park Road. St William will engage with the residents ahead of this.</p> <p>As landowners, St William will take responsibility for clearing of any fly-tipping that has occurred within its legal title. St William will review the clearance required in order to deliver the Moselle Walk and this is likely to require removal of material within the area of unregistered land between the former gasworks site and Hornsey Park Road properties. Any hazardous substances identified will be cleared in the appropriate and safe manner. St William will not accept any responsibility for fly-tipping or hazardous materials in other party's ownership</p>
--	---	---

	existing residents of Hornsey Park Road whose gardens border the path of the river;	The submitted reserved matters application for Blocks D3 and D4 do not include any proposals to de-culvert the Moselle River. St William have submitted and had discharged the Moselle River feasibility study that was required under condition 29 of decision HGY/2017/3117
--	---	---

APPENDIX 3 – Quality Review Panel report

14 November 2018

Summary

The Quality Review Panel warmly supports the way that detailed designs for Clarendon Gasworks Eastern Quarter are evolving, promising high-quality development. As design work continues towards submission of a reserved matters application, the panel highlights some areas where there is scope for refinement to make the most of the opportunity to create a new quarter for the Haringey Heartlands. The panel would encourage further exploration of the design of the ground floor / basement level frontage, and entrances / approach sequence to all blocks. It would welcome refinements to the materiality of the blocks, to enhance the architectural expression of the development. In terms of the open spaces within the site (including the Moselle Walk), the panel would support further work to explore the issues of surveillance, overlooking and access, to ensure that open spaces are safe and well-used, and avoid creating tensions between different groups of residents. Further details on the panel’s views are provided below.

Public realm and landscape

- The panel welcomes the emphasis on landscape and ecology as well as the social interaction aspect of the design of the public realm.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of how external spaces will be sub-divided, and how this will translate into physical boundary treatments.
- The landscape strategy should ensure that planting schemes will look good

throughout the whole year. The design team should avoid an approach to the landscape that is very verdant in summer but austere in winter.

- The relationship between affordable housing and play space / open space would benefit from further thought, to avoid overlooking issues which might create unnecessary tension between residents e.g. between block D2 and the adjacent courtyard.
- The panel notes that the proposed Moselle Walk (to the rear of blocks D2, D3 and D4) seems very narrow and includes a lot of vegetation. As it also lacks direct surveillance and is located away from the main pedestrian and vehicular thoroughfares, this may result in the route being perceived as an isolated and unsafe area.
- Bedrooms (rather than living rooms) overlooking the proposed Moselle walk will not provide enough passive surveillance; the panel would encourage further thought on this aspect. The potential exists to extend balconies out into the area of the walk so that they provide more active surveillance of this part of the public realm.
- Access points from the affordable housing blocks into the Moselle Walk could also help to improve surveillance and activity. The panel wonders whether it may be of benefit to re-think the nature of this area of land that runs to the rear of blocks D2, D3 and D4. It would encourage the design team to explore using this area as garden spaces.
- A strategic approach to mitigating antisocial behaviour through design should also be adopted in this part of the masterplan. Fixtures such as security lights and CCTV cameras should be designed in at the earliest stages if they are considered likely to be necessary, to avoid the need for retrospective measures. At a detailed level, design to deter motorbikes would also be encouraged.

Architectural expression and scheme layout

- The panel thinks the architectural expression reflects a good contextual understanding of the local area. It welcomes the ongoing involvement of the design team as the detailed design of the architecture continues.
- Due to the overall size and scope of the masterplan, it would encourage the design team to seek out ways of enhancing the variety, interest and richness of the different blocks.
- Broadening the materials palette to include some elements of 'surprise' could help to punctuate and diversify the predominantly brick architecture within the scheme.
- The quality of materials and construction will be essential to the success of the completed scheme. The panel would support planning officers in securing this through planning conditions.
- Further consideration of the different entrances and approaches through the scheme would be welcomed, as there are some very complex wayfinding requirements.

- Exploration of what it would be like to approach and walk through this part of the masterplan, and the sequence of views will be helpful to test wayfinding. This will be especially important in terms of the pedestrian route up to raised podium level entrances and spaces.
- The panel notes that the overall development is extremely large, and highlights that clarity on arrangements for visitors (including visitor parking) will be required.
- Thinking about the design of entrances to each block, and how these could be made distinctive, could also help residents and visitors find their way around. There are some areas where the external walls of the ground floor basement levels actually front onto – and address – parts of the public realm. Where this happens, careful thought will be needed to ensure activation and visual interest.
- The panel would also encourage the design team to explore further how the adjacent buildings frame external spaces, and how different elevational treatments will ‘talk’ to each other.

Next Steps

The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers.

Appendix 4 – Plans and Images

The Illustrative Masterplan



Heights of illustrative masterplan



Heights of Illustrative Masterplan
(heights exclude undercroft and basement levels)

- 13+ storeys
- 7-12 storeys
- 2-6 storeys

Reserved matters application

Boundary for Buildings D3 and D4 shown in red



Basement level plan under Building D4



Ground floor level plan - Building D3 and D4



Townscape views of Building D3



View south along Moselle Walk with Building D3 on the right. Brickwork feature alongside path reflects position of historic gasometer base.



View showing Building D3 from the Moselle Walk



View of the approach to Building D3 from the central gardens



View of the approach to Building D3 entrance from public courtyard



View looking towards Building D3 from within the central gardens



Building D3 view towards D4 from central courtyard



View of Building D3 rooftop amenity space.

Townscape views of Building D4



View 1 towards D4 from Brook Road



View 2 towards D4 from Brook Road



View from building showing possible ground floor facade



View of Building D4 from along the Moselle Walk, east façade of D3 to the left