

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

### **1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS**

**Reference No:** HGY/2020/0795

**Ward:** Noel Park

**Address:** Former Petrol Filling Station, 76-84 Mayes Road, N22

**Proposal:** Redevelopment of the site to provide a single building of between 4 and 9 storeys in height, comprising 75 residential units (C3) and 953 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1-A5, B1 and B8), with associated cycle parking, plant, refuse and recycling provision, landscaping and all necessary ancillary and enabling works.

**Applicant:** Caxton Road LLP

**Ownership:** Private

**Case Officer Contact:** Tobias Finlayson

**Date received:** 18/03/2020

- 1.1 The application has been referred to the Planning Sub-committee for a decision as it is a major application that is also subject to a s106 agreement.

### **1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.2.1 The proposed development is a well-designed, residential-led mixed-use scheme providing a suitable range of residential accommodation and flexible commercial floor space on this brownfield site within the metropolitan centre in accordance with National, Regional and Local Policy.
- 1.2.2 The proposed development would contribute to the housing needs of the borough by providing 75 residential units including affordable housing of 11 Low Cost Rented homes (3 Social Rented and 8 London Affordable Rent) and 14 Shared Ownership homes, representing 39.4% provision by habitable room.
- 1.2.3 The site is 'designated' in the Council's adopted Site Allocations DPD – identified as SA11 - Wood Green Library Site and also forms part of the emerging (preferred options) Draft Wood Green AAP. The layout, density, land-uses and design of the proposed development optimise the potential of the site whilst providing for a potential future link into the Haringey Heartlands in accordance with the objectives of the Wood Green Library Site Allocation and draft Wood Green AAP.

- 1.2.4 The design and scale of the proposed development is acceptable, supported by QRP and would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
- 1.2.5 The proposed development would not materially harm the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants.
- 1.2.6 The proposed development is car-free, promotes sustainable modes of transport and will not, subject to conditions and s106 obligations, result in significant parking, transport or highway safety impacts.
- 1.2.7 The proposed development will secure a number of s106 planning obligations including financial contributions to mitigate the residual impacts of the development.
- 1.2.8 In accordance with the NPPF, permission should be granted as there are no significant adverse or harmful impacts of doing so that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning 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 obligations 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 30 September 2020 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow.
- 2.4 That following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution 2.1 within the time period provided for in resolution 2.3 above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions listed in full at Appendix 1.

**Conditions summary** (the full text of Conditions is contained in Appendix 1 to this report):

Compliance:

1. Time limit for implementation (LBH Development Management)
2. Development in accordance with approved drawings and documents (LBH Development Management)
3. Ancillary B8 use only (LBH Development Management)
4. Café/Restaurant Opening Hours (LBH Development Management)
5. Internal Noise Levels within Residential Units (LBH Noise)
6. Plant Noise Design Criteria (residential or noise sensitive receptors) (LBH Noise)
7. Plant Noise Design Criteria (commercial) (LBH Noise)
8. Accessible dwellings (LBH Development Management)
9. Satellite antenna restriction (LBH Development Management)

Pre-commencement:

10. Construction Environmental Management Plan (LBH Carbon Management)
11. and Contamination (LBH Carbon Management)
12. PRE-COMMENCEMENT: Unexpected Contamination (LBH Carbon Management)
13. Piling/intrusive groundworks (Thames Water and Environment Agency)
14. Borehole management (Environment Agency)
15. Sustainable Urban Drainage System (LBH Drainage)
16. NRMM (LBH Carbon Management)
17. Energy Plan (LBH Carbon Management)

Prior to above ground works:

18. Materials (LBH Development Management)
19. Landscaping (LBH Development Management)
20. Sound insulation between commercial and residential (LBH Noise)
21. Cycle parking (LBH Transport)
22. Living Roofs and photovoltaic array (LBH Carbon Management)
23. BREEAM (LBH Carbon Management)
24. Secured by Design (Metropolitan Police)

Prior to installation/first occupation/first use:

25. Odour control equipment (commercial) (LBH Noise)
26. Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (LBH Carbon Management)
27. Combustion and Energy Plant (LBH Carbon Management)
28. Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management Plan (LBH Transport)
29. Electric Charging Points (LBH Transport)

### 30.Overheating (LBH Transport)

**Informatives summary** (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 1 to this report):

1. Working with the applicant (LBH Development Management)
2. S106 agreement (LBH Development Management)
3. CIL (LBH Development Management)
4. Party Wall Act (LBH Development Management)
5. Disposal of commercial waste (LBH Waste Mangement)
6. Sewers (Thames Water)
7. Underground Water Assets (Thames Water)
8. Pressure (Thames Water)
9. SbD accreditation – Met Advice (Thames Water)
- 10.Fire safety (London Fire Brigade)
- 11.Street numbering (LBH Transportation)

### **Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

#### Affordable Housing

##### **1. Affordable Housing:**

- a. Minimum of 39.4% by habitable room
- b. Tenure split: 12% Social Rent, 32% London Affordable Rent, 56% Intermediate (shared ownership) Housing
- c. London Affordable Rent levels and Shared Ownership income bands
- d. LB Haringey to be offered first rights to purchase all of the Low Cost Rented homes
- e. Triggers for provision (no more than 25% of Market Units occupied until 50% of Affordable Units delivered, no more than 50% of Market until 100% of Affordable Units delivered)

##### **2. Viability Review Mechanism:**

- a. Early Stage Review if not implemented within 2 years
- b. Break review if construction is suspended for 2 years or more

##### **3. Access Strategy:** To ensure and maintain appropriate access to different blocks and areas of amenity space including child play space

#### Future access to 'Caxton Mews' through-site link

##### **4. Future Public Access to 'Caxton Mews':** To ensure and maintain public access and future management and maintenance in line with the Site Allocation

#### Transportation

**5. Car-free Development**

- a. No residents therein will be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development.
- b. The applicant must contribute a sum of £4000 towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.

**6. Travel Plan (Residential):** Submit a Residential Travel Plan with the following measures:

- a. Appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator
- b. Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables, to every new resident
- c. Establishment or operation of a car club scheme, which includes the provision of 2 car club bays and two cars with two years' free membership for all residents and £50.00 (fifty pounds in credit) per year for the first 2 years. Car club operator to advise as required.
- d. The travel plan must include specific measures to achieve the 8% cycle mode share by the 5th year.
- e. £2,000 per year for 5 years for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives

**7. Travel Plan (Work Place):** Submit a Work Place Travel Plan with the following measures:

- a. Appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator working in collaboration with the Facility Management Team
- b. Provide, showers lockers and changing room facility for the work place element of the development
- c. £1,000 per year for 5 years for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives

**8. Sustainable and active travel contribution:** Contribution of £30,000 towards a package of measures to improve the walking and cycling conditions on the following key routes:

- 1. Caxton Road/Caxton Mews
- 2. Mayes Road
- 3. Brook Road
- 4. Hornsey Park Road

**9. Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)**

- a. Demonstrate how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Brook Road, Western Road, and the roads surrounding the site is minimised. Must take into consideration other sites that are being developed locally and were possible coordinate movements to and implement also measures to safeguard and maintain the operation of the local highway network

- b. A monitoring fee of £3,000

#### **10. Parking Management Plan**

- a. Parking Management Plan including details on the proposed locations for 3 blue badge space on the public highway in the locality of the site, that will be in place prior to occupation of the development
- b. Propose and agree locations for 5 further blue badge bays on the public highway and provide funding for their implementation to meet demands from the development as required.

#### **11. Section 278 - Highway Act 1980**

- a. Enter into agreement with the Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act to pay for any necessary highway works, which includes if required, but not limited to, footway improvement works, reinstatement of redundant crossovers, alterations to carriageway arrangements, associated street furniture relocation, carriageway markings, and associated traffic regulation order changes. Unavoidable works required to be undertaken by Statutory Services will not be included in the Highway Works Estimate or Payment
- b. Details of any temporary highways scheme required to enable construction or occupation of each phase of the development, which will have to be costed and implemented independently of the cost estimate for the above

#### Employment and Training

**12. Employment and Skills Plan:** Including Construction Apprenticeships Support Contribution and Skills Contribution (to be calculated in accordance with Planning Obligations SPD)

#### Carbon Management and Sustainability

**13. Temporary heating solutions:** Any temporary boilers installed in the development before connection to a district energy network shall be high efficiency condensing gas boilers.

#### **14. Future connection to District Energy Network:**

- a. Submission of Energy Plan
- b. Use all reasonable endeavours to negotiate a supply and connection agreement with the DEN within a 10-year window.

#### **15. Carbon offsetting**

- a. Developer to pay an agreed deferred carbon offset amount if no connection to a DEN is forthcoming after 10-years of completion.

#### Telecommunications

**16. Ultrafast broadband infrastructure:** Connections to be provided.

Construction

17. Commitment to **Considerate Constructors Scheme**

Monitoring

**18. Borough monitoring costs** in accordance with Paragraph 5.42 of the Planning Obligations SPD

- 2.5 In the event that members 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 2.3 above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
- (i) In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable housing and 2) viability review mechanism, the scheme would fail to foster mixed and balanced neighbourhoods where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies 3.9, 3.11 and 3.12, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP2, and Development Management DPD Policies DM11, DM13 and DM48.
  - (ii) In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) parking management plan, residential and commercial Travel Plans, Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments and a Construction Management and Logistics Plan (CMLP) and 2) financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, car club funding, sustainable and active travel and parking control measures, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP7 and Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM48.
  - (iii) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a carbon offset payment and updated energy plan, the proposal would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal is unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2, Strategic Policy SP4 and Development Management DPD Policies DM21, DM22 and DM48
  - (iv) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards child play space, the proposal would fail to deliver an acceptable

level of play and informal recreation based on the expected child population generated by the scheme. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policy 3.6, the Mayor's Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG and Local Plan Strategic Policy SP13.

- (v) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards construction training and local labour initiatives, the proposal would fail to deliver an acceptable level of support towards local residents accessing the new job opportunities in the construction phase of the scheme. As such, the proposal is contrary to Haringey's Planning Obligations SPD 20184.
- (i) In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme, the development would fail to mitigate the impacts of construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies 5.3 and 7.15, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP11 and Development Management DPD Policies DM1 and DM48.

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 or the Assistant Director Planning (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;
- (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Head of Development Management or 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 2.1 above to secure the obligations specified therein.



## **CONTENTS**

- 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
- 4.0 CONSULATION
- 5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
- 6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
- 7.0 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
- 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

## **APPENDICES**

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| Appendix 1 | Conditions and Informatives                  |
| Appendix 2 | Plans and Images                             |
| Appendix 3 | Internal and External Consultation Responses |
| Appendix 4 | Local Representations                        |
| Appendix 5 | DM Forum Summary                             |
| Appendix 6 | QRP Reports                                  |

### 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS

#### 3.1 Proposed development

##### Overview

- 3.1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the following:

*Redevelopment of the site to provide a single building of between 4 and 9 storeys in height comprising 75 residential units (C3) and 952 sqm of flexible commercial floor space (Use Classes A1-A5, B1 and B8), with associated cycle parking, plant, refuse and recycling provision, landscaping and all ancillary works*

##### Scale

- 3.1.2 The proposed new built form is divided into several separate volumes, breaking up the massing of the proposed development. Starting by creating a perimeter block for active frontages with set-backs from the site boundaries, the built form then extends upwards with elements of 4, 6, 7 and 9 storeys proposed.
- 3.1.3 The tallest element of the building (9 storeys) is located along the eastern site boundary, adjacent to the large built-mass of The Mall. The mass of the building then steps down to the west and Caxton Road, to four storeys.

##### Proposed residential units

- 3.1.4 A total of 75 residential units are proposed as set out below:

Unit type	Number of units	Proposed mix
One bedroom	38	50.7%
Two bedroom	26	34.7%
Three bedroom	11	14.7%

- 3.1.5 The residential units will be accessed from one of two cores at ground floor level facing onto Caxton Road. Deck access, beginning at first floor podium level, would provide the main circulation route from the core to each home.
- 3.1.6 Affordable housing of 39.4% (by habitable room) will be provided and will include 11 Low Cost Rented homes (3 Social Rented and 8 London Affordable Rent) and 14 Shared Ownership homes.

##### Flexible commercial use

- 3.1.7 The proposed development includes 953sqm (GIA) of flexible commercial floor space (A1-A5, B1 with ancillary B8), which will be located on the ground floor of the building facing Mayes Road and Caxton Road, and extending up to the first floor along the eastern site elevation, along a new outdoor/yard space.

#### Amenity space, landscaping and public realm

- 3.1.8 The residential units would benefit from private balconies (inset balconies are proposed facing onto Mayes Road to provide additional noise protection) and terraces and two communal roof terraces. At first-floor level, above the podium, is a further communal courtyard amenity area in the centre of the site. These communal areas (residents will be able to visit either through fob access) also include sufficient child play space.
- 3.1.9 The site is currently 'brownfield' and dominated by the site hoardings and limited width footways that are interrupted by three vehicle accesses relating to the previous Petrol Filling Station use. The proposed development offers improvements to the landscape both around and within the site. These improvements include widened footways, achieved through setting the proposed building line back from the site boundary, higher quality hard landscaping materials and additional planting within the public realm.

#### Access, parking and servicing

- 3.1.10 There are currently three vehicle accesses to the site however, given the development will be 'car-free' and serviced from on-street, they are not required and the kerb will be reinstated, which will be secured within the s278 agreement.
- 3.1.11 Given the high PTAL (5) of the site, the proposed development will be car free and therefore designated 'permit-free' with one 'blue badge' disabled parking space provided on-street (Caxton Road) in close proximity to the site.
- 3.1.12 138 cycle parking spaces for residents within dedicated cycle stores within the ground floor of the building, with an additional 10 short stay spaces and a further 9 cycle spaces for the commercial element will be provided.
- 3.1.13 Service/delivery vehicle movements will be accommodated via on-street servicing on Caxton Road

#### Amendments since submission

- 3.1.14 Since the application was submitted and publically consulted upon, the following amendments have been made to the proposed development:
- The introduction of social rented units within the affordable housing provision; and

- The removal of the vehicle access on Mayes Road and change to servicing on-street from Caxton Road.

### **3.2 Site and surrounding context**

- 3.2.1 The site, with an area of 0.2ha, is located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Mayes Road and Caxton Road, Wood Green.
- 3.2.2 This brownfield, town centre site, is currently vacant and hoarded, but was previously occupied by a petrol filling station (PFS), which was removed a number of years ago.
- 3.2.3 To the north and east, the site is bound by a vehicle ramp serving the Wood Green Mall main car park, with the main shopping centre located beyond, to the east. To the north, beyond the vehicle ramp, is a community centre and to the west the site is bound by Caxton Road, with residential properties on the opposite side of the road as with Mayes Road to the south.
- 3.2.4 The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), with surrounding residential streets subject to a combination of resident permit holder only restrictions, pay and display bays, single/double yellow line restrictions and marked on-street disabled parking bays.
- 3.2.5 The site is not located within a Conservation Area and does not contain any statutorily listed or locally listed buildings.
- 3.2.6 The site is subject to a number of designations, namely:
- Site Allocation DPD 2016 – SA11 - Wood Green Library
  - Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP) (Preferred Options) 2018 – part of SA9 Wood Green Town Centre West;
  - Wood Green Growth Area;
  - Wood Green Metropolitan Centre
  - Wood Green Primary Shopping Area
  - Tall Building Growth Areas, Wood Green/Heartlands
- 3.2.7 The site has a PTAL of 5 (very good) and is well connected to public transport modes, including a number of bus routes, Wood Green Underground Station and shops and services within the wider town centre. The site is located approximately a 4-minute walk from Barratt Gardens and Wood Green Common to the northwest.
- 3.2.8 The Site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk – 0.01% annual probability of fluvial or tidal flooding). The Moselle River (75% of which is culverted), is located to the east, outside of the application site boundary.

### **3.3 Relevant planning history**

- 3.3.1 2002: Planning permission (HGY/2002/0299) granted for installation of 3 x 1 tonne LPG tanks in compound and new forecourt.
- 3.3.2 1974: Advertisement consent (OLD/1974/0746) granted for display of non-illuminated fascia sign, illuminated projected box sign and illuminated forecourt pole sign.
- 3.3.3 1973: Planning permission (OLD/1973/0769) granted for erection of petrol filling station and car showroom.

### **3.4 Consultation and Community Involvement**

#### *Statement of Community Involvement*

- 3.4.1 The applicant has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) with the application. The SCI notes that the applicant undertook a public exhibition and consulted with a range of stakeholders in early 2020.

#### *Development Management Forum*

- 3.4.2 Emerging proposals were presented at a Development Management (DM) Forum on 19 February 2020. A summary of comments from the DM Forum are attached as **Appendix 5**.

#### *Planning Sub-Committee Pre-Application Briefing*

- 3.4.3 The proposal was on the agenda to be presented to the Planning Sub-Committee at a Pre-Application Briefing on 9 March 2020. However, due to the preceding items on the agenda, there was insufficient time to consider the item.

#### *Quality Review Panel*

- 3.4.4 The emerging proposals were considered by Haringey's Quality Review Panel (QRP) on 4 December 2019 and on 12 February 2020. The QRP Reports following these reviews are attached as **Appendix 6**.

## **4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

#### Internal:

LBH Head of Carbon Management  
LBH Regeneration  
LBH Cleansing Team

LBH Environmental Health (Pollution)  
LBH Environmental Health (Noise)  
LBH Policy  
LBH Design Officer  
LBH Transportation Group  
LBH Building Control  
LBH Housing Design and Major Projects  
LBH Flood, Surface Water and Drainage

External:

London Fire Brigade  
Metropolitan Police - Designing Out Crime Officer  
Arriva London  
Transport for London  
Thames Water Utilities  
Environment Agency

- 4.2 The full text of comments from internal and external consultees that responded to consultation is contained in **Appendix 3**. A summary of the consultation responses received is below:

Internal:

- 4.2.1 LBH Head of Carbon Management: No objection subject to conditions and s106 obligation
- 4.2.2 LBH Waste Management: No objection ('green' RAG status).
- 4.2.3 LBH Environmental Health (Pollution): No objection subject to standard conditions
- 4.2.4 LBH Environmental Health (Noise): No objection subject to standard conditions
- 4.2.5 LBH Transportation Group: No objection subject to conditions, s106 obligations and s278 agreement
- 4.2.6 LBH Design Officer: No objection
- 4.2.7 LBH Housing: No objection
- 4.2.8 LBH Flood, Surface Water and Drainage: No objection subject to conditions
- 4.2.9 LBH Building Control: No objection

External:

- 4.2.10 Thames Water: No objection subject to standard conditions and informatives
- 4.2.11 London Fire Brigade: No objection – noted need to conform to Part B of the Building Regulation
- 4.2.12 Metropolitan Police - Designing Out Crime Officer: No objection subject to conditions
- 4.2.13 Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions
- 4.2.14 Transport for London: No objection subject to conditions

## **5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 The following consultation was undertaken in accordance with national requirements under the Town and Country Planning (Development Procedure) (England) Order 2015 as well as the Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2017:
- 871 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties notified by letter (advising consultation period until 05/06/2020)
  - 1 charity (Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust)
  - 2 site notices displayed near the application site on 11 May 2020
  - 1 press notice placed in the local paper on 13 May 2020
- 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: 43  
Objecting: 42  
Comment / Neither: 1
- 5.3 The following Member of Parliament made representations:
- Catherine West – Labour MP for Hornsey and Wood Green
- 5.4 The following local groups/societies made representations:
- Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust
- 5.5 The following Councillor made representations:
- Councillor Brabazon
  - Councillor Gordon
- 5.6 The fuller summary of representations received and the officer response are set out in **Appendix 4**. A summary of issues that are material considerations is given below:

#### Principle and Housing:

- Tenure segregation is contrary to relevant planning policies
  - housing in separate blocks
  - separate deck access
  - separate roof amenity and child play provision
- Failure to define any social housing rental offer
- Lack of family-sized housing
- In breach of the Equality Act 2010
- Market housing will increase borough population with people from outside the area
- Pressure on existing infrastructure and services

#### Size, Scale and Design:

- Excessive height and scale
- Overdevelopment of the site – should be low density
- Out of keeping with local character

#### Amenity provision:

- Child play space segregated by tenure
- Play space is unsafe
- Lack of green/public space for general public
- Opportunities for contribution towards upgrading, maintaining and improving existing open spaces

#### Neighbouring Residential Amenity:

- Overshadowing
- Increased overlooking
- Loss of day/sunlight
- Increased sense of enclosure/overbearing

#### Parking, Transport and Highways:

- Insufficient parking provision including for self-employed
- Increased road congestion
- Construction traffic impacts

#### Other Matters:

- Role of Haringey Council's planning team in bringing such an unacceptable proposal forward should be investigated

## **6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

#### **6.1.1 Policy framework:**

- Key planning policy context update



- National policy
  - The Development Plan
- 6.1.2 Principle of the development:
- Comprehensive redevelopment
  - Redevelopment of the site
  - Quantum of development
  - Flexible commercial uses
  - Housing provision
  - Density
  - Dwelling unit mix
  - Summary
- 6.1.3 Affordable housing
- Policy background
  - Amount, type, location
  - Affordable Housing Dwelling Mix
  - Affordability
  - Viability assessment and review
  - Summary
- 6.1.4 Design and appearance
- Policy context
  - Quality Review Panel
  - Masterplan and Streetscape Character
  - Form, Pattern of Development, Bulk and Massing
  - Elevational Treatment, Fenestration, including Balconies and Materials
  - Conclusion
- 6.1.5 Quality of residential accommodation
- Unit size, quality and aspect
  - Child play space
  - Daylight and sunlight provision
  - Privacy of future occupants
  - Inclusive access
  - Security
  - Noise
- 6.1.6 Impact on neighbouring residential amenity
- Daylight and sunlight impacts
  - Privacy and outlook
  - Noise
  - Construction impacts
- 6.1.7 Transportation, parking and highway safety

#### 6.1.8 Energy, climate change and sustainability

- Lean Carbon Savings
- Clean Carbon Savings
- Green Carbon Savings
- Overall Carbon Savings
- Overheating
- Sustainability
- Conclusion

#### 6.1.9 Environment, energy and climate change

- Air quality
- Land contamination
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology

#### 6.1.10 Fire safety

#### 6.1.11 S106 mitigation/planning obligations

### 6.2 Policy framework

#### National policy

6.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (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 '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.'

6.2.2 The NPPF also 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 Development Plan

6.2.3 For the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, at this particular site, the Development Plan includes the London Plan (2016), Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013 with alterations 2017), Haringey Site Allocations DPD (2017), Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and the Draft Wood Green Area Action Plan – preferred options (2018).

### *The London Plan*

- 6.2.4 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, setting out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London over the next 20–25 years. The London Plan (2016) sets out several 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.
- 6.2.5 The current London Plan is the adopted Development Plan, but the Draft London Plan is a material consideration in planning decisions although it currently has limited weight. The significance given to it is a matter for the decision maker, but the draft plan gains more weight as it moves through the process to adoption.
- 6.2.6 The draft new London Plan has now progressed through Examination in Public (EiP) and the GLA have recently published (December 2019) an Intent to publish version of the Plan showing all of the Mayor's suggested changes following EiP. The SoS has made comments on the latest draft in March 2020 and has requested further modifications be made.

### *Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017)*

- 6.2.7 In 2017 Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies document was updated to reflect the increasingly challenging borough-wide housing and affordable housing targets of 19,802 and 7,920 homes respectively.

### *Haringey Development Management Policies (2017)*

- 6.2.8 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.

### *Haringey Site Allocations DPD (2017)*

- 6.2.9 The Site Allocations DPD identifies the Site within a wider allocation (SA11 Wood Green Library) and as being suitable for comprehensive redevelopment to deliver mixed-use development consisting of town centre uses at ground and first floor level, with residential uses above.

### *Draft Wood Green Area Action Plan (2018)*

- 6.2.10 The Council is in the process of preparing the Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP) (Preferred Options - February 2018) and a further draft is expected to be consulted upon later in 2020. The site forms part of site allocation SA9. Given

its current status, it is considered to have relatively limited weight in the decision-making process. Notwithstanding, the design and layout of the proposed Development has sought to reflect a number of core aspirations of the latest draft (as well as the adopted Site Allocation SA11), including future proofing a potential pedestrian link along the eastern boundary of the site to connect the High Road to Wood Green's western heartland.

#### *Other relevant policy documents*

6.2.11 Other policy documents that are material to the consideration and determination of this application include supplementary planning guidance and documents prepared by both the Greater London Authority and the London Borough of Haringey including:

- Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (August 2017)
- GLA SPG 'Shaping neighbourhoods: play and informal recreation' (2012)
- LBH Planning Obligations (October 2014)
- LBH Sustainable Design and Construction (March 2013)

### **6.3 Principle of development**

#### Comprehensive development

6.3.1 Development Management DPD Policy DM55 states: "Where development forms part of an allocated site, the Council will require a masterplan be prepared to accompany the development proposal for the wider site and beyond, if appropriate, that demonstrates to the Council's satisfaction, that the proposal will not prejudice the future development of other parts of the site, adjoining land, or frustrate the delivery of the site allocation or wider area outcomes sought by the site allocation".

6.3.2 The application includes an indicative master plan for the whole of the Site Allocation (SA11) demonstrating that the design and massing of the proposed development works on a standalone basis but also importantly, would not impact upon or prejudice the ability of other sites within the allocation to be viably brought forward for development. Furthermore, the set-backs from the site boundary and the introduction of Caxton Mews are designed to future proof for any development that may come forward at the adjacent shopping mall site or the site to the north. The proposed development therefore accords with the adopted Site Allocation DPD, the emerging Wood Green AAP and Development Management DPD policy DM55.

#### Redevelopment of the site

6.3.3 The principle of a mixed use residential and commercial development at this site is considered acceptable in a highly accessible town centre location which is within a designated Growth Area and identified as an Opportunity Area in the

Intend to Publish London Plan (2020). Policy SD1 of the Intend to Publish London Plan states that development should be prioritised within Opportunity Areas, on brownfield land, on sites which are well-connected by existing or planned tube and rail stations, and within town centres which this site is.

- 6.3.4 The subject site is currently vacant and has been for several years and therefore is not optimizing its potential to deliver benefits. As noted above, Wood Green is identified as a key strategic location for future development in adopted and emerging regional and local planning policy. The site forms part of a wider Site Allocation for comprehensive redevelopment, and the proposed development would result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site, and therefore would make efficient and effective use of the site.
- 6.3.5 Given the above, the principle of redeveloping the site to help meet the borough's development needs, fully accords with national, regional and local planning policy and guidance.

#### Quantum of development

- 6.3.6 Policy SP1 of the Local Plan Strategic Policies document states that the Council expects development in Growth Areas to maximise site opportunities. The Wood Green Library Site Allocation (SA11) does not specify how many dwellings or how much commercial floor space should be delivered at the former petrol filling station, rather the site is expected to contribute to the overall target of 358 net residential units and 2,783 sqm of commercial floor space within the wider allocation. It is noted that the Site Allocations quanta are minimums, and therefore in this highly accessible, town centre urban location the proposed quantum and density of this proposed development is considered acceptable from a land-use perspective.

#### Flexible commercial uses

- 6.3.7 The site is located within a Primary Shopping Area and a Metropolitan Town Centre. The introduction of 953 sqm floor space of flexible commercial units would therefore be appropriate at ground and first floor levels, and is welcomed. In this regard the proposed development therefore complies with Development Management DPD Policy DM41 and London Plan Policy SD6, which support new commercial development within existing town centres with the aim of bolstering their vitality and viability. Given the site is not currently designated frontage, and it is located away from the primary shopping frontages, the proposed range of town centre uses proposed for the western frontage (A1-A5) is acceptable as it would not undermine the policy aims but rather compliment and support the existing range of uses in the existing designated primary shopping frontage in the town centre.

- 6.3.8 The proposal to include B1 floor space for SMEs to be located in the dual height western elevation (termed 'Caxton Mews') is also supported as appropriate town centre uses in line with Local Plan policies. In addition, the proposed commercial uses would provide a significant uplift in employment yield at the site, particularly as it is currently vacant and has been for several years. Furthermore, this will provide, in the short term, attractive 'maker space' for Caxton Mews and in the long term, potential high-quality frontage for a potential connection from Western Heartlands to Wood Green Town Centre in line with the aims and objectives of the Site Allocation and emerging Wood Green AAP.
- 6.3.9 However, the inclusion of B8 use class within the flexible uses proposed is generally not a use acceptable within town centres. In light of the submitted commercial strategy which highlights that the employment space will be for maker space/artists' studios, and given the difficult commercial market, an aspect of storage associated and ancillary with B1 uses could be acceptable in this instance. It is recommended that the B8 use is clearly tied, by way of the imposition of a condition, to those units that would require this flexibility to be attractive to the local market for creative flexible employment space.
- 6.3.10 Given the above, the proposed flexible commercial units will greatly contribute towards the regeneration of Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre by enhancing its offer and providing high quality retail space and space for SME businesses. The proposed development will therefore sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre network and its inclusion would be compliant with regional and local policy framework.

#### Housing provision

- 6.3.11 Local Plan policies SP1, SP2 and SP10 seek to maximise the supply of housing to meet London and local housing targets. This is in line with London Plan policy 3.3, which provides explicit strategic support for the provision of housing within London and sets a target for the Council to deliver a minimum of 15,019 homes in the Plan period 2015-2025. This target is set to increase with the adoption of the draft London Plan where policy H1 sets a target of 19,580 net completions of homes in the draft plan period of 2019/20-2028/29. This yields an annualised target for Haringey of 1,958 homes.
- 6.3.12 The Haringey Site Allocations DPD identifies and allocates development sites with the capacity to accommodate new homes. The wider Wood Green Library area is allocated in the Site Allocation DPD (SA11) as an appropriate place for residential development alongside a mix of town centre uses and has an indicative development capacity of 358 net residential units and 2,783 sqm of town centre floor space. As no new development within SA11 of either residential units or town centre floor space has come forward since the adoption of the Site Allocation DPD, the proposed 75 units and 953 sqm of town centre

floor space is welcome and as previously noted, is acceptable in terms of quantum within the overall site allocation (SA11).

- 6.3.13 Given the above, the principle of housing provision (alongside commercial uses) is acceptable and most common in such locations. An assessment of density and dwelling mix is set out in the sections below.

#### Density

- 6.3.14 London Plan Policy 3.4 indicates that a rigorous appreciation of housing density is crucial to realising the optimum potential of sites. While the draft London Plan proposes to remove the London Plan's density matrix and promotes optimising site capacity through the design-led approach, the current adopted London Plan remains part of the Development Plan for the site.
- 6.3.15 The supporting text of London Plan Policy 3.4 indicates that it is not appropriate to apply the London Plan Density Matrix and its thresholds mechanistically. Its density ranges for particular types of locations are broad, enabling account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential including local context, design and transport capacity which are particularly important, as well as the availability of social infrastructure.
- 6.3.16 The Mayor's Housing SPG also notes that where it can be demonstrated that infrastructure and amenity space requirements can be met outside the site, consideration should be given to developing at the higher end of the appropriate density range.
- 6.3.17 The application site is within a "central" setting - areas with very dense development, a mix of different uses, large building footprints and typically buildings of four to six storeys, located within 800 metres walking distance of an International, Metropolitan or Major town centre and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5. The Mayor's density matrix (Table 3.2 of the current London Plan) sets a target range of 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) for residential developments in this type of location and PTAL. In terms of units per hectare, London Plan Table 3.2 advises 215-405 units per hectare (u/ha). The matrix is not due to be carried forward into the new London Plan, in favour of a design-led approach. However, it offers a good 'guide'.
- 6.3.18 The application proposes 198 habitable rooms within a 75 units (u) on a site area of 0.2 hectare (ha). This equates to a density of 990 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) and 375 units per hectare (u/ha). The proposed development therefore represents a density considered as being suitable in the existing London Plan.

#### Dwelling unit mix

- 6.3.19 London Plan Policy 3.8 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. Draft London Plan Policy H12C notes that boroughs should not set prescriptive dwelling size mix requirements (in terms of numbers of bedrooms) for market homes.
- 6.3.20 Development Management DPD 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 Haringey's Housing Strategy does not set out a target dwelling mix for market housing. However, draft Wood Green AAP Policy WG2(3) states that sites will be required to deliver a mix of sizes of units across the AAP area, including ensuring an appropriate mix of 1, 2, and 3+ bedroom properties are created. New family housing will be focussed (unlike the application site) outside of the town centre and Cultural Quarter, in the Zone More Suitable for Family Housing.
- 6.3.22 The overall housing mix of housing within the proposed development is:

Unit type	Number of units	Proposed mix
One bedroom	38	50.66%
Two bedroom	26	34.66%
Three bedroom	11	14.66%

- 6.3.23 The proposed dwelling mix is 85.4% 1 and 2 bed units and 14.6% family sized housing. The proposed mix is not considered to represent an unacceptable over-concentration of 1 and 2 bedroom units given the site's location within an area considered to be generally less suitable for family housing but also a highly sustainable i.e. in close proximity to public transportation. An assessment of the suitability of the dwelling mix as it relates to affordable housing is detailed later in this report.
- 6.3.24 Given the above, the proposed dwelling mix is suitable and appropriate having regard to policy provisions and the location of the development.

### Summary

- 6.3.25 Given the above, the principle of the proposed mixed-use development of this vacant, brownfield site is acceptable and consistent with existing National, Regional and Local Policy.

## **6.4 Affordable housing**

### Policy background



- 6.4.1 Paragraph 62 of the revised NPPF states that where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required. London Plan Policy 3.12 states that Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing having regard to affordable housing targets, and the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development.
- 6.4.2 Intend to Publish London Plan Policy H5 and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG set a strategic target of 50% affordable housing. Policy H6 identifies a minimum threshold of 35% (by habitable room) affordable housing, whereby applications providing that level of affordable housing, with an appropriate tenure split, without public subsidy, and meeting other relevant policy requirements and obligations to the satisfaction of the borough and the Mayor, can follow the "fast track route" set out in the SPG; this means that they are not required to submit a viability assessment or be subject to a late stage viability review.
- 6.4.3 Policy H6 of the 'Intend to Publish' London Plan and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG sets out a preferred tenure split of at least 30% low cost rent, with London Affordable Rent as the default level of rent, at least 30% intermediate (with London Living Rent and share ownership being the default tenures), and the remaining 40% to be determined in partnership with the Local Planning Authority and the GLA.
- 6.4.4 Policy SP2 of the Local Plan requires developments of more than 10 units to provide a proportion of affordable housing subject to viability to meet an overall borough target of 40%. Haringey's Planning Obligations SPD notes that if the proposed development is achieving 35% affordable housing on the site without grant funding, then the Council will not require a full viability appraisal and independent review.
- 6.4.5 Development Management DPD Policy DM13(A[b]) sets out the affordable housing tenure mix as 60% provision to be social/affordable rent and 40% intermediate housing.
- 6.4.6 Haringey's Housing Strategy 2017-22 (and Haringey's Intermediate Housing Policy statement 2018) provide guidance on the preferred tenure mix for affordable housing across the borough in order to deliver the overall aims of the Local Plan and meet housing need.
- 6.4.7 Revisions to the Housing Strategy agreed by Cabinet in February 2019 set out the Council's preference for general needs affordable housing as being Social Rent and, where this is not possible, London Affordable Rent and the preference for intermediate rented housing is London Living Rent or Discount Market Rent, at rent levels equivalent to London Living Rent.

Amount, type, location

- 6.4.8 The applicant originally proposed 39.4% affordable housing by habitable room (based on no grant funding) with the tenure split being 71.8% Rented (LAR) by habitable room and 28.2% Shared Ownership by habitable room.
- 6.4.9 Since submission, following negotiations with officers, and based on consultation responses, the applicant has revised the affordable housing offer by introducing 3 Social Rented units. As a result, whilst the overall affordable housing provision remains 39.4% by habitable room, the tenure split has changed to 44% Low Cost Rented (27.3% Social Rent and 72.7% London Affordable Rent) and 52.64% Intermediate (based on no grant funding). This is compared to the original affordable housing tenure mix of 60% Low Cost Rented (100% London Affordable Rent) and 40% Intermediate.
- 6.4.10 As a result of providing the 3 Social Rent Units, whilst the overall number of affordable housing units would remain the same as originally proposed (25), there would be 4 fewer Low Cost Rented units than originally proposed (11 as opposed to 15) but 4 additional Shared Ownership homes (14 as opposed to 10). This is considered an acceptable and policy compliant amount and type of provisions towards the borough wide affordable housing target.
- 6.4.11 A s106 planning obligation will ensure that the Council has the first right of refusal to purchase all of the Low Cost Rent housing (Social Rent and London Affordable Rent).
- 6.4.12 Block B will consist of the various affordable housing units and contain 25 units. It is accepted that the location of affordable properties within schemes is informed largely by experience of Registered Providers ("RP"), including Council's Housing Department, where grouping affordable housing units in the same area of the development allows effective management by the RP property management team, as opposed to a private management company, which can cause issues with third party involvement; more control over service charges going forward; and the ability for the RP to represent all their residents, and their interests, on wider development/estate issues.
- 6.4.13 Third parties have objected on the basis the tenures are not pepper-potted. However, this would make it difficult to secure an RP and influence service charges for tenants.
- 6.4.14 The applicant confirms that the scheme is designed so that all future residents will have access to all residential parts of the development, regardless of tenures. This includes sharing the same communal entrance and lobby area accessed off Caxton Road and which leads up to the communal podium landscaped play area, also shared. Each of the residential properties are

accessed from external walkways on each floor, with front doors overlooking each other and the podium.

- 6.4.15 There are two further proposed landscaped roof amenity areas, both accessible to all future residents. The larger of the two (160 sqm vs 142 sqm) is on the side of the building with the most family homes, which is also where the affordable homes are situated (Block B). Access to both areas are off the same shared external podium, and have the same specification of finishes proposed.
- 6.4.16 To ensure the development is inclusive and conducive to supporting a mixed and balanced community, the applicant has offered a section 106 obligation for an 'Access Strategy' (or similar report) to be submitted to the Council for approval. Through this, the LPA can seek to ensure all residents have access to all the amenity areas regardless of whether they own or rent their home.
- 6.4.17 A s106 planning obligation is recommended to ensure that the provision of affordable housing keeps pace with the provision of market housing, such that no more than 25% of approved Market homes can be occupied until 50% of Affordable homes are delivered and that no more than 50% of market homes can be provided until all the affordable homes are provided.

#### Affordable Housing Dwelling Mix

- 6.4.18 Haringey's Housing Strategy 2017-2022 (updated February 2019) identifies a targeted housing mix for affordable housing. The table below sets out the proposed development's dwelling mix by tenure and how this relates to the target mix for affordable housing.

	<b>1-bed</b>	<b>2-bed</b>	<b>3-bed</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Market</b>	30 (60%)	20 (40%)	0	50
<b>Low Cost Rent</b>	0	3 (27.3%)	8 (72.7%)	11
	Target (11%)	Target (45%)	Target (33%)	
<b>Intermediate</b>	8 (57.1%)	3 (21.4%)	3 (21.4%)	14
	Target 30%	Target 60%	Target 10%	

- 6.4.19 The proposed affordable housing dwelling mix is not in strict accordance with the Council's target however, given the circumstances of the site and the fact that Social Rent units are now being provided, which has meant changes to the affordable housing dwelling mix, this is considered to be acceptable in this instance. It is also noted a higher percentage of the rented units would be family units.

### Affordability

- 6.4.20 Of the Low Cost Rented homes, 27.3% would be at Social Rent levels and 72.7% at London Affordable Rent levels with the Council having the first right of refusal to these units.
- 6.4.21 London Affordable Rent is a form of Affordable Rent, for legal and regulatory purposes, but whereas nationally the cap on Affordable Rent is no more than 80% of market rent, the Mayor does not consider 80 per cent of market rent to be 'genuinely affordable' in most parts of London.
- 6.4.22 The starting point for London Affordable Rent are benchmarks which reflect the national formula rent cap for social rents, uprated by CPI for September 2016 plus one per cent. These benchmarks are uprated each April by the increase in CPI (for the previous September) plus one per cent and updated benchmarks are published by the GLA on an annual basis. Providers have the flexibility to charge less than the benchmark. This means that London Affordable Rents tend to be more expensive across London than Social Rents with the difference being smaller for larger bedroom units. In the case of Haringey, social rents tend to be lower than other boroughs. As a quantitative example, in this case, the weekly rent for a London Affordable Rent 3 bed unit would be £173.37 compared to £149.85 at Social Rent, £324.57 Local Housing Allowance (LHA) and £230.77 at Haringey affordable rent cap (50%) using 2020/21 benchmarks.
- 6.4.23 Once let, London Affordable Rent homes will be subject to rent-setting guidance issued by the Social Housing Regulator and will be subject to the annual one per cent rent reductions up to 2020. Providers will be able to re-let at up to the applicable benchmark level, uprated annually, or at an otherwise agreed level, as appropriate and in line with legislation and Regulator guidance. The benchmark rents do not include service charges, which may be charged in addition. Rents for London Affordable Rent homes have to be set in accordance with the Social Housing Regulator's Affordable Rent guidance and the landlord of these homes must be registered with the Social Housing Regulator. The applicant is prepared to include a clause within the s106 agreement requiring that any service charges levied will be fair and reasonable, in accordance with the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, and other relevant legislation.
- 6.4.24 The Intermediate Affordable Housing proposed is London Shared Ownership with a minimum of 25% share on equity and rental on the unsold equity of up to 2.75%. Haringey's Intermediate Housing Policy Statement 2018 sets out that applicants must have a gross household income of less than £90k to be eligible to purchase but units will be targeted at households with a maximum income of £40k for 1 and 2 bed properties, and £60k for larger properties. The purchasers should have enough household incomes that could support an initial purchase of between 25 per cent and 75 per cent of the value of a property.

- 6.4.25 To ensure that those who need the Intermediate Housing product most in the borough are able to express an interest first, a s106 obligation is recommended requiring that the Intermediate Housing be marketed in the following order, by band:

	Time period	Criteria
Band 1	Pre-completion and 3 months post -completion	Those living or working in Haringey with a maximum annual income of £40,000 for 1 and 2 bed properties and £60,000 for larger properties
Band 2	3-6 months post completion	Those living or working in London with a maximum annual income of £60,000
Band 3	From 6 months post completion	Those living or working in London with a maximum annual income of £90,000

#### Viability assessment and review

- 6.4.26 The applicant's offer of 39.4% affordable housing (by habitable room) means that the application benefits from adopted and emerging London Plan Policy for "fast track" consideration and does not need to be justified by a Financial Viability Assessment (FVA). Applications proposing 35% or more benefit from "fast track".
- 6.4.27 In order to ensure that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is delivered, s106 planning obligations securing Early Stage and Break Viability Review are recommended. These obligations would re-consider viability in the event that any planning permission is not implemented within two years and if a planning permission is implemented but then stopped.

#### Summary

- 6.4.28 Given the above, the proposed affordable housing offer is acceptable, subject to s106 obligations and Early and Break viability review mechanisms.

### **6.5 Design and appearance**

#### Policy context

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

- 6.5.2 Local Plan Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. Development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity, which is supported by London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6.
- 6.5.3 Development Management DPD Policy DM1 states that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to, building heights, form, scale and massing prevailing around the site, urban grain, sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines, rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths, active, lively frontages to the public realm, and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.
- 6.5.4 London Plan Policy 7.7 requires that tall buildings generally be limited to sites in opportunity areas, areas of intensification or town centres that have good access to public transport. However, tall buildings in Haringey are defined by the glossary of the Site Allocations Document as being of 10-storeys or more. It is therefore considered that the maximum 9-storey element of the proposed development does not represent a defined tall building.

#### Quality Review Panel

- 6.5.5 The Quality Review Panel (QRP) has been involved in the design evolution of the proposal, it having being presented at pre-application stage on two separate occasions. The two QRP reports are set out in full at **Appendix 6** with the summary from the final report as below:

*The Quality Review Panel feels that the design team has addressed many of its comments from the previous review in December 2019 and that, subject to some further small refinements, the scheme now promises high quality development.*

*The panel supports the approach taken to the massing and distribution of accommodation and uses, and welcomes inclusion of deck access to improve the quality and liveability of residential units. While the general approach is supported, the panel feels that scope for further refinement remains within the architectural expression of the proposals, and within the design of the main residential entrance onto Caxton Road*

- 6.3.1 A summary of the most recent Chair's review is below, in addition to the applicant's response and officer comments.

QQP Chair's Review Comments	Officer Response
-----------------------------	------------------

<i>Massing and development density</i>	
The panel welcomes the adjustments to the distribution of the massing, and considers that locating the tallest element to mark the termination of the view down Brook Road is appropriate.	Noted.
It also supports the approach to visually break up the mass into simpler elements, and feels that this is particularly successful at the frontages onto Caxton Road and Mayes Road.	Noted.
Creating a more uniform scale for the development fronting onto Caxton Road, as currently proposed, helps to establish a positive relationship to the existing houses opposite.	Noted.
<i>Place-making</i>	
The panel welcomes the wider masterplan, outlined to provide the immediate context of this development, in order to anticipate some of the future possibilities. It feels that the proposed scheme is a sensible and pragmatic response. Future links into the market hall and north east towards the library and the centre of Wood Green would be very desirable.	Noted.
It supports the clarity of the nature and roles of Caxton Road and Caxton Mews / New Road. The makers' space in the yard area seems well considered.	Noted.
<i>Layout of residential accommodation</i>	
The panel commends the design team's work to minimise single aspect residential units.	Noted.

It also supports inclusion of generous deck access circulation, and considers that pulling the deck away from critical windows as proposed could significantly mitigate privacy issues. The deck is also likely to have amenity value as a space to watch over children playing in the courtyard below. This could be accommodated in the detailed design of the deck.	The proposal maintains the deck access approach with 1.8m void space away from building façade for daylight and privacy. The “bridge” entering each home is chamfered to form a flexible space that could be for planting or seating. The deck itself is also a good space to watch over the play space in the communal courtyard on level 1.
The panel would encourage further work to unify the existing residential entrances by bringing the external stair inside, within the lobby area. This would create a single entrance, which could be very generous and glazed to allow light inside and views through - and up the stairs - to the landscaped courtyard beyond.	The applicant re-considered the entry sequence and the current proposal reflects the design discussions with the panel and has only one entry point. The grand stairs leading to the landscaped courtyard comes directly from the lobby. Glazed façades allows a view into the courtyard through lobby from Caxton Road.
<i>Architectural expression</i>	
The panel supports the simpler approach to the architectural expression and the articulation of the different block-forms within the proposals.	Noted.
It welcomes the use of a lighter brick within the courtyard area. However, it would encourage the design team to wrap the edge of the outer façade of darker brick round into the courtyard, rather than the lighter brick wrapping onto the outer façade, as currently proposed.	The applicant tested the brick details as suggested by the QRP. It is considered that the light brick wrapping around into the street facade is more appropriate as it better defines each volume and helps to break the overall scale especially along Caxton Road where the existing terraced houses are. Where the darker brick wrapped inwards, it gave the elevations the appearance of being thinly applied.
A more generous glazed residential entrance onto Caxton Road would be encouraged, as suggested above.	The glazed area to the lobby has been enlarged.
The panel asks whether a more muted colour scheme should be used	The colour scheme used for balconies and window frames has been reviewed



for balconies and window frames rather than black, which would result in quite a stark contrast.	and changed to dark grey, which is considered to match the proposed brick well.
In addition, the detailed design of the parapets and balconies could strike a better balance between achieving openness on the one hand and privacy and screening on the other.	The balustrades are proposed as a perforated metal which balances air and light penetration, views and the need for privacy and screening of life's 'detritus'.
Further consideration of how the relationship between the residential entrance on Caxton Road and deck access circulation above might be perceived would also be welcomed, in order to resolve any visually awkward juxtaposition in the elevation.	Two changes make the current circulation simpler and clearer. The external stair has been moved into the lobby area, making a single entering point into the communal courtyard. The two external escape stairs have been moved internally near the lifts. This change also helps resolve the visual impact the escape stairs had on the elevation. Both these changes have simplified the routes and wayfinding to the homes.
The quality of materials and construction, for example the bricks used, and the detailed design of the deck access, will be essential to the success of the completed scheme. The panel would support planning officers in securing this through planning conditions.	Noted.
<i>Next steps</i>	
The Quality Review Panel supports the proposals for development at Caxton Road, subject to some minor adjustments and refinements as outlined above.	Noted.

### Masterplan and Streetscape Character

- 6.5.6 As noted in the principle section of this report, the application includes a masterplan showing how the proposed development could fit into a likely redevelopment of the neighbouring Mall, Islamic Cultural Centre and Library sites in accordance with the Site Allocation as well as the potential development

at the Iceland site. The key master planning aspirations are the East-West Link for the High Road to Heartlands, greater east-west permeability generally and the new “Civic Heart” on the Library/Cultural Centre site. In addition, the submitted masterplan demonstrates how continued use of neighbouring identified potential development sites as they are at present, or with more modest change than a comprehensive redevelopment can be accommodated.

- 6.5.7 Given the aspirations of the Site Allocation but also the constraints and likely progress of redevelopment on adjoining and neighbouring site, officers’ conclusion is that the site be treated as an ‘island’. This would potentially allow for a public street frontage, onto a vibrant town centre type street, on all four, or certainly three sides (the one that is least likely being the north-eastern side onto the lower part of the car park ramp). Currently, the Mayes Road frontage is the most important, and that is likely to remain a street of fairly high importance, with a mixture of residential, employment and town centre functions and a need to have an active frontage. The likely potential future outcome is that the south-eastern side of the application site will become the main East-West Link from Wood Green Town Centre to Heartlands and beyond but in the short to medium term it will face the blank flank wall of The Mall. The proposed 2 storey workspaces, with double height frontages and windows, will mark and animate this frontage and be flexible enough to accommodate both immediate and various possible future settings. This East-West Link would continue across Mayes Road at this point and thence along Brook Road, and the southern corner of this development will partially close the vista along Brook Road. Hence the primary corner of the scheme is its southern corner, which is treated as a high point, a local landmark, with a prominent two storey base, marking and turning the corner of Mayes Road and the future East-West Link.

#### Form, Pattern of Development, Bulk and Massing

- 6.5.8 The proposed scheme is for a courtyard, podium block, with the four blocks enclosing a central space at 1st floor level, with the whole of the site being built on at the ground floor. People in the courtyard can have glimpses out (and people in the street have glimpses into the courtyard) through two gaps between the block along the north-western side of the site and those along the north-eastern and south-western sides, and the four sides rise to different heights; the lowest, north-western side to 4 storeys (3 storeys from the courtyard, the north-east and south-west sides to 7 storeys (6 from the courtyard – with the north-east side losing another floor at its north-western end, to 5 storeys from the street), and the highest south-eastern side to 9 storeys (8 from the courtyard).
- 6.5.9 This will give the proposal a modelled form from the outside, that responds to the differing nature of the surrounding context and reflects the transition from the 2 to 4 storey context to the north-west and the 8 storey plus context (with higher floor-ceiling heights in their commercial floors) of the existing Mall/Sky

City and emerging proposals for other neighbouring major development sites. This is an appropriate response in this location with urban character that inevitably has low rise nineteenth century suburban housing in close proximity to a high intensity metropolitan town centre of a central character as defined by the London Plan and as the council's Urban Character Study confirmed.

- 6.5.10 The gaps along the north-east façade, onto the quieter, narrower, lower-rise and more residential Caxton Road streetscape, will break up the grain and rhythm of this street frontage, which will add to the lower height of the proposal along this street in giving it a lower impact here.

#### Elevational Treatment, Fenestration, including Balconies and Materials

- 6.5.11 Officers note that the proposed modelling and massing concept is carried through into the proposed material choices, fenestration pattern and elevational composition. The application proposes a palette of three contrasting complimentary bricks, used on three contrasting elements, appropriate for their situations and chosen to compliment and reference existing local context. This is combined with window shape and proportions based on local precedent, with detailing such as window reveals and balcony balustrading appropriate to its function as well as picking up on existing local and nearby detailing including the window patterns in the Great Rose Window of Alexandra Palace.
- 6.5.12 Two different brick colours are proposed for the outside elevations; a darker brick based on colours of bricks typically found in the town centre, used to define the key corners of the development onto Mayes and Caxton Roads, and a lighter brick based on houses typically found in surrounding quieter streets, used to create variety and visually slim the tallest element. A third brick for the courtyard, which are contrasted further with an off white brick to the internal courtyard walls, thereby reflecting light into the courtyard and create an interesting, striking detail at corners, providing a hint of the courtyard from the street.

#### Conclusion

- 6.5.13 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in design terms and will not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### **6.6 Quality of residential accommodation**

- 6.6.1 London Plan policy 3.5 requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwellings to be of sufficient size and quality. The draft London Plan incorporates this approach in Policy D4.
- 6.6.2 Strategic Policy SP2 and Development Management DPD Policy DM12 reinforce this approach. The Mayor's Housing SPG sets out the space

standards for new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation is offered.

#### Size, quality and aspect

- 6.6.3 All residential units have been designed to comply with the standards set out in the London Plan, notably:
- All units achieve or exceed minimum space standards;
  - All units have a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m in principal rooms;
  - All units achieve compliance with Building Regulations M4 (2) and 10% of units achieve M4 (3).
- 6.6.4 Furthermore, all dwellings meet or exceed the private external amenity space in the London Plan, with private balconies or roof terraces. Privacy of amenity space is achieved by many balconies being recessed, and those that are not, having at least a partially solid balustrade. Many flats have larger roof terraces, exploiting the design which permits roof terraces in the steps in the blocks.
- 6.6.5 There are no single aspect flats in the whole development and this is a major benefit of the courtyard layout with “deck access”. All flats are at least dual aspect, many triple aspect, a commendable achievement in such a high density urban development.
- 6.6.6 The proximity of the car park access ramp along the eastern and northern site boundary has informed the design and layout of the units, including increasing the height of employment space along the eastern elevation.
- 6.6.7 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of unit size, quality and aspect.

#### Child play space

- 6.6.8 In accordance with policy 3.6 of the London Plan, development proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs. This policy position is carried through in Local Plan 2017 Strategic Policy SP13, which underlines the need to make provision for children’s informal or formal play space.
- 6.6.9 Based on the Mayor’s Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG and most recent play space calculator (v3.2), the proposed development would result in a total child yield of 29.5 children and therefore a total play space requirement of 295sqm.
- 6.6.10 The proposed on-site play space provision exceeds (by approximately 68.5 sqm) the total amount required as a result of the development’s child yield. The

applicant has given careful consideration to the safety of the play space areas on the upper levels, which at the same time, not resorting to 'cage like' structures that would dominate the parapet and be visually intrusive. As a result, the child play space areas on the upper levels are set back a minimum of 1.2m from the parapet, which are 1.2m high in accordance with Building Regulation requirements and will not include any equipment over 0.6m tall.

- 6.6.11 A condition requiring details of play equipment to be installed is recommended should permission be granted. In addition, the applicant has confirmed that all residents will have access to all of the roof amenity areas – regardless of tenure. To ensure this is maintained, a s106 obligation requiring submission and approval of an access strategy has been offered by the applicant and is recommended should planning permission be granted.
- 6.6.12 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of child play space provision.

#### Daylight and sunlight provision

- 6.6.13 The submitted Daylight and Sunlight assessment finds that the proposed development would achieve good levels of daylight to the proposed dwellings. The assessment finds that all the Living Rooms meet the standard recommended in the BRE Guide, including all the open plan Living/Dining/Kitchens meeting the higher kitchen standard, 90% of bedrooms meeting the bedroom standard, and only the separate kitchens not meeting the BRE daylight standard. For sunlight where the BRE Guide standard applies only to living rooms facing within 90° of due south; all those meet the standard, but they point out that 69% of living rooms do not face south. It is worth pointing out that in all flats where their living room does not face within 90° of due south, they will have other rooms that do face within 90° of due south, and that all residents have access to outdoor amenity spaces, some of which will get very large amounts of sunlight.
- 6.6.14 In the case of the outdoor amenity spaces, two of the spaces (the two roof terraces) receive exceptionally high levels of sunlight, with just the central podium courtyard not meeting the BRE Guide standard. However, this space was never likely to be a sunny space, and it is not unreasonable in a development with a variety of external amenity spaces for one of the three to be a shadier space. Furthermore, this space will be a busy circulation route as a result of residents entering the space to gain access to their flats and will likely receive a lot of artificial light spillage.
- 6.6.15 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in daylight and sunlight provision terms.

#### Privacy of future occupants

- 6.6.16 Within the development, most of the proposed habitable rooms face out, away from each other; only those that face into the central courtyard will be able to 'look' at each other. These flats will therefore lose an element of privacy from neighbours using the access balconies. However, the courtyard's width, at over 20m, and the placing of non-residential space close to the internal corners on one side of each corner, means there will be no material overlooking between residents' windows. Privacy is improved by moving the access balconies away from the face of the building, and adding planting beds. Furthermore, it is recognised that the affected windows are in all cases kitchens or second bedrooms, never living rooms, and that the movements of those passing by will be transitory, not prolonged.
- 6.6.17 With regards to privacy from the public realm, the whole of the residential accommodation is raised up to at least 1st floor level, with the southeast side at least at 2nd floor level. Therefore, there will be no loss of privacy to residents from the street or from the ramp to the Mall car park, which will always be below window cill levels of adjacent flats, with flats facing the ramp at the lowest applicable levels being carefully designed to have their primary windows facing away from or being well above the ramp.

#### Inclusive access

- 6.6.18 Local Plan Policy SP2 and Policy 3.8 of the London Plan require that all housing units are built to include a minimum of 10% wheelchair accessible housing or easily adaptable for wheelchair users (M4(3) and 90% 'accessible and adaptable' (M4(2)).
- 6.6.19 10% of the units have been designed to be in accordance with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations (Wheelchair adaptable), whilst the remaining units have been designed to be in accordance with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. Standard conditions will be imposed on the planning permission to ensure such provision.
- 6.6.20 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in inclusive access terms.

#### Security

- 6.6.21 London Plan Policy 7.3 requires development to reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour and contribute to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating. Local Plan Strategic Policy SP11 requires all development to incorporate solutions to reduce crime and the fear of crime by promoting social inclusion, creating well-connected and high-quality public realm that is easy and safe to use and apply 'Secured by Design' and Safer

Places principles. DMDPD Policy DM2 seeks to ensure that new developments have regard to the principles set out in 'Secured by Design'.

- 6.6.22 The applicant has worked with the Metropolitan Police Secured by Design (SBD) Officer to address several potential issues raised earlier in the process, particularly the relationship with the adjoining shopping mall and associated car parking ramp. The SBD Officer does not object to the proposed development subject to standard conditions requiring details of and compliance with the principles and practices of the Secured by Design Award Scheme. It is also recommended that a condition be placed on the planning permission requiring provision and approval of lighting details in the interests of security.
- 6.6.23 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in security and Secured by Design terms.

#### Noise

- 6.6.24 The application includes a Noise Assessment, which has been reviewed by Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO). Subject to recommended conditions requiring details of sound insulation, the EHO has no objection in terms of potential noise impacts on future occupiers of the proposed development.

### **6.7 Impact on neighbouring residential amenity**

- 6.7.1 London Plan 2016 Policy 7.6 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Development Management DPD 2017 policy DM1 states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development's users and neighbours.

#### Sunlight and daylight and overshadowing

- 6.7.2 The application includes a Daylight and Sunlight Report assessing the effect of their proposed development on neighbouring dwellings. The report has been prepared fully 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".
- 6.7.3 The assessment finds that the impact of the development on existing neighbouring residential properties is generally favourable for both daylight and sunlight, with only six neighbouring existing residential properties found to lose a noticeable amount of daylight, and no neighbours losing a noticeable amount of sunlight. The six properties that would lose a noticeable amount of daylight to any of their windows are no 3 Caxton Road (to one window), no. 1 Caxton (2

windows), no. 86 Mayes Road (to 3 windows; these 3 properties being opposite the site over Caxton Road), and to 63-67 Mayes (neighbouring houses opposite the site over Mayes Road; to 13 of 16 windows).

- 6.7.4 In all cases the impacted houses or flats are dual aspect (no 86 is triple aspect), with their other aspects unaffected, and they currently benefit from the unusual situation of having a vacant site opposite them. All the affected windows would retain Vertical Sky Components (VSC) of over 20%, where 27% is the recommended level in the BRE Guide, and levels over 20% are considered good. The losses are generally only to 60 or 70% of their current value (where 80% is considered not noticeable), only one is as low as 50%, and generally their No Sky Line (NSL) does still meet the BRE Guide recommended levels.
- 6.7.5 In the case of higher density developments, it should be noted that the BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations; as in London, the Mayor of London's Housing SPG acknowledges. In particular, the 27% 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. Therefore, full compliance with the BRE Guide is not to be expected.
- 6.7.6 The losses of some light to neighbouring properties must be considered in the round. It is not considered so significant or affecting a large number so as to outweigh the positive benefits of the scheme.

#### Privacy and outlook

- 6.7.7 All residential neighbours adjacent to the application site are on the other side of streets, being Caxton Road to the northwest and Mayes Road to the southwest. The community centre is opposite the application site to the north and the Mall to the east. Furthermore, there would be no instances where the proposed development would be looking at the back gardens and rear elevations of houses, where residents would have a greater reasonable expectation of privacy, except in the case of the flank view of no 86 Mayes Road, across Caxton Road. In this one case, that rear elevation is already visible from Caxton Road itself, and benefits from significant screening from existing trees.
- 6.7.8 Additionally, the width of the surrounding streets and resulting separation distance provides additional privacy to existing neighbours from the proposed development, particularly as it is generally accepted that the human face cannot be recognised over 18m away. The separation distance between Mayes Road



properties' front elevation to the back of pavement hoarding line, (from which the proposed building line is back another a further 1m), is 21m. The equivalent Caxton Road separation is 18.5m, with the proposed building line set back a minimum of 1.5m from the hoarding line.

- 6.7.9 Given the above, the proposed development would not result in any material levels of overlooking or loss of privacy or outlook for the occupants of neighbouring residential properties

#### Noise

- 6.7.10 London Plan policy 7.15 states that development proposals should seek to manage noise by avoiding significant adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development. This approach is reflected in Development Management DPD policy DM1, which states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of amenity for neighbours addressing, among other matters, noise.
- 6.7.11 The application includes a Noise Assessment, which has been reviewed by Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO). Subject to recommended conditions relating to the construction phase and the commercial uses and plant, the EHO has no objection in terms of potential noise impacts on residential neighbours from the proposed development.

#### Construction impacts

- 6.7.12 The impacts of construction noise are temporary and are proposed to be controlled by condition, notably construction logistics and management plans. The Government's Covid19 response to extended working hours is noted, but is temporary. The applicant will also be required to join the Considerate Constructors Scheme (as per the S106 agreement) with proof of registration provided to the Local Authority.
- 6.7.13 It is also noted that hours of construction are controlled by other legislation (Control of Pollution Act) and an informative is recommended in this regard.

### **6.8 Transportation, parking and highway safety**

- 6.8.1 The NPPF is clear at Paragraph 108 that in assessing development proposals, decision makers should ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have been taken up.
- 6.8.2 London Plan Policy 6.1 seeks to support development that generates high levels of trips at locations with high levels of public transport accessibility. This policy also supports measures that encourage shifts to more sustainable modes and promotes walking by ensuring an improved urban realm. London Plan

Policies 6.9 and 6.10 address cycling and walking, while Policy 6.13 sets parking standards.

- 6.8.3 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 Development Management DPD Policies DM31 and DM32.
- 6.8.4 Development Management DPD Policy DM32 states that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where there are alternative and accessible means of transport available, public transport accessibility is at least 4 as defined in the Public Transport Accessibility Index and a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be provided prior to the occupation of the development.
- 6.8.5 This application seeks to redevelop the former petrol filling station site on the corner of Mayes Road and Caxton Road within Wood Green Town Centre, to provide 75 residential units and 952 sqm of commercial floor space.
- 6.8.6 The development is proposed as a 'car free/permit free' development and in principle this is appropriate and acceptable subject to formal designation as a permit free/car free development. No off highway blue badge parking is proposed, which does not meet the requirements of the London Plan, so it will be necessary for the applicant to provide 3 spaces on street to meet the lower 3% threshold required from occupation of the development, and propose and fund appropriate locations for another 5 spaces to meet the 10% London Plan target and potential future demands if necessary. The Parking Stress Survey recorded spare parking capacity available in the locality of the site, which should comfortably accommodate any parking demands arising from the standard, non-wheelchair user residential units in the development, however these are expected to be minimal.
- 6.8.7 Cycle parking has been proposed to numerically meet the requirements of the forthcoming/draft London Plan, with the appropriate amounts of parking for larger cycles and the like. Subject to sight of full details required by condition, this will be acceptable. The servicing arrangements have evolved during the consideration of the application and all servicing will now take place from the kerbside in Mayes Road. A Delivery and Servicing Plan will be required to cover the changes including the permitted hours for loading activity.
- 6.8.8 A number of minor changes to the public highway will result from the development, including the reinstatement of redundant crossovers, changes to on street waiting and loading restrictions, and the applicant will need to enter into a S278 agreement to cover these. It is also considered appropriate that this

process includes provision of the improved pedestrian crossing facility proposed for Mayes Road and an improved public realm along Caxton Road. As an alternative to delivery via the S278 process, the applicant could make a financial contribution to the Highways works to deliver these measures.

- 6.8.9 Contributions towards other schemes and initiatives that are being developed to improve connectivity to and from the site and the wider area to Wood Green Town Centre are also considered appropriate to contribute towards achieving travel plan and Mayoral Targets for active travel.

### Summary

- 6.8.10 Given the above, subject to conditions and s106 obligations, the proposed development is acceptable in transportation, parking and highway safety terms.

## **6.9 Energy, climate change and sustainability**

- 6.9.1 The NPPF, London Plan Policies 5.1-5.3 and 5.5-5.9, Local Plan Policy SP4 and Development Management DPD Policies DM21 and DM22 set out the approach to climate change and require developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design. New development is expected to achieve the necessary energy and CO2 requirements within the London Plan and Haringey Local Plan or pay an off-set payment.
- 6.9.2 London Plan policy 5.9 seeks to reduce the impact of the urban heat island effect in London and encourages the design of places and spaces to avoid overheating and excessive heat generation. Major development proposals are expected to demonstrate how the design, materials, construction and operation of the development would minimise overheating and also meet its cooling needs. New development in London should also be designed to avoid the need for energy intensive air conditioning systems as much as possible.
- 6.9.3 The London Plan sets a target of 25% of the heat and power used in London to be generated through the use of localised decentralised energy systems by 2025. Where an identified future decentralised energy network exists proximate to a site it will be expected that the site is designed so that it can easily be connected to the future network when it is delivered. Connection to a future DEN will be secured by way of s106 obligation.

### Lean Carbon Savings

- 6.9.4 The applicant has proposed an improvement beyond Building Regulations by 18.2% through improved energy efficiency standards in the residential element and 17% improvement for the commercial element. This goes beyond the minimum 10% and 15% reduction respectively set in Policy SI2 in the Intended to Publish London Plan so is supported.

## Clean Carbon Savings

- 6.9.5 The Be Clean strategy to connect to the DEN in Wood Green is generally acceptable however, evidence should be provided that the DEN system was inputted into the SAP model and that the plant room is adequately sized for a substation. Therefore, a condition requiring provision and approval of such details prior to commencement is recommended.

## Green Carbon Savings

- 6.9.6 The energy assessment submitted with the application reviewed the installation of various renewable technologies and concluded that air source heat pumps (ASHPs) are the most viable for the commercial units and solar photovoltaic (PV) panels will deliver the Be Green requirement for the residential units. A total 7.24 tCO<sub>2</sub> of emissions are proposed to be reduced under Be Green measures. This represents a 6.95% reduction from the baseline for the residential and 22% reduction for the commercial elements.
- 6.9.7 The solar array is proposed to be made up of 86 PV panels at a 30° angle facing SW/SE, with an efficiency of at least 20%. The peak output would be 28 kWp, which is estimated to produce around 23,005 kWh of renewable electricity per year. This equates to a yearly saving of 5.36 tCO<sub>2</sub>. The carbon savings from ASHPs are 2.8tCO<sub>2</sub>/year, with a Coefficient of Performance (COP) of 3.4.

## Overall carbon savings

- 6.9.8 The overall predicted reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the development, from the Baseline development model (which is Part L 2013 compliant), shows an improvement of approximately 69% in residential carbon emissions and 39% improvement of commercial emissions. However, this is based on SAP10 factors and should be recalculated with SAP2012 carbon factors to take into account connection to the Decentralised Energy Network (DEN). A condition requiring submission and approval of a revised energy report prior to commencement is therefore recommended.
- 6.9.9 The remaining carbon emissions will need to be offset at £95/tCO<sub>2</sub>. A deferred carbon offset contribution mechanism will apply to this scheme as it is expected to connect to the DEN when this has been built.

## Overheating

- 6.9.10 The overheating modelling has been undertaken for all rooms and in line with CIBSE TM59 with TM49 weather files: DSY1-3 for 2020s weather pattern and the 2050s and 2080s future weather patterns. The results for DSY2 and 3 (2020s), and 2050s and 2080s show a significant number of the rooms risk overheating under Criteria 2. However, it is acknowledged that overheating

occurs mostly between 22:00 and 00:00, which is linked to thermal mass taking some time lose its heat through purge ventilation. A revised overheating report including overheating measures will be required to be submitted and approved prior to occupation.

#### Sustainability

- 6.9.11 Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD requires developments to demonstrate sustainable design, layout and construction techniques. The Sustainability section in the report sets out the proposed measures to improve the sustainability of the scheme.
- 6.9.12 The applicant submitted a revised BREEAM Pre-Assessment report showing a score of 58.62% is expected to be achieved, equivalent to 'Very Good' rating. a condition requiring prior to commencement, an accreditation certificate of such a score.

#### Conclusion

- 6.9.13 The Council's Carbon Management Officer concludes that based on the submitted responses and additional/amended information, the application can be supported in carbon management terms subject to conditions relating to an updated energy assessment, updated overheating report, mechanical ventilation and heath recovery report, living roofs and BREEAM accreditation.
- 6.9.14 Given the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable in energy, carbon reduction, overheating and sustainability terms.

### **6.10 Environment**

- 6.10.1 The NPPF and London Plan Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10 and 5.1 and Local Plan Policy SP4 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design, including the conservation of energy and water; ensuring designs make the most of natural systems and the conserving and enhancing the natural environment. The London Plan requires all new homes to achieve a zero carbon target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations.

#### Air quality

- 6.10.2 The NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) is consistent with the local air quality action plan. London Plan Policy 7.14 sets out the Mayor's commitment to improving air quality and public health and states that development proposals should minimise increased exposure to poor air quality.

- 6.10.3 At the local level, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP7 states that in order to control air pollution developers must carry out relevant assessments and set out mitigating measures in line with national guidance. This approach is reflected in DMDPD Policy DM23, which states that air quality assessments will be required for all major development and other development proposals, where appropriate.
- 6.10.4 The site falls within the LBH AQMA, which is a borough-wide designation due to measured exceedances of the air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (as PM<sub>10</sub>). The primary source of emissions of these pollutants in the borough is road traffic.
- 6.10.5 The application includes an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) demonstrating that the proposals will have a negligible impact upon existing air quality concentrations. Air quality for future residents is predicted to be good. An 'air quality neutral' assessment of the building and transport emissions concluded that these will not exceed the derived benchmarks and demonstrates compliance with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan.
- 6.10.6 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has assessed the report and confirms that having considered all the submitted supportive information, he has no objection to the proposed development in relation to air quality subject to the imposition of (standard) planning conditions and informatives should planning permission be granted.
- 6.10.7 Given the above, subject to condition, the proposed development is acceptable in air quality terms.

#### Land contamination

- 6.10.8 DMDPD policy DM32 requires development proposals on potentially contaminated land to follow a risk management-based protocol to ensure contamination is properly addressed and carry out investigations to remove or mitigate any risks to local receptors.
- 6.10.9 The application includes a Desk Study/Preliminary Risk Assessment that identifies potential sources of contamination including the potential for Made Ground associated with previous development operations on site and contaminated ground associated with historic use both on site and off site.
- 6.10.10 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has assessed the report and confirms that having considered all the submitted supportive information, he has no objection to the proposed development in relation to land contamination subject to the imposition of (standard) planning conditions and informatives should planning permission be granted.

6.10.11 Given the above, subject to conditions, the proposed development is acceptable in land contamination terms.

#### Flood risk and drainage

6.10.12 London Plan policy 5.13 and Local Plan Strategic Policy SP5 require developments to utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the drainage hierarchy.

6.10.13 Relevant policy also requires drainage to be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation. Further guidance on implementing London Plan Policy 5.13 is provided in the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG including the design of a suitable SUDS scheme.

6.10.14 The application includes a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Assessment for the proposed development showing the site located entirely within Flood Zone 1, meaning a low probability of flooding.

6.10.15 The Council's Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) Officer has assessed the drainage strategy for the proposed development and confirms that due to the limited space available, there are few opportunities to have SuDS solutions towards the top of the hierarchy. Therefore, the chosen SuDS are green roofs, permeable paving, attenuation tank and pumping station to manage the surface water before being discharged to the Thames Water network. The SuDs Officer advises that a management maintenance schedule has been provided for each SuDS, element and details of a backup system should be made available for the pumping station should the system fail and that the management maintenance must be in place for the lifetime of the development.

6.10.16 Based on the information provided, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) can accept the drainage strategy for the proposed development and requests by way of condition, a plan showing the overland flow path and final detailed drainage drawings.

6.10.17 Given the above, subject to condition, the proposed development is considered acceptable in flood risk and drainage terms.

#### Ecology

6.10.18 London Plan Policy 7.19 states that 'development proposals should wherever possible, make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity'. Local Plan Policy SP13 states that

development shall contribute to providing ecological habitats including through providing green roofs plus other methodologies.

6.10.19 The site is not designated for its nature conservation value. However, the application includes a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. The proposed design and landscape has been informed by the recommendation within the appraisal and would enhance the ecology value of the site. This would be through provision of the following (to be secured by condition):

- Native tree and shrub planting
- Inclusion of green roofs
- Nest boxes
- Insect towers
- Bee posts

6.10.20 Given the above, the proposed development would enhance the ecological value of the site is considered acceptable in ecology terms.

## **6.11 Fire safety**

6.11.1 Fire safety is generally assessed at Building Regulations stage along with other technical building requirements relating to structure, ventilation and electrics, for example. However, policy D12 in the Intend to Publish London Plan (December 2019) makes clear that all development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety and requires all major proposals to be supported by a Fire Statement. Following requests by officers, the applicant has submitted a detailed Fire Safety Statement in light of the emerging policy.

6.11.2 The statement consists of a high-level review of fire safety requirements for the proposed development based on relevant British Standards and addresses means of escape, fire safety systems, internal fire spread, external fire spread and access and facilities for the fire service.

6.11.3 The development would be required to meet the Building Regulations in force at the time of its construction by way of approval from a relevant Building Control Body. As part of the plan checking process a consultation with the London Fire Brigade would be carried out. On completion of work, the relevant Building Control Body would issue a Completion Certificate to confirm that the works comply with the requirement of the Building Regulations.

6.11.4 Upon consultation, the London Fire Brigade and Haringey Building Control has confirmed that they are satisfied with the proposed development.

6.11.5 Whilst it is noted that the London Fire Brigade is satisfied with the proposal, should planning permission be granted, the standard informative advising the applicant of the brigade's recommendation for sprinkler systems is recommended.



## **6.12 S106 mitigation/planning obligations**

6.12.1 Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows the Local Planning Authority to seek planning obligations to mitigate the impacts of a development. As such, the s106 Heads of Terms are listed in section 2 of this report and are all considered necessary, directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind.

## **6.13 Conclusion**

6.13.1 The proposed development, subject to appropriate conditions and s106 obligations, is in accordance with national, regional and local planning policies as:

- The proposed development is a well-designed, residential-led mixed-use scheme providing a suitable range of residential accommodation and flexible commercial floor space on this brownfield, town centre site in accordance with National, Regional and Local Policy.
- The proposed development would contribute to the housing needs of the borough by providing 75 residential units including affordable housing of 11 Low Cost Rented homes (3 Social Rented and 8 London Affordable Rent) and 14 Shared Ownership homes, representing 39.4% provision by habitable room.
- The layout and design of the proposed development optimise the potential of the site whilst providing for a future link into the Haringey Heartlands in accordance with the objections of the Wood Green Library Site Allocation and drat Wood Green AAP.
- The design and scale of the proposed development is acceptable and would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
- The proposed development would not materially harm the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants.
- The proposed development is car-free, promotes sustainable mode of transport and will not, subject to conditions and s106 obligations, result in any significant parking, transport or highway safety impacts.
- The proposed development will secure a number of s106 planning obligations including financial contributions to mitigate the residual impacts of the development.

- In accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, permission should be granted as there are no significant adverse or harmful impacts of doing so that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

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

## 7.0 CIL

7.1 Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £410,681.04 (6,886sqm (residential & non-residential x £59.64) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,368,090.47 (5,933sqm (residential only as nil rate for other proposed uses x £230.59).

7.2 This is based on the following figures:

Development type	Net additional gross internal area following development (square metres)
Total residential	5,933
Total non-residential	953
Grand total	6,886

7.3 The provision of affordable housing may be exempt from both Mayoral and Haringey CIL liability. However, the applicant must apply for social housing relief before this element of the development can be deducted from the final CIL calculations.

7.4 CIL will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be 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.

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

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions listed in **Appendix 1** and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.