

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2009/0219

Ward: Muswell Hill

Date received: 29/01/2009

Last amended date: 27/03/09 REV A ; 16/04/09 REV B

Drawing number of plans: HW206-A020, A030, A031, A032, P040 REV A, P099 REV A, P100 REV B, P101 REV A, P102 REV A, P103 REV A, P104 REV A, A200 REV A, A201 REV A, A300 REV A, A301 REV A, A302 REV A & A303 REV A.

Address: Former Hornsey Central Hospital, Park Road N8

Proposal: Demolition of vacant nurses homes and erection of 2 x four storey residential blocks with basement car parking, comprising 20 x one bed, 23 x two bed, 10 x three bed and 3 x four bed units, plus landscaping (Revised Scheme)

Existing Use: Nurses Quarters (Vacant)

Proposed Use: Residential

Applicant: Acorn (Park Road) Limited

Ownership: Private

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Road Network: Classified Road

Officer contact:

Michelle Bradshaw

P: 020 8489 5280

E: michelle.bradshaw@haringey.gov.uk

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to section 106 Legal Agreement

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is part of the former Hornsey Central Hospital (now demolished), and lies on the south-west side of Park Road. The development site is approximately 0.39 hectares (residential site area) and occupies approximately one third of the total hospital site. The majority of the site (north-western section) has been

redeveloped as a new Polyclinic/Health Centre with 97 onsite parking spaces. The works to this development are nearing completion.

A footpath runs along the southern boundary and across the rear of the site, leading to the rear entrance of the Highgate Wood School. On the other side of this footpath to the south is Park Road Leisure Centre, a large 2-storey building accommodating swimming pools & gyms.

To the rear are playing fields attached to the school and open land (formerly tennis courts) which are all designated Metropolitan Open Land.

The Leisure Centre site is located to the south-eastern boundary. Between the leisure centre building and the boundary footpath, is a service road and a line of parallel parking spaces. The new Health Centre will have parking spaces along the northern boundary of the site.

Opposite the site, on the northern side of Park Road, is a terrace of four 2-storey houses and Ramsey Court, a 4 storey block of 24 flats set well back from the road. Apart from Ramsey Court, the area is predominantly characterised by 2-storey houses.

The land slopes down from north to south so that the application site is slightly lower than the rest of the hospital site.

The nurses quarters remain on the site to the rear, and is the equivalent of 3-storeys high, having a raised ground floor.

There are 2 mature trees on the site. The site is not within a Conservation Area.

PLANNING HISTORY

HGY/2000/1679 – April 2001 permission GRANTED for Demolition of existing buildings (except war memorial) and erection of part single/part two storey/part three storey building comprising 56 x 1 bed flats (high dependency sheltered accommodation) 16 x rehab/respite bed-sit units, healthy living centre, elderly day centre, physiotherapy and doctor call centre. Provision of associated parking and landscaping (Not Implemented)

HGY/2004/2133 - October 2004 permission GRANTED for demolition of hospital buildings (except listed War Memorial), & erection of part 2/part 3 storey Primary Health Care Centre, with parking for 103 cars & landscaping (Implemented – Building Complete)

HGY/2004/2134 - October 2004 Listed Building Consent GRANTED for Repair & restoration of listed War Memorial, & demolition of hospital buildings.

HGY/2006/2317 - November 2006 approval of details in connection with permission of October 2004 (HGY/2004/2133).

HGY/2007/1823 - November 2007 permission REFUSED for demolition of former Nurses Home and erection of two 4-storey linked blocks providing 70 flats comprising 14 x one bed, 50 x two bed and 6 x three bed units and basement parking for 61 cars and 70 cycles. Decision UPHeld on Appeal.

HGY/2008/0835 – October 2008 permission REFUSED for demolition of vacant nurses home and erection of 2 x four storey residential blocks with basement car parking, comprising 22 x one bed, 21 x two bed, 11 x three bed and 4 x four bed units, plus landscaping (Revised Scheme).

HGY/2009/0012 – approval of details pursuant to condition 8 (Green Travel Plan) attached to October 2004 permission (HGY/2004/2133).

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of vacant Nurses Home and erection of 2 x four storey residential blocks with basement car parking, comprising 20 x one bed, 23 x two bed, 10 x three bed and 3 x four bed units, plus landscaping (Revised Scheme)

Block A would provide 20 “affordable” dwellings (35.71% of the total number of units and 40.24% of the total in terms of habitable rooms per hectare), with 4 x 1 bed, 9 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed and 3 x 4 bed. The ground floor flats of Block A each have access to a private garden ranging in size from 57m² to 72m².

Block B provides 36 private flats for sale, comprising 16 x 1 bed, 14 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed. The ground and upper floor flats have access to a large communal garden area to the west and north-west ends of the site.

The basement provides 44 car parking spaces including 2 disabled spaces, at a ratio of 0.77 spaces per unit and 58 cycle parking spaces.

CONSULTATION

London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)
Metropolitan Police - Crime Prevention Officer

Haringey Design Team
Haringey Transportation Department
Haringey Building Control
Haringey Arboriculturalist
Haringey Waste Management Department
Haringey Strategic and Community Housing
Haringey Housing Enabling Team

Ward Councillors

Highgate Wood School
Combined Residents Action Group
CREOS
Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association
Hornsey CAAC
Adjoining occupiers – 740 local residents and occupiers

RESPONSES

London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)

The Brigade is not satisfied with the proposals. This application does not comply with Approved Document B. Pt 5, regarding Fire Brigade access and facilities. Travel distances from Fire Pump to furthest point in premises in excess of 45 metres. Guidance note 29 sent of previous occasions. Available in future on request.

Note: The scheme has been modified to overcome this objection by the provision of a dry riser (shown on site plan).

Metropolitan Police – Crime Prevention Officer

With reference to this proposed development and request for observations. I have previously made comments on this scheme in September 2007 and am disappointed that the design and access statement still makes little mention of crime or crime prevention. Paragraph 87 of the DCLG Circular 01/2006 states that, "Design and Access Statements for outline and detailed applications should therefore demonstrate how crime prevention measures have been considered in the design of the proposal and how the design reflects the attributes of safe, sustainable places set out in *Safer Places – the Planning System and Crime Prevention* (ODPM/Home Office, 2003)".

My main concerns are about:

- The design of the communal entrances, particularly for the block set further back from Park Road, Block B. This entrance appears overly recessed with poor natural surveillance from properties around it.
- The need for clear demarcation between semi-public and private space within the development and that this "defensible space" is promoted for the good of the future residents. There will need to be some form of buffer between the communal gardens and the homes of Block B. It is not acceptable for a communal garden to directly adjoin the private space of a home. Unless a buffer zone and defensible space is created, the homeowner will lose all control of the space directly outside their property. (Safer Places 2004, p.30)
- The basement car parking and cycle storage for the development is far from ideal. This is obviously located well away from the control and surveillance of the building's users.

- The perimeter treatment for the scheme should be robust, particularly on the south and east side. Similarly, the bin stores can become venues for crime without careful and sympathetic design. We can give further advice as necessary.
- It is crucial that the communal door entry systems are of a high security standard.
- The use of good quality lighting, especially on the access points throughout the scheme is a key crime prevention measure.
- The homes would benefit from the enhanced security standards detailed in the “Secured by Design Scheme” (www.securedbydesign.com).

The design and planning stage of the development is the ideal opportunity to reduce crime opportunities and provide a sustainable environment for the local community. The Crime Prevention Department can meet with the architect or developer to discuss the scheme as required.

Note: There have been some modifications to the scheme to address the above points, detailed in section 10 below.

Haringey Building Control

The access for fire fighting vehicles is considered unacceptable as some dwellings will be more than 45 metres from the stopping point and there are no turning facilities provided to enable egress from the site.

Haringey Transportation Team

This proposed development is on the W7 bus route Park Road and within a short walking distance of W3 bus route Priory Road, which combined, offer some 50 buses per hour (two-way), for frequent bus connection to and from Finsbury Park tube station, with Bus Route No.144 present on the latter route providing some 15 buses per hour (two-way), for bus connections to Turnpike Lane tube station. We have subsequently considered that the majority of the prospective residents of this development would use sustainable travel modes for their journeys to and from the site. In addition, our interrogation with TRAVL database suggests that based on comparable London sites (Grand Union Village - UB5, Kew Riverside - TW9, Longfield Avenue - NW7 and Yeats Close - NW10), this development proposal, some 4000 sq.m GFA, would only generate 15 and 13 combined in and out vehicle movements during the morning and evening peak hours respectively. We have therefore accepted the applicant's consultant's (Saville Bird and Axon's) forecast, which is slightly higher than ours and conclude that these supplementary vehicle movements, to the existing vehicle trips associated with the approved hospital development abutting this development, would not have any significant adverse traffic impact on the adjacent roads.

The applicant has proposed 44 car parking spaces in line with the UDP parking standard, 30 cycle racks which are to be enclosed under a secure shelter and a revised access leading to a turning area for servicing vehicles on the ground floor and car/cycle parking on the basement level, as indicated on Plan Nos.HW206-

P099 and HW206-P100. However, there is the concern that the cycle parking provision for this development proposal is insufficient. Therefore, we will ask that the number of cycle racks is increased to 52. We are also concerned that cyclists are hindered by the parking pressure which reduces the width of Park Road and the general lack of highway safety features for these vulnerable road users on this road including around its junction with Park Avenue South. As part of the cycling study for this area this year, we have identified a series of measures geared towards enhancing the conditions for cyclists at this location, encompassing the construction of 'Link 82' cycle route and the associated parking/entry treatment schemes, with the appropriate costs already documented. The walking conditions of pedestrians, in the vicinity of this development will also require certain enhancement. In particular, the footways of Harefield Road and Barrington Road which connect with Abbeville Road and eventually to Priory Park and, the substandard section of footway between these two roads will require some upgrade. We will also ask for improved crossing facilities along Park Road and additional entry treatment encompassing dropped kerb around the new access and the entrancement to the Swimming Centre, for wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs/buggies. We will therefore be seeking some financial contribution towards executing these works and other traffic management measures deemed imperative, in the immediate vicinity of this development. It is estimated that the cost of these works would be in the region of £450,000 (four hundred and fifty thousand pounds).

Consequently, the highway and transportation authority would not object to this application, subject to the conditions that the applicant:

1. Contributes a sum of £450,000 (four hundred and fifty thousand pounds) by way of S.106 agreement, towards footway, cycle route, entry treatment and crossing upgrade schemes, in the vicinity of this development. Reason: To improve the conditions for pedestrians and cyclists at this location.
2. Provides 52 (fifty-two) cycle racks, which shall be enclosed within a secure shelter. Reason: To improve the conditions for cyclists at this location.
3. Submits details of the routeing/management of the construction traffic to the transportation planning team, for approval. Reason: To minimise the impact of the movement of the associated construction vehicles, on the adjoining roads.

Informative

1. The proposed development requires a new crossover to be made over the footway. The necessary works will be carried out by the Council at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 020 8489 1316 to obtain a cost estimate and to arrange for the works to be carried out.
2. The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Transportation Group at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

Haringey Waste Management Team

Further to your request concerning the above planning application I have the following comments to make:

- Route from waste storage points to collection point must be as straight as possible with no kerbs or steps. Gradients should be no greater than 1:20 and surfaces should be smooth and sound, concrete rather than flexible. Dropped kerbs should be installed as necessary.
- If waste containers are housed, housings must be big enough to fit as many containers as are necessary to facilitate once per week collection and be high enough for lids to be open and closed where lidded containers are installed. Internal housing layouts must allow all containers to be accessed by users. Applicants can seek further advice about housings from Waste Management if required.
- Waste container housings may need to be lit so as to be safe for residents and collectors to use and service during darkness hours.
- All doors and pathways need to be 200mm wider than any bins that are required to pass through or over them.
- If access through security gates/doors is required for household waste collection, codes, keys, transponders or any other type of access equipment must be provided to the council. No charges will be accepted by the council for equipment required to gain access.
- Waste collection vehicles require height clearance of at least 4.75 metres. Roads required for access by waste collection vehicles must be constructed to withstand load bearing of up to 26 tonnes.
- Adequate waste storage arrangements must be made so that waste does not need to be placed on the public highway other than immediately before it is due to be collected. Further detailed advice can be given on this where required.
- Other comments as follows:

This proposed development will require 12 x 1100 refuse bins and 4 x 1100 recycling bins. There are three bin storage areas illustrated which indicate a capacity to hold 18 bins, but one area appears to be behind a set of security gates. If this is the case keys or fobs will need to be provided to the refuse and recycling collectors.

Haringey Design and Conservation Team

The application site (approximately 0.38ha.) lies on the south-west side of Park Road and is part of the site of the since demolished Hornsey Central Hospital. A public footpath runs between the site and Park Leisure Centre (a large 2-storey building located to the south). Designated Metropolitan Open Land comprising playing fields attached to the school and open land are located to the rear of the site. On the other side of Park Road, opposite the site, is a terrace of four 2-storey houses and Ramsey Court, a 4-storey block of 24 flats, which is set well back from the road. The land slopes down from the north to south so that the application site is slightly lower than the rest of the hospital site.

The proposed development would comprise 2 linked three-and-four-storey blocks, with basement car parking extending across the footprint of the building. This would provide 21 x one bed, 19 x two bed, 12 x three bed and 5 x four bed units.

The scale of buildings in this part of the area (with the exception of Ramsey Court) is predominantly characterised by 2-storey houses. The existing building on the application site is set far back into the site and does not intrude into the street scene. The polyclinic and leisure centre are imposing structures; (as is usual for large institutional buildings within smaller scale residential areas); however these institutional buildings do not necessarily set the parameters for new development.

The overall three-storey (with four-storey element) bulk of Block A (approximately 8.6m high) and four-storey bulk of Block B (approximately 11.6m high) will appear excessive in height, bulk and mass and out of scale with the established scale of development in the surrounding area and will be intrusive and dominant in the street scene, particularly when viewed from the south along Park Road and from the adjacent Metropolitan Open Land. The effect will be detrimental to the spatial and visual character of the site and its surrounding area, contrary to UDP policies UD3 and UD4.

The large footprint of this development (approximately 16.6m deep double banked accommodation to Block A, approximately 18.6m to Block B and approximately 78m long) runs close to the site boundary on each side leaving little amenity space.

The width of the buildings within the narrow frontage of the site, in close proximity to both the northern and southern boundaries combined with their height would result in a cramped development within the site. The site has a narrow frontage and the proposed building would fill much of the width of the site, with the remaining frontage being dominated by hard surfaced access and turning space.

The height, bulk and massing of the proposed scheme would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would not accord with UDP policies UD3 and UD4, which require development proposals to compliment the character of the local area and be of high design quality when considered against a number of interconnected elements including urban grain, building lines, form, rhythm and massing, height and scale.

Note: there have been some amendments to the design, including reducing the bulk of the building, to try to overcome these objections.

Hornsey Conservation Areas Advisory Committee (CAAC)

No objection other than the excessive use of timber, which may weather badly and present maintenance problems leading to future unsightly appearance.

Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association

- Outlook - adverse effect on outlook and views from houses opposite
- The scheme is very similar to the one previously refused.
- The issues raised by the Planning Inspector in considering the appeal application HGY/2007/1823 have not been adequately addressed in that the forward siting, height and bulk of these two long linked blocks would be visually dominant and intrusive in the street scene.
- The reduction in parking spaces will put yet more pressure on street parking which is already overloaded and causing delays and congestion affecting public and private transport.
- Unsatisfactory Standard of Accommodation - flats are accessed by long internal corridors with no natural light, approximately 50% of the flats face north or north-west and some of the 3 and 4 bedroom flats in the social housing have only 1 bathroom.
- The scheme represents overdevelopment of the site, is damaging to the local environment and puts pressure on traffic, transport and local parking.

Highgate Wood School

Highgate Wood School has some serious reservations regarding the current plans to redevelop this site. They fall broadly into four areas:

1. The conflict of vehicle and pedestrian access with the existing entrances to the school, Park Road Pool and the new hospital
2. The management of works directly adjacent to an entrance used by approximately 600 students twice a day (am and pm) and 200 during lunchtime
3. The proximity to and overlooking of school play areas and student access routes
4. The conflict of land use and purpose with all surrounding sites being used for public services (leisure centre, school and health care centre) and parts of the adjoining land being Metropolitan Open Land designated for leisure and health use only

Residents:

A total of 20 individual objection letters have been received. The issues include:

- Growing imbalance between the available infrastructure and number of users
- Traffic congestion - the development will add to traffic trying to use Park Road, which is already very congested, with congestion due to increase significantly when the new polyclinic opens. There is just 1 bus service supplying this area.
- Lack of adequate parking provision - in spite of on-site parking provision the development will increase kerb side parking demand in streets already under parking pressure
- The traffic survey was done in early February 2008, so does not take into account the new Hospital/Polyclinic opening this year or the Lido at the Leisure Centre which adds considerable traffic from May to September.
- The proposed scheme is very similar to the previously refused scheme HGY/2008/0835 only replacing one 1 bed unit and two 2 bed units with one 3 bed unit and one 4 bed unit – an increase of two bedrooms.
- Bulk and Scale – the 4 storey block will be considerably bigger than the other residential buildings on this side of Park Road and replaces a 2 storey building set well back from the road. Park Road is narrow and the proposed buildings would appear looming and bulky from pedestrian pavements and from the 2 storey houses opposite. The proposed buildings are too high, are out of keeping with the general scale of the road, and will exacerbate the domination of the street by the new polyclinic. Block A too near the road.
- The artists impressions do not take into account the difference in levels across the adjacent sites and therefore give a misleading impression of the bulk and scale of the proposed buildings.
- Proximity of buildings to site boundaries detrimental to outlook & amenity
- Unsatisfactory standard of accommodation – very long artificially lit access corridors. Approximately 50% of the flats face north or north-west. Some of the 3 and 4 bedroom flats in the social housing have only 1 bathroom. The proximity of block A to the hospital car park on the northwest side will lead to unsatisfactory conditions for the future occupants of those flats.
- Overdevelopment – too many flats for the site. The density is higher than that prevailing in the local area. Site coverage is excessive.
- No architectural merit to the design – the scheme is out of sympathy with the existing 2-storey Edwardian village character of Crouch End. The design continues to erode the existing character. The exaggerated horizontal roof and window lines create an intrusive development.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Guidance

| | |
|-------|---|
| PPS1 | Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) |
| PPS3 | Housing (November 2006 and April 2007) |
| PPG13 | Transport (March 2001) |
| PPS22 | Renewable Energy (August 2004) |

The London Plan

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006)

| | |
|-------|--|
| UD1 | Planning Statements |
| UD2 | Sustainable Design and Construction |
| UD3 | General Principles |
| UD4 | Quality Design |
| UD7 | Waste Storage |
| UD10 | Planning Obligations |
| HSG1 | New housing developments |
| HSG4 | Affordable housing |
| HSG9 | Density standards |
| HSG10 | Dwelling mix |
| ENV3 | Water Conservation |
| ENV9 | Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency |
| ENV10 | Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy |
| M3 | New Development Location and Accessibility |
| M4 | Pedestrians and Cyclists |
| M10 | Parking and Development |
| OS5 | Development Adjacent to Open Spaces |
| OS17 | Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines |

Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006)

| | |
|--------|--|
| SPG1a | Design Guidance |
| SPG3b | Privacy, Overlooking, Aspect, Outlook & Daylight, Sunlight |
| SPG5 | Safety by Design |
| SPG7a | Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement |
| SPG8b | Materials |
| SPG8c | Environmental Performance |
| SPG8d | Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees |
| SPG10 | The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations |
| SPG10c | Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development |
| SPG10e | Improvements to public transport infrastructure and services |
| SPD | Housing |

Government guidance on planning issues is set out in a series of Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs). PPGs are currently in the process of being replaced with Planning Policy Statements (PPSs). PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, PPG15, PPG16, PPS22 and PPG24 are considered relevant in this case.

National Planning Policies

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Communities

PPS1 provides an overview and general statement of the Government's objectives for the planning system. PPS1 is fully committed to achieving the aims of sustainable development. It indicates that Planning should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of urban development by making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives.

PPS3 – Housing

PPS3 sets out the Government's most up-to-date guidance with regard to the provision of housing. The Guidance sets out a commitment to promoting more sustainable patterns of development and emphasises the importance of making more efficient use of urban land within high quality development and encouraging greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility and along public transport corridors.

PPG13 - Transport

PPG13 seeks to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to help reduce the need to travel and the length of car journeys. Its objective is to make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling.

PPS 22 – Renewable Energy

PPS22 is intended to highlight the principles of the government following targets set in the Energy White Paper: "Our energy future: creating a low carbon economy". The PPS states that this can be achieved through the provision of renewable energy, improvements in energy efficiency and the development of combined heat and power.

Regional Planning Policies

The London Plan (2008)

The Development Plan for the area comprises the London Plan Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (February 2008). The London Plan is a material consideration for local authorities when determining planning applications and reviewing their Unitary Development Plans.

In order to respond to the existing and future housing demand, the London Plan has increased the housing provisions targets; seeking the provision of 30,500

additional homes per year across London. For Haringey, it estimates a capacity of a minimum of 6,800 new dwellings between 2007/8 and 2016/7 which equates to 680 per year.

Local Planning Policies

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006)

Haringey Council adopted its Unitary Development Plan in 2006. The policies within this document have been “saved” by the Government Office for London (GoL), under the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, for up to 3 years (from 27th September 2007). Also adopted with the UDP in 2006, were Supplementary Planning Guidance documents (SPG’s) and in 2008 SPD Housing.

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

Policy UD1 states that new development will need to be accompanied by the appropriate statements. It states that: all new development must be accompanied by a Design and Access Statement and Sustainability statement.

The application is accompanied by Planning, Design & Access and Transport Statements in which the applicants seek to demonstrate that the intensity of development of the revised (reduced) scheme and height and bulk of the buildings is justified by the nature and type of buildings in the surrounding area, and that the traffic generation of the new development is less than that of the old hospital and can be accommodated by the existing road network.

The main issues in this case derive from the amount of development on the site and concern density, dwelling mix, height, bulk and massing, residential amenity, and traffic generation. Secondary issues include parking and trees and landscaping.

The following issues will be discussed in the assessment report below:

1. The Principle of Residential Development
2. Density
3. Dwelling Mix
4. Residential Amenity
5. Design – Height, Bulk and Massing
6. Trees, Landscaping and Adjacent Open Space
7. Traffic and Parking
8. Sustainability
9. Waste Management
10. Security and Crime Prevention
11. Section 106 Agreement

1. The Principle of Residential Development

The application seeks to use the site for residential purposes. This part of the former Hornsey Hospital site is the location of the nurses' quarters and as such have historically provided a residential use, albeit attached to the former hospital itself. The hospital has been demolished and replaced with a modern polyclinic building to the northern part of the site. The applicant appointed Hampson Williams Architects to consider the conversion of the existing nurses' quarters into residential. The investigation concluded that this was not feasible and a new build residential scheme the appropriate design solution for the site.

The demolition of the existing buildings constitutes permitted development under Part 31 of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 and therefore planning permission is not required to demolish the existing buildings. As the site is not within a Conservation Area, Conservation Area Consent is not required for the demolition.

Both the Council and the Planning Inspectorate have accepted the principle of the site's redevelopment for residential use. As such, the proposal to use the site for a residential purpose is deemed to be appropriate and in line with current national, regional and local planning policies related to housing need in the United Kingdom., including PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development, PPS3 – Housing, The London Plan – policies 3A.1, 3A.2, and 3A.4, and Haringey Unitary Development Plan – HSG1 – New Housing Developments.

2. Density

The site has an area of 0.39 hectares. With 164 habitable rooms, the density of the development is 420.51 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) (reduced from 531 hr in the 2007 scheme and 428 in the 2008 scheme). This density falls within the overall range specified in the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) of 200-700 hrh.

The London Plan sets out a number of different density ranges to be achieved depending on the local context and public transport accessibility. The council considers the public transport accessibility level (PTAL) for this site to be 2 while the applicant argues that the rating of level 3 is applicable. Either way, the latest alterations to the London Plan place the accessible indices 2 and 3 within the same group of density ranges. Further contention lay in whether the site should be classified as 'urban' (dense development with a mix of different uses and buildings of 3 to 4 storeys, such as town centres, along main arterial routes and substantial parts of inner London) or 'suburban' (lower density development, predominately residential, of 2 to 3 storeys, as in some parts of inner and much of outer London). The inspector noted in appeal report relating the 2007 application that 'at the hearing the Council conceded that, for the purpose of the London Plan matrix, the site could be considered 'urban'. Therefore, the London Plan specifies a density range of 200-450hrh.

On this basis, a density of 420hrh for this site falls within both the London Plan density matrix and Haringey density range, set out in HSG9 – Density Standards,

however is at the upper end of the acceptable standard. Also, as noted by the inspector, density itself is not the issue, but rather the manifestation of that density in terms of the quality of the development. The issues of height, bulk and mass, residential amenity and impact on the character of the area will be discussed below.

3. Dwelling Mix

Policy HSG10 states that all new residential development should, where possible, provide a mix of dwelling types and size in order to meet the housing needs of the local community.

The scheme, as amended by Revision A dated 27/03/2009, is divided into 2 blocks. Block A provides 20 'affordable' flats (9 for social renting and 11 for intermediate shared ownership) consisting of 4 x 1 bed, 9 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed and 3 x 4 bed. Block B provides 36 private flats for sale, comprising 16 x 1 bed, 14 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed.

The Council's guidance for dwelling mix, SPD Housing section 7.2 states that the Housing Needs Survey (2007) identifies a short full of all sizes of accommodation. However, the requirement is most acute for affordable three and four bedroom properties. Figure 7.3 sets out the percentage dwelling mix for affordable housing as follows: 1 bed 19%, 2 bed 26%, 3 bed 27% and 4+ bed 28%. In this case the development would provide 20% 1 bed, 45% 2 bed, 20% 3 bed and 15% 4 bed units. On this basis, the affordable housing mix would provide an over provision of 2 bedroom units and an under provision of 3 and 4 bedroom units.

The table below compares the proposed mix of units against the Councils adopted Housing SPG (2008).

Dwelling Mix - Affordable Housing

| No. of Bedrooms | Housing SPD requirement (%) | Proposed (%) | Difference (%) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | 19 | 20 | +1 |
| 2 | 26 | 45 | +19 |
| 3 | 27 | 20 | -7 |
| 4 | 28 | 15 | -13 |

The recommended dwelling mix for private market housing is 37% 1 bedroom, 30% 2 bedroom, 22% 3 bedroom and 11% 4+ bedrooms. In this case the development would provide 44% 1 bed, 39% 2 bed, 17% 3 bed and 0% 4 bed units. On this basis, the private housing mix would provide an over provision of 1 and 2 bedroom units and an under provision of 3 and 4 bedroom units.

Dwelling Mix - Private Housing

| No. of Bedrooms | Housing SPD requirement (%) | Proposed (%) | Difference (%) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | 37 | 44 | +7 |

| | | | |
|---|----|----|-----|
| 2 | 30 | 39 | +9 |
| 3 | 22 | 17 | -5 |
| 4 | 11 | 0 | -11 |

There is therefore an under provision of larger family dwellings (3 & 4 bed) in both the affordable and private blocks.

Policy HSG4 and SPD Housing also set out targets for affordable housing. The council will seek to negotiate an element of affordable housing on all housing sites capable of providing 10 or more units. The aim will be to achieve a borough wide target of 50% of habitable rooms as affordable housing depending on location, scheme details or site characteristics. The proposed development has allocated 35.71% based on the number of flats or 40.24% based on the number of habitable rooms as affordable housing. In this location this provision of affordable housing is deemed to be appropriate.

Furthermore the Housing SPD states that a mix of social rented and intermediate shared ownership is required to meet housing needs in the borough. As a starting point for negotiation, the Council will apply a borough wide target of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate shared ownership. However factors such as the existing proportion of social rented housing in the ward, suitability of the site and location for family housing, individual site costs etc should be taken into account. This scheme would provide 45% social rented and 55% intermediate shared ownership. This allocation is deemed to be acceptable given the findings of the “Three Dragon’s” report on financial viability, and the fact that this scheme is far closer to the policy recommendation than the previous schemes. In addition, a letter from Circle Anglia housing association has been provided stating that they fully support the proposed scheme.

4. Residential Amenity

Policy U3, SPG3a and SPD Housing state that the Council will require development proposals to demonstrate that there are no significant adverse impacts on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy, overlooking, aspect along with the avoidance of air, water, light and noise, pollution, smell or nuisance. The development has been designed so as not to result in any significant overshadowing, loss of light or privacy to other units within the development or to adjacent uses. The site is surrounded on two sides by car parking, associated with the polyclinic to the north-west and the leisure centre to the south-east. This, in addition to being set away from these side boundaries will mean the development has little impact on the adjacent sites. To the rear is Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The development has been set back between 10m and 11.5m from this rear boundary. The design of the rear of Block B has been amended, with the upper level set back from the edge and a glazed balcony provided. In addition, the fenestration has been altered. This will in effect reduce the bulk of the building and minimise any impact on the amenity of users of the MOL. Two units of block A will have windows facing Park Road, however the building will be located at a distance so as not to result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy to residential properties opposite.

The Housing SPD also provides guidelines on private and communal amenity space. It states that all new residential development should provide external amenity space and this should be appropriate to the needs of the likely occupants.

The development proposes both communal and private amenity space. In both scheme 1 (2007 application) and scheme 2 (2008 application) the amenity space for the ground floor units, particularly to the northern side and ground floor private units (southern side) were considered inadequate, partly due to the depth of the gardens at approximately 3 metres. In response to this the proposed development has been set further away from the boundaries to allow garden depths of up to 5 metres for the affordable units and 5.5 metres for the private units.

All flats in Block B (for sale) have balconies and/or terraces and access to communal gardens. A large communal space is provide to the north western corner of the site which is approximately 320 sq. m in area adjacent to the polyclinic boundary and an addition 220 sq m. or so, adjacent to the rear boundary of the site. This allocation for the rear block is more than double the minimum standards set out in SPD Housing which states that useable communal space should be provided at 50 sq m. plus 5 sq. m per additional unit over five units. In addition the ground floor flats of Block B have private garden spaces ranging in size from 17m² to 37m² for the north-west facing flats and between 40m² to 66m² for the south-east facing flats.

Block A (affordable) have private gardens at ground floor level, servicing the 3 and 4 bedroom family units. These garden spaces range in size from 57m² to 72m². This is in excess of the minimum 50sq m. for family dwelling, specified in SPD Housing.

All flats above ground floor level have balconies and/or roof terraces. the amendments to the scheme under Revision A, dated 27/3/09 have included an increase in the size of the balconies on the south-east elevation, facing the leisure centre.

Overall, the provision of amenity space is deemed to be acceptable an in line with councils policies.

5. Design - Height, Bulk and Massing

Policies UD3, UD4 and SPG1a require new development to be of a high standard of design using good quality materials. In particular, they should respect the rhythm, form and massing, the height and scale and the historic heritage context of the site. The spatial and visual character of the development site and the surrounding area/street scene should be taken into consideration in the design of developments.

The simple, modern form the proposed building is a response to its context between the new polyclinic building and the existing leisure centre. The

characteristics of the adjacent buildings and the variety in building design in the vicinity mean that a contemporary approach to the design is not inappropriate.

The building is divided into two blocks, linked at the centre of the site. The new buildings are sited to create a large communal garden area to the rear which a high proportion of the proposed units will overlook. This arrangement will result in an attractive aspect for the residents facing in a generally westerly and north-westerly direction so benefiting from sunlight and views over the Metropolitan Open Land.

One of the main issues which resulted in the dismissal of the appeal was the impact on the character of the area. The Inspector considered the proposed block would be overbearing and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

This refused scheme had located the development on the same line as the forward most projection of the polyclinic, and well in front of the swimming pool building. It would have been only slightly lower in height than the polyclinic building but only by virtue of the difference in land levels. Since the dismissal of the appeal, the scheme has been redesigned, taking into consideration the issues considered unacceptable by the Inspector. The redesign has included:

- reducing the number of units from 70 to initially 57 units, and now 56 since the most recent amendments, and thus the density has now 420 hrh down from 531hrh
- reducing the height of the front building, Block A, from 4 storeys down to the 3 storeys for the majority of its length,
- reducing the site coverage by setting in the Block A from the northern boundary by 5 metres rather than 3 metres, and the main core of Block B from the southern boundary by 5.5 metres rather than 4 metres,
- increasing the setback from Park Road by an additional 3.50 metres (Revision A, dated 27/3/09) which creates a total set back of 10.6 metres and 13 metres from the front boundary of the site.
- removing the larger of the two residential units at roof level on Block A
- enlarging the balconies on the south-east side of Block B

It is considered that the above amendment to the design go some way in overcoming the issues raised by the Inspector. The reduction in height will reduce the impact of the building, particularly when viewed in the approach from the south along Park Road, an issue raised in the appeal report. Increasing the setbacks from the front and side boundaries will also help reduce the cramped appearance, which due to the narrow frontage seemed to fill most of the width of the site, under the design of the previous schemes. Overall, on balance, the scheme is deemed to be acceptable in design terms, in line with the intent of policy UD3, UD4 and SPG1a.

The materials to be used in the design are brick, timber panelling and grey metal/timber composite windows. The use of timber cladding has been reconsidered following comments from the planning department raising issue of long term appearance and maintenance. It is now proposed to use a composite

veneered timber cladding panel. The roof is to be flat using a single ply polymeric membrane. The solar panels are to be set back from the edges of the building so they are not visible. A condition of consent will require full details and material samples be submitted and approved by the planning authority prior to the commencement of works. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with policy UD3 and SPG8b.

6. Trees, Landscaping and Adjacent Open Space

Policy OS17 and SPG8d seek to protect and improve the contribution of trees, trees masses and spines to local landscape character.

The main existing trees on the site are a prominent Silver Maple close to the road frontage and an Ash on the side boundary with the Health Centre towards the rear of the site. Both of these are to be retained. There is a line of conifers on the side boundary between the application site and the polyclinic car park, which are to be retained and will provide some screening.

The Inspector, in the appeal against the refusal of application HGY/2007/1823, made specific reference to trees. "There are two important trees on the site, a silver maple and an ash which would be retained. The silver maple towards the front of the site is, to my mind, an important feature in the street scene". The Inspector had reservations about the likely effect of the proposal on the future health of this tree, given that the amount of hard surfacing around the tree would be increased. Since the appeal decision, the proposed development has undergone a number of design modifications. The retaining wall which was proposed in close proximity to the tree trunk in the 2007 application has now been removed from the plan. The access drive is also further away from the base of the tree in this proposal than in the previous schemes. It is considered that suitable planning conditions requiring protection of the tree during the construction period and supervision by a qualified Arboriculturalist would help ensure the ongoing longevity of this tree and in turn, its positive contribution to the street scene.

The plans indicate both soft and hard landscaping along the side boundaries adjacent to the polyclinic and leisure centre and the rear boundary adjacent to the Metropolitan Open Land. The front boundary will have trees and planting around the pedestrian and vehicle entrances and screening to the refuse stores. Conditions of consent will require full details of landscaping and boundary treatment prior to the commencement of works. The proposal is deemed to satisfy policy OS17 and SPG8d.

The site is bounded to the rear by Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Policy OS5 states that development close to the edge of Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, Significant Local Open Land or any other valuable open land will only be permitted if it protects or enhances the value and visual character of the open land. The proposed building would be approximately 10 metres from the boundary with the Metropolitan Open Land. The scheme as amended under Revision A, dated 27/03/09, has made several modifications to the rear elevation in order to minimise the visual impact on this open space. The upper level has been set back from the edge of the building. The balustrade of the upper level

flats will be glazed and fenestration has been altered, to reduce the perceived mass of the building. The materials have been used to achieve a design that breaks this rear elevation into three or four elements, thereby reducing the scale and impact of the building when viewed from the MOL. Landscape planting along the rear boundary will also minimise the visibility of the building from the rear. Overall, the development is deemed to be acceptable in terms of policy OS5.

7. Traffic and Parking

PPG13 'Transport' notes paragraph 49 states that "The availability of car parking has a major influence on the means of transport people choose for their journeys".

Policy M10 states that the Council will apply its parking standards to restrain car use, to reduce congestion, to improve road safety, to give priority to essential users and peoples with disabilities, to improve the environment, to improve local accessibility and to encourage sustainable regeneration. Development proposals will be assessed against the parking standards set out in the UDP which are in turn assessed against the London Plan matrix.

Policy M3 states that the Council will require that developments with high trip generating characteristics locate where public transport accessibility is high; located where the need to travel by car will be reduced and use of public transport increased. Both policy M3 and M4 along with SPG7a require new proposals to have a building design and layout and location which encourages walking and cycling.

The applicant has proposed 44 car parking spaces at basement level and 57 cycle parking spaces. The Haringey Transportation Group has assessed the application and concluded that the anticipated vehicle movements associated with the proposed development in addition to the existing vehicle trips associated with the approved polyclinic development abutting the site, would not have any significant adverse traffic impact on the adjacent roads. The Transportation Group have indicated that works to the adjacent road and pedestrian links are required to improve the existing facilities. They have sought a financial contribution, in the form of section 106, toward the cost of these works.

There have been a number of resident objections to the proposal many of which site traffic congestion and parking issues as the main concern. It should be noted that on the planning appeal relating to the 2007 application (HGY/2007/1823) the Inspector did not find that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of traffic generation, parking and pedestrian safety. Furthermore, the Council withdrew the 5th reason for refusal which related to the absence of any assessment as to the likely traffic generation from the proposed development in comparison with the previous use and its impact on the highway network. The Council accepted that the appellants' evidence (which took account of the likely levels of traffic from the former nurses' home and the development of the adjoining site) showed that the predicted levels would not exceed the recommended threshold of 5% of existing flow. The Inspector stated that she had no reason to disagree and determined the appeal on this basis. The number of units has been reduced from 70 flats with 61

car parking spaces to 56 units with 44 car parking spaces, thus the traffic associated with this development would be even less than that considered acceptable by the Inspector. Also, traffic and parking issues were not a reason for refusal of the 2008 (HGY/2008/0835). Overall the development is deemed to be acceptable and in line with the relevant policies.

The Transportation Officer's request for £450,000 towards Highway Improvements and repair works is considered excessive; to the extent that payment is for repair of footpaths on road on the other side of Park Road, they do not reasonably relate to the development which is the subject of this application. However, works in the immediate vicinity of the site, including improved crossing facilities for pedestrians, are considered to relate to this development and a sum of £250,000 would appear appropriate.

8. Sustainability

Policy UD2 requires sustainable design and construction to form an integral part of any scheme, requiring energy efficiency and renewable energy sourcing measures to be considered. In addition, the Council will seek that development schemes take into account, where feasible, the environmentally friendly materials, water conservation, recycling and sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS).

Policy ENV3 states that all new development should incorporate water conservation methods. Policy ENV9 states that the council will encourage energy efficiency and a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions, while ENV10 requires all major developments to provide an energy assessment with their planning application, showing an on-site provision of 10%, where feasible, of their projected energy requirement from renewable sources.

The application states that the proposed development is to target a Code for Sustainable homes (CFSH) level 3, subject to viability assessments and Government requirements. This rating requires a 25% improvement over Target Emission Rate as determined by the 2006 Building Regulation Standards.

The development is to have energy efficient condensing boilers and solar thermal panels on the roof to provide hot water to the residential boilers. A renewable energy assessment and a drainage and water assessment are still to be commissioned. Conditions of consent will require these assessments be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of works, to ensure the development is in line with local, regional and national targets on sustainability.

9. Waste Management

Policy UD7 requires all new development to include adequate provision for the storage and collection of waste and recyclable material and for large developments to produce a waste management plan. In addition the Council will encourage, the allocation of space for composting in developments with gardens. The scheme includes 3 separate bin storage areas providing a capacity for 18 bins, which combined, will provide adequate bin storage for a development of this

size. Refuse vehicles will access the site from Park Road. A turning head is provided near the entrance to the site so that refuse vehicles may exit in a forward direction. Haringey Waste Management has provided a number of comments. These will be included as conditions of consent.

10. Safety, Security and Crime Prevention

Policy UD3 and SPG5 requires all new development to take into account the provisions of Circular 5/94 Planning Out Crime and the 'Secured by Design' initiative. This seeks to reduce the potential for crime by good design. The Crime Prevention Officer has been consulted and has raised several issues with the current design. However, if the scheme were to meet all the points raised by the Crime Prevention Officer, such as having no basement parking and not having communal gardens adjoining private amenity space, it would be difficult to develop the site at anything other than a much lower density. The applicant has responded to the points raised by the Crime Prevention Officer as follows:

- This entrance to Block B appears overly recessed with poor natural surveillance from properties around it.

We have reviewed the design of the entrance area and checked sight lines - the entrance is visible from the lift and stair area of Block B, all of the flats on the south side of Block A, and the three flats at the east end of Block B - the recess is only to provide a weatherproof overhang at the entrance door. There will be an entry phone camera at the entrance doors.

- Clear demarcation between semi-public and private space within the development should be provided and that this "defensible space" is promoted for the good of the future residents. Currently, communal gardens directly adjoin the private space of a home.

The plans have been adjusted to show Private Spaces to both sides of Block B. To the South (Leisure Centre) side these extend to the boundary as requested but to the North they have been limited in order to maintain the communal areas. Refer to revised plan HW206 P100 Rev B dated 16/04/2009.

- Basement car parking and cycle storage is located well away from the control and surveillance of the building's users. Without proper safeguards and secure access control into the basement, this will easily become a crime generator. Concerns regarding the entrance to the basement on the south of the scheme, within the communal garden.

The basement car parking entrance has a security gate. The basement entrance at the south end of the scheme is a means of escape, definitely not an entrance; it will be gated and linked to the fire alarm system to prevent access.

- Perimeter treatment for the scheme should be robust, particularly on the south and east side. Similarly, the bin stores can become venues for crime without careful and sympathetic design.

This issue can be resolved as part of a landscaping and boundary planning condition.

- Communal door entry systems should be of a high security standard. Poor quality door systems lead to crime and high maintenance costs for the owner and are not in any way part of a sustainable development.

The entry control door systems will be of a high security standard.

- The use of good quality lighting, especially on the access points throughout the scheme is a key crime prevention measure. Bollard lighting is generally a poor choice in such an environment.

The lighting detail will be agreed as part of a planning condition.

- The homes would benefit from the enhanced security standards detailed in the “Secured by Design Scheme” (www.securedbydesign.com).

In making the above amendments and clarifications the scheme complies with the principles of the “Secured by Design Scheme” within the site constraints.

It is considered that the majority of these issues could be dealt with via condition. The revised ground floor plan addresses the issue of private units abutting communal areas. Overall, the development is deemed to satisfy policy UD3 and SPG5.

The London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) and Haringey Building Control both raised concern about compliance for fire brigade access and facilities on the basis that travel distances from fire pump to the furthest point in the premises is in excess of 45 metres. Since these initial comments the applicant has contacted the relevant officers and clarified these issues. The LFEPA has provided an email that states ‘in principle this Authority would have no objection to fire fighting access subject to the points below and detailed submission of the location and calculation for the dry risers that are to be provided at building control stage of the project’

- A turning point is provided for both refuse trucks and fire appliances
- A number of the units are in excess of 45m from the position of the appliance is able to reach. For this reason it is noted on the drawings that a dry riser is to be provided within the scheme with easy access from the appliance location. The exact position and system design will be finalised in consultation with building control and London Fire Brigade.

As such, a condition of consent will be included to address the above issue.

11. S. 106 Legal Agreement

Policy UD8 requires development, where appropriate, to be subject to a Section 106 agreement in order to secure appropriate benefits in line with guidance set out in SPG10a and SPG10c.

The Council is seeking the following s106 contributions:

1. Affordable housing based on 20 units (35.71% based on number of units or 40.24% based on the number of habitable rooms). Allocated as follows: 9 units Social Rented and 11 units intermediate shared ownership.
2. An Education contribution of £291,200.00 based on the formula set out in SPG10c.
3. Provision of highway works to the value of £250,000 including footway, cycle route, entry treatment and crossing upgrade schemes, in the vicinity of this development.
4. Administration charge of £27,000 as required by SPG10a.

The total amount of s106 contribution would be £568,200

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The Council accepts the principle of residential use for this site. The proposed scheme has an improved dwelling mix that, although still not complying fully with Council guidance, is sufficiently close to be acceptable. The scheme has been reduced both in terms of the number of units and height, bulk and massing and setbacks from the boundaries compared to the scheme dismissed on appeal. The design is deemed adequate and the amenity spaces provided for future residents are exceed Councils requirements. The scheme is not found to be unacceptable in terms of traffic generation, parking or pedestrian safety. Having said that this is still a large scale development at the upper end of the acceptable density range. However, on balance, it is considered that the development is in line with the intent of National, Regional and Local Planning Policies including policy UD1 'Planning Statements', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage' UD10 'Planning Obligations', HSG1 'New housing developments', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG9 'Density standards', HSG10 'Dwelling mix', ENV3 'Water Conservation' ENV9 'Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency', ENV10 'Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy' M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility', M4 'Pedestrians and Cyclists' M10 'Parking and Development', OS5 'Development Adjacent to Open Spaces' OS17 'Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG3b 'Privacy, Overlooking, Aspect, Outlook & Daylight, Sunlight', SPG5 'Safety by Design', SPG7a 'Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement', SPG8b 'Materials', SPG8c 'Environmental Performance', SPG8d 'Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees', SPG10 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations', SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development', SPG10e 'Improvements to public transport infrastructure and services' and SPD 'Housing' of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006). On this basis, it is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and s106 legal agreement.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2009/0219 and associated conditions and subject to a pre

condition that Acorn Limited shall first have entered into an agreement with Haringey Council under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) and Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 in order to secure:

1. Affordable housing based on 20 units (35.71% based on number of units or 40.24% based on the number of habitable rooms). Allocated as follows: 9 units Social Rented and 11 units intermediate shared ownership.
2. An Education contribution of £291,201.62 based on the formula set out in SPG10c.
3. Provision of highway works to the value of £250,000 including footway, cycle route, entry treatment and crossing upgrade schemes, in the vicinity of this development.
4. Administration charge of £27,000 as required by SPG10a.

The total amount of s106 contribution would be £568,200

RECOMMENDATION 2

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

Registered No: HGY/2009/0219

Applicant's drawing No's: HW206-A020, A030, A031, A032, P040 REV A, P099 REV A, P100 REV B, P101 REV A, P102 REV A, P103 REV A, P104 REV A, A200 REV A, A201 REV A, A300 REV A, A301 REV A, A302 REV A & A303 REV A.

Subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. A renewable energy assessment and water and drainage assessment shall be prepared and submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: To ensure the development complies with local, regional and national guidance on sustainability.

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

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

5. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development to include detailed drawings of:

- a. Those existing trees to be retained.
- b. Those existing trees to be removed.
- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be agreed with the Council's Arboriculturalist.
- d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

6. Details of a scheme depicting those areas to be treated by means of hard landscaping shall be submitted to, approved in writing by, and implemented in accordance with the approved details. Such a scheme to include a detailed drawing of those areas of the development to be so treated, a schedule of proposed materials and samples to be submitted for written approval on request from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development has satisfactory landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

7. The existing trees on the site shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise affected in any way (including raising and lowering soil levels under the crown spread of the trees) and no excavation shall be cut under the crown spread of the trees without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Particular attention should be paid to the protection and retention of the silver maple and a qualified Arboriculturalist should be present to ensure appropriate measures are implemented during the construction period.

Reason: In order to safeguard the trees in the interest of visual amenity of the area.

8. Before any works herein permitted are commenced, all those trees to be retained, as indicated on the approved drawings, shall be protected by secure, stout, exclusion fencing erected at a minimum distance equivalent to the branch spread of the trees and in accordance with BS 5837:2005 and to a suitable height. Any works connected with the approved scheme within the branch spread of the trees shall be by hand only. No storage of materials, supplies or plant machinery shall be stored, parked, or allowed access beneath the branch spread of the trees or within the exclusion fencing.

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

9. Notwithstanding the details contained within the plans hereby approved, full details of boundary treatments, including fencing and gates, to the entire site be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the area and to ensure adequate means of enclosure for the proposed development.

10. Notwithstanding the details contained within the development hereby approved, full details of the artificial lighting scheme to the entrance, vehicular routes and parking areas, pedestrian routes and designated communal amenity space shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

11. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood.

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

(a) A minimum of 12 x 1100 refuse bins and 4 x 1100 recycling bins. If any of the bin enclosures are set behind security gates, keys or fobs will need to be provided to the refuse and recycling collectors.

(b) Route from waste storage points to collection point must be as straight as possible with no kerbs or steps. Gradients should be no greater than 1:20 and surfaces should be smooth and sound, concrete rather than flexible. Dropped kerbs should be installed as necessary.

(c) If waste containers are housed, housings must be big enough to fit as many containers as are necessary to facilitate once per week collection and be high enough for lids to be open and closed where lidded containers are installed. Internal housing layouts must allow all containers to be accessed by users. Applicants can seek further advice about housings from Waste Management if required.

(d) Waste container housings may need to be lit so as to be safe for residents and collectors to use and service during darkness hours.

(e) All doors and pathways need to be 200mm wider than any bins that are required to pass through or over them.

(f) If access through security gates/doors is required for household waste collection, codes, keys, transponders or any other type of access equipment must be provided to the council. No charges will be accepted by the council for equipment required to gain access.

(g) Waste collection vehicles require height clearance of at least 4.75 metres. Roads required for access by waste collection vehicles must be constructed to withstand load bearing of up to 26 tonnes.

(h) Adequate waste storage arrangements must be made so that waste does not need to be placed on the public highway other than immediately before it is due to be collected. Further detailed advice can be given on this where required.

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

13. Details of the routeing/management of the construction traffic shall be submitted to Haringey Transportation planning team, for approval, prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: To minimise the impact of the movement of the associated construction vehicles, on the adjoining roads.

14. The exact position and system design of the dry riser system shall be finalised and approved in consultation with Building Control and London Fire Brigade.

Reason: To ensure the development complies with Approved Document B. Pt 5 Regarding Fire Brigade access and facilities.

15. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

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

INFORMATIVE: The proposed development requires a new crossover to be made over the footway. The necessary works will be carried out by the Council at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 02084891316 to obtain a cost estimate & to arrange for the works to be carried out.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Transportation Group at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

RECOMMENDATION 3

In the event that an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) is not signed by 11 June 2009 or within such extended time as the Council's Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) shall in his direction allow, the application shall be refused for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide an Education and Highway works contribution in accordance with the requirements set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10c and SPG10e of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006).

RECOMMENDATION 4

In the event that the planning application is refused for the reason set out in recommendation 3 above, the Assistant Director (Planning Policy and Development), in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee, is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates this planning application, provided that: -

- (i) there has not been any material change in circumstances relevant to planning considerations, and
- (ii) the further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) within a period of no more than 12 months from the date of the refusal, and
- (iii) the relevant parties shall have entered into an agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (As Amended) as outlined above to secure the obligations specified therein.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposal has been assessed against and found to comply with the intent of Policies UD1 'Planning Statements', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage', UD10 'Planning Obligations', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG9 'Density Standards', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix', ENV3 'Water Conservation' ENV9 'Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency', ENV10 'Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy' M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility', M4 'Pedestrians and Cyclists' M10 'Parking and Development', OS5 'Development Adjacent to Open Spaces', OS17 'Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG3b 'Privacy, Overlooking, Aspect, Outlook & Daylight, Sunlight', SPG5 'Safety by Design', SPG7a 'Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement', SPG8b 'Materials', SPG8c 'Environmental Performance', SPG8d 'Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees', SPG10 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations', SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development', SPG10e 'Improvements to public transport infrastructure and services' and SPD 'Housing' of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006).