

## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

### 1. APPLICATION DETAILS

**Reference No:** HGY/2021/2075

**Ward:** Bounds Green

**Address:** Land at the junction of Partridge Way and Trinity Road N22 8DW

**Proposal:** Redevelopment of the site comprising the demolition of existing garages and the erection of a nine-storey building to accommodate 23 residential units for council rent (Class C3). Associated cycle and refuse/recycling storage facilities, accessible car-parking spaces, and landscaping and public realm improvements including a children's play space. Relocation of existing refuse/recycling facility.

**Applicant:** London borough of Haringey

**Ownership:** Council

**Case Officer Contact:** Conor Guilfoyle

**Site Visit Date:** 12/08/2021

**Date received:** 09/07/2021 **Last amended Date:** N/A

1.1 The application has been referred to the Planning Sub-committee for decision as it is a major application that is also a Council owned and led development.

#### 1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- Planning policy recognises the important role and contribution that small sites such as this play in meeting an identified need for new housing in borough. The site is within an established neighbourhood with good access to public transport connections and existing neighbourhood facilities, where planning policy expects additional housing at a greater density than existing. This is subject to a design-led approach to development of the site, which was carried out here to capitalise on the opportunities and location of the site to bring forward and deliver 23 much needed affordable homes as per the Council's Local Plan. In land-use terms, the proposal is strongly supported in principle.
- The development would be of a high-quality design which responds appropriately to the local context and is supported by the Quality Review Panel.

- The proposal also includes an associated comprehensive hard and soft landscaping scheme and a wider public realm strategy including improvements to existing children's play areas.
- The size, mix, tenure, and quality of accommodation are acceptable and either meet or exceed relevant planning policy standards. All flats have external amenity space.
- The proposal has been designed to avoid any material harm to the amenity of neighbouring living conditions in terms of a loss of sunlight and daylight, outlook, or privacy, in terms of excessive noise, light or air pollution.
- The proposed development is car free and would not result in any significant adverse impacts on parking due to imposed restrictions on future occupiers of the development being unable to obtain on-street parking permits. Furthermore, the site's location is in a highly accessible location in terms of public transport routes and the scheme is also supported by sustainable transport initiatives to be secured by condition and legal agreement.
- High performance energy saving measures form part of the proposal, which would also include insulation measures that would safeguard the amenity of future occupiers from excessive noise levels whilst preventing heat-loss.
- The proposal would have a negligible impact on the historic built environment which is considered acceptable when it is weighted against the public benefits of the proposal.
- The proposed development will secure several planning obligations including financial contributions to mitigate the residual impacts of the development.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of an agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below following the expiry of the consultation by way of press notice on 23<sup>rd</sup> September without any new material representations.
- 2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

- 2.3 That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 14th October or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- 2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

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

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval
- 4) Details of hard and soft landscaping
- 5) SuDS Maintenance and Management
- 6) Energy Strategy
- 7) Biodiversity measures
- 8) Overheating measures
- 9) Land contamination
- 10) Unexpected contamination
- 11) Demolition/Construction
- 12) Non-Road Mobile Machinery
- 13) Interim Travel Plan
- 14) Full Travel Plan
- 15) Cycle parking
- 16) Construction Logistics Plan
- 17) Secured by Design
- 18) Social Rent
- 19) Car-free
- 20) Car Club membership
- 21) Highway works
- 22) Employment and skills plan
- 23) Energy Strategy
- 24) Energy performance indicators
- 25) Considerate Contractors
- 26) Construction Management and Logistic Plans
- 27) Telecommunications / Broadband
- 28) Architect retention

## **Informatives**

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Fire safety and sprinklers
- 7) Surface water drainage
- 8) Thames Water
- 9) Asbestos
- 10) Secured by Design advice

## **Planning Obligations**

- 2.5 Planning obligations are usually secured through a S106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the local planning authority and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.
- 2.6 Several obligations which would ordinarily be secure through a S106 legal agreement will instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.
- 2.7 It is recognised that the Council cannot commence enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's housing team and the planning department, including the resolution of non-compliances with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.
- 2.8 The Council cannot impose conditions on planning permission requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning has confirmed in writing that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented.

## **Payment Head of Terms:**

1. Initial carbon offset contribution
  - o £14,170 (50% of expected carbon offset based on the energy report). Payable on implementation.

2. Deferred carbon offset contribution
  - £14,170 - 50%+ of expected carbon offset based on the energy report, plus any additional carbon offset charges required following energy testing based on £90/per tonne of carbon. Payable prior to occupation.
3. Amending TMO
  - The applicant must contribute a sum of £4,000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.
4. Employment skills provision
  - Provision of employment skills and support payment

## 2.9 **Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

- 2.10 In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to the officer recommendation it will be necessary to consider the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF. This is because the Council's delivery of housing over the last three years is substantially below its housing target and so paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged by virtue of footnote 7 of the NPPF. Members must state their reasons including why it is considered that the presumption is not engaged.

## CONTENTS

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4. CONSULATION RESPONSE
5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8. RECOMMENDATION

### APPENDICES:

Appendix 1	Planning Conditions and Informatives
Appendix 2	Plans and Images
Appendix 3	Consultation Responses – Internal and External Consultees
Appendix 4	Representations
Appendix 5	QRP Reports
Appendix 6	Pre application presentation minutes

## 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

### 3.1 Proposed development

- 3.2 This is an application for the redevelopment of the site comprising the demolition of existing garages and the erection of a nine-storey building and associated works. The building would accommodate 23 residential units (14 x 1 beds and 9 x 2 beds) for Council rent as follows;

- 14 x one-bed two-person units
- 7 x two-bed four-person units
- 1 x two-bed three-person 'wheelchair unit'
- 1 x two-bed four-person 'wheelchair unit'

- 3.3 The proposal includes cycle and refuse/recycling storage facilities, reprovision of the existing refuse/recycling facility, and provision of two accessible car-parking spaces off Partridge Way. The proposal also involves associated landscaping and public realm improvements which includes upgrading the green/children's play space space adjacent to the north-east.
- 3.4 The building would be nine storeys in height with a two storey plinth. The design reflects the triangular shape of the site and would be finished in textured buff brick with dark windows, panelling and balcony railings. It incorporates framed balconies on each of its three corners and inset brick panelling and detailing.
- 3.5 The site is one of several identified sites that the Council is seeking to develop for Council housing as part of its 2018 commitment to delivering a thousand new Council homes at Council rents by 2022. The Council homes built will be managed by Homes for Haringey who manage the Council's existing stock.

### **3.6 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.7 The application site comprises two areas. The first (and main) part of the site is a prominent triangular shaped parcel of land, located at the junction of Partridge Way and Trinity Road which runs parallel to Bounds Green Road.
- 3.8 This part of the site is currently occupied by a row of garages fronting Partridge Way. Paving slabs cover the remainder of this area, up to the adjacent house of No.2 Partridge Way to the east. No.2 Partridge Way is a two-storey end-terrace property, which forms part of a group of mid-twentieth century terrace houses. Their 'rear' gardens back onto Trinity Way. Their main front access is gained from a footpath to the north, off Partridge Way.
- 3.9 The second part of the application site encompasses the green space to the north-east of the main triangular site, opposite the front of the Partridge Way terraced houses. This area would comprise public realm improvements including a children's play space for continued use by the public.
- 3.10 The site is not subject to any notable planning designations. It is not in a conservation area and does not affect the setting of any locally or statutorily listed building.
- 3.11 However, the building would be visible from two nearby conservation areas – Trinity Gardens and Bowes Park conservation areas. They lie beyond the immediate environs of the site to the south/east and northeast/north respectively.

### **3.12 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

- 3.13 None relevant.

## **4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

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

- 4.2 The proposal was presented to the Planning Sub Committee at a Pre-Application Briefing on 08th September 2020. The minutes are attached in Appendix 6.

### **4.3 Quality Review Panel**

- 4.4 The scheme has been presented to Haringey's Quality Review Panel on two occasions.
- 4.5 Following the final Quality Review Panel meeting on 26th August 2020, Appendix 6, the Panel offered their 'warm support' for the scheme, subject to further refinement of some detailed points.

- 4.6 The panel welcomed the revisions (since the first QRP) to the layout and form of the proposals and felt that the scale of the proposals is suitable for the location. Adjusting the footprint and layout of the tower to accommodate three units per floor, rather than two as previously proposed, was stated as very successful. The removal of the proposed two-storey terrace and the adjusted location of the tower, pulled away from the adjacent housing, was also supported.
- 4.7 The notes for the most recent review are set out in Appendix 5. Its support included suggestions to improve the scheme. These suggestions include exploring further improvement of the function and nature of the proposed new yard (between the tower and the adjacent terrace), improved security and access arrangements for the bicycle store by including access from this gated yard, improvements to the elevation of the first floor plinth and its windows, and consideration of a less gloomy textured brick. The applicant has addressed these details in this submission.
- 4.8 In summary, the latest iteration of the proposal is consistent with the final scheme presented to the QRP. The proposed design reflects their suggestions.

#### 4.9 **Application Consultation**

4.10 The following responses were received:

Internal:

- 1) LBH Transportation Group – No objection subject to conditions further details of waste/recycling and servicing arrangements. Awaiting further information from applicant and review before revised comments
- 2) LBH Carbon Management – No objection subject to energy strategy, carbon contribution, and further details including = biodiversity and overheating matters which can be secured by condition(s)
- 3) LBH Environmental Health Services (EHS) – Pollution, Air Quality & Contaminated Land - No objection subject to conditions
- 4) LBH Cleansing – No objection in principle but raised queries with further information expected to be submitted to address them
- 5) LBH Design Officer – No objection: Outlined merits of proposal
- 6) LBH Conservation Officer – No objection
- 7) LBH Health Officer – No comment

8) LBH Drainage – No objection subject to a management schedule for the SUDS measures

9) LBH Building Control – No comment

External:

10) Metropolitan Police DOCO: No objection subject to details which can be secured by condition(s) and informatives

11) London Fire Brigade – No comment

Thames Water – No comment

## **5 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 The following were consulted:

- 241 Neighbouring properties
- Site notices were erected close to the site
- A notice advertising the application was placed in the press

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: 25

Objecting: 23

Supporting: 0

Others: 2

5.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

5.4 The following Councillor made representations:

- None

5.5 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 4 and summarised as follows:

### **Design/Appearance/Character**

- Excessive scale, height, and proximity relative to surroundings
- Unattractive design
- Design fails to respond to context
- Excessive/inappropriate density

### **Amenity Impacts**

- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Loss of daylight/sunlight/natural light to residents/neighbours
- Sense of enclosure to nearby residents
- Loss of outlook/visible sky
- Light pollution
- Loss of 'peace'/disturbance from additional comings and goings
- Construction noise/disturbance/pollution harm to nearby residents
- Air pollution

### **Transport impacts**

- Loss of parking spaces from garages
- Parking pressures from additional flats/deliveries/servicing
- Parking interruptions during construction
- Suggestion that permit-free restrictions would create a 'two track' Council housing list/allocation
- Junction with Bounds Green Road difficult for some drivers to manoeuvre
- Garages are in-demand
- Concerns emergency services could be hindered
- Disabled neighbours' road access would be hindered such as by making it harder for ambulances to park in the road
- Child/road user safety risk increased by increased traffic

### **Other**

- No need for new housing here
- Will over-stretch existing services/infrastructure
- Query what will replace garages for bulk storage
- Air quality concerns for new residents (proximity to Bounds Green Rd)
- Loss of 'open' space (Officer comment: Site is partly 'open' hardstanding almost entirely enclosed on two sides, partly single storey garages)
- Crime/fear of crime/security/antisocial behaviour concerns
- Rooms too small, bedrooms would have inadequate storage space
- Objection to a children's play area near a main road
- Fire Risk: building too close to others, particularly Finsbury House high-rise flats
- Social rent rate is higher than normal council rents
- Comments on formal pre-application advice process including the absence of public participation

5.6 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Comments on informal pre-application advice/engagement events

- Misunderstandings on the purpose of pre-application submissions
- Impact on property prices
- Suggestions for alternative proposals
- Tenure of existing/future occupants and neighbours
- Comments on past improvement works
- Comments on work outside the scope of the application
- Suggestion that permit-free restrictions create a 'two track' housing list/allocation
- Suggestion permits could still be issued
- Procedural issues – site notice not visible
- Objection to consultation letters sent in English-only given many residents have other first languages

## **6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### Statutory Framework

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with policies of the statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### Considerations

- 6.2 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:
1. Principle of the development
  2. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and nearby conservation areas
  3. Landscaping, public realm, amenity and play space and associated works
  4. Housing mix, tenure and quality of accommodation
  5. Impact on neighbouring amenity
  6. Impact on nearby conservation areas
  7. Transport, parking, waste/recycling and servicing
  8. Sustainability, Energy and Climate Change
  9. Crime Prevention
  10. Flood risk & Drainage
  11. Air quality
  12. Ecology
  13. Land-contamination

### **6.3 Principle of the development**

#### *National Policy*

- 6.4 The 2021 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes the overarching principles of the planning system, including the requirement of the system to “drive

and support development” through the local development plan process. It advocates policy that seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing and requires local planning authorities to ensure their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed housing needs for market and affordable housing.

- 6.5 Paragraph 69 notes that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes.

#### Regional Policy - The London Plan

- 6.6 The London Plan (2021) Table 4.1 sets out housing targets for London over the coming decade, setting a 10-year housing target (2019/20 – 2028/29) for Haringey of 15,920, equating to 1,592 dwellings per annum.
- 6.7 Policy H1 ‘Increasing housing supply’ states that boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites, especially sites with existing or planned public transport access levels (PTALs) 3-6 or which are located within 800m of a station or town centre boundary.

Policy H2A outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites such as this (below 0.25 hectares in size). It states that they should play a much greater role in housing delivery and boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on them to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London’s housing needs. It sets out (table 4.2) a minimum target to deliver 2,600 homes from small sites in Haringey over a 10-year period. It notes that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate more housing on small sites.

- 6.8 London Plan Policy H4 requires the provision of more genuinely affordable housing. The Mayor expects that residential proposals on public land should deliver at least 50 per cent affordable housing on each site.
- 6.9 London Plan Policy D6 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services. It emphasises the need for good housing quality which meets relevant standards of accommodation.

#### 6.10 Local Policy

The Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies DPD (hereafter referred to as *Local Plan*), 2017, sets out the long-term vision of the development of Haringey by 2026 and sets out the Council’s spatial strategy for achieving that vision. Policy SP2

revises the Borough's housing target to a minimum target per annum from 820 to 1,502 for the period 2015-2026. While this is not an 'allocated site' for larger-scale housing growth, not all housing development will take place in allocated sites. The supporting text to Policy SP2 specifically acknowledges the role these 'small sites' play towards housing delivery.

- 6.11 Local Plan policy SP2 states that the Council will aim to provide homes to meet Haringey's housing needs and to make the full use of Haringey's capacity for housing by maximising the supply of additional housing to meet and exceed the minimum target including securing the provision of affordable housing.
- 6.12 The Development Management DPD (2017) (hereafter referred to as the *DPD*) is particularly relevant. Policy DM10 seeks to increase housing supply and seeks to optimise housing capacity on individual sites such as this. Policy DM13 makes clear that the Council will seek to maximise affordable housing delivery on sites.

#### *Assessment*

- 6.13 The site is one of several identified sites that the Council is seeking to develop for Council housing as part of its 2018 commitment to delivering a thousand new Council homes at Council rents by 2022. The Council homes built will be managed by Homes for Haringey who manage the Council's existing stock. This proposal makes a valuable contribution to Council housing supply.
- 6.14 This proposal seeks to provide 100% of the housing as Council rent which would satisfy the above planning policy requirements.
- 6.15 Officers note that the surrounding area is an established residential area which includes a range of tenures, including private rent, owner-occupation and Council rent. The proposal would therefore contribute to a mixed and balanced community and make a significant contribution to delivery of the Borough wide affordable housing target.
- 6.16 The site is not subject to any specific planning policy designations but is a brownfield site with good access to public transport within a residential area. So there is strong policy support for the principle of residential development on this site as set out in Policy H1 and H4 of the London Plan.
- 6.17 In summary, residential development of this underutilised brownfield site is supported. The principle of an affordable residential development on the site is strongly supported by national, regional, and local policies. The provision of 23 units will make an important contribution towards meeting Haringey's housing target in line with Policies SP1 SP2 and DM10 and an important contribution to the Borough wide target of 40% affordable housing.

## **Design and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and nearby conservation areas**

### *National policy*

- 6.18 Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2021) states that that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
- 6.19 It states that, amongst other things, planning decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development and be visually attractive due to good architecture, layouts, and appropriate and effective landscaping.

### *Regional Policy – London Plan*

- 6.20 The London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality design and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D4 notes the importance of scrutiny of good design by borough planning, urban design, and conservation officers (where relevant). It emphasises the use of the design review process to assess and inform design options early in the planning process (as taken place here).
- 6.21 Policy D6 concerns housing quality and standards and notes the need for greater scrutiny of the physical internal and external building spaces and surroundings as the density of schemes increases due the increased pressures that arise. It includes qualitative measures such as minimum housing standards.

### *Local Policy*

- 6.22 Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan requires 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. Policy SP12 requires new development to conserve the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets and their settings.
- 6.23 Policy DM1 of the 2017 DPD requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to several considerations including building heights; forms, the scale and massing prevailing around the site; the urban grain; and a sense of enclosure. It requires all new development to achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.
- 6.24 DPD Policy DM6 concerns building heights. It expects all development proposals to include heights of an appropriate scale, responding positively to local context and achieving a high standard of design in accordance with Policy DM1. For buildings projecting above the prevailing height of the surrounding area it will be

necessary to justify them in in urban design terms, meeting prescribed design requirements.

### Assessment

#### *Site context*

- 6.25 In accordance with the above policies, the design of any proposal should optimise the potential of the site to deliver high-quality homes having regard to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 6.26 Partridge Way comprises two existing 15-storey council tower blocks and low-rise housing and the surrounding area also accommodates a varied built environment. Traditional housing and further post-war residential developments feature locally in addition to a range of non-residential buildings, public realm, and open spaces. The existing garages on the application site are not of architectural merit, nor are existing hardstanding elements etc.

#### Tall buildings

- 6.27 Policy D9 of the London Plan states that Development Plans should define what is considered a tall building for specific localities, the height of which will vary between and within different parts of London but should not be less than 6 storeys or 18 metres measured from ground to the floor level of the uppermost storey. The Council's 2017 Local Plan (Strategic Policies DPD) pre-dates the London Plan and defines tall buildings as 10 storeys and above. However, given the London Plan is most recent policy it takes precedence and this proposal must be considered and assessed as a tall building in line with Policy D9.
- 6.28 Policy D9 B sets out that boroughs should determine if there are locations where tall buildings may be an appropriate form of development and such locations and appropriate tall building heights should be identified on maps in Development Plans. Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans.
- 6.29 As the Local Plan only considers tall buildings to be 10 storeys or above in this instance this site has not been identified as suitable for a tall building as defined in the London Plan of 6 storeys and above. However, given this policy position a tall building can be considered acceptable if it meets the other detailed requirements of the Policy D9.
- 6.30 Policy D9 requires development proposals to address the following impacts:
- 1) *visual impacts*
    - the views of buildings from different distances:

- whether part of a group or stand-alone, tall buildings should reinforce the spatial hierarchy of the local and wider context and aid legibility and wayfinding
- architectural quality and materials
- harm to heritage assets and their settings.
- adverse reflected glare
- light pollution from internal and external lighting

#### 2) *functional impact*

- safety of all occupants
- servicing, maintenance and building management arrangements
- entrances, access routes, and ground floor uses
- capacity of the area and its transport network
- maximises the role of the development as a catalyst for further change in the area
- should not interfere with aviation, navigation or telecommunication, and solar energy generation on adjoining buildings

#### 3) *environmental impacts*

- wind, daylight, sunlight penetration and temperature conditions around the building(s)
- air movement
- noise should not detract from the comfort and enjoyment of open spaces around the building

#### 4) *cumulative impacts*

6.31 This building would be visible from surrounding areas, rising above the prevailing building heights. It would be most prominent in views from Bounds Green Road. The building would be seen within the existing context of the two taller tall buildings adjacent. It would represent a step-down in height between those and the two storey houses on the other side which are more typical of prevailing buildings in the area. Its height, massing and position would not harm any protected local or strategic London views.

6.32 The existing taller buildings are established already visual landmarks and wayfinding points and located this building adjacent to them would reinforce the spatial hierarchy of the local and wider context and further aid legibility and wayfinding, particularly from Bounds Green Road where it would be most prominent.

6.33 The architecture and quality of materials are considered later in this report but found to be high-quality design. It also noted to avoid significant harm to the nearby conservation areas (heritage assets) and views from within it.

- 6.34 The proximity to the taller buildings and location adjacent to existing houses to its sides and rear means it would not cause excessive light pollution in this setting and combined with its recessed balcony glazing, this would also avoid adverse reflected glare.
- 6.35 In terms of the functional requirements set out in Policy D9, the building features standard safety measures including adherence to fire safety standards and measures outlined in a fire safety strategy and compliance with relevant building regulations.
- 6.36 The building layout has been designed to consider servicing, management and maintenance arrangements. It would have generous room at the ground floor for services, plant, and resident facilities, good access would be provided to all relevant areas and routes in and out are clear and legible. Its height below that of the taller towers would be insufficient to interfere in aviation, navigation, telecommunications, or solar energy generation on adjoining buildings.
- 6.37 A wind analysis was carried out and concluded the proposal would result in no adverse wind or micro-climate impacts harmful to residents and pedestrians. The balcony and recessed glazing would act as solar shading to avoid internal overheating on the most sensitive elevations. Daylight, sunlight and noise studies demonstrate how the proposal would avoid causing detrimental harm to existing or future occupiers. Mechanical ventilation avoids the need to open windows during noisier periods if this is so desired, giving occupiers choice. Comprehensive studies have assessed environmental impacts on existing and future occupiers to be acceptable.
- 6.38 There would be no cumulative impact from other buildings and the existing buildings were considered assessments. The proposal is therefore an acceptable tall building with regards to the criteria of London Plan Policy D9.

*Quality Review Panel*

- 6.39 The proposal has been presented to QRP at pre-application stage on two separate occasions. The latest QRP report is set out in full at Appendix 5 with the summary from the final report as follows;
- The panel offers warm support for the scheme, subject to further refinement of a number of detailed points. It welcomes the adjustments to the layout and form of the proposals and feels that the scale of the proposals is suitable for the location.
  - Adjusting the footprint and layout of the tower in order to accommodate three units per floor – rather than two as previously proposed – is very successful.

The removal of the proposed two-storey terrace and the adjusted location of the tower – pulled away from the adjacent housing – are also supported.

6.40 A summary of the most recent Chair’s review and suggested refinements is below, in addition to the officer comments.

QQP Chair’s Review Comments	Officer Response
<i>Massing form and layout</i>	
<p>Whilst the layout of the adjusted proposals is now generally working well, the panel notes that at a detailed level, scope for improvement remains within the bicycle storage at ground floor level.</p> <p>The panel feels that currently the access arrangements are not secure enough, with the store accessed from a door leading from the pavement. It would encourage the design team to adjust the layout in order to accommodate two layers of secure entry</p>	<p>Design amended accordingly to move the cycle access door to the side passage. This in turn provides ‘active’ surveillance of that area, and further security behind its entrance.</p>
<p>The panel highlights that the new yard located between the tower and the adjacent houses should also be very carefully considered, to avoid the prospect of it becoming an informal residents’ waste/storage area. This consideration should extend to the materiality, function, and detailed design of the yard.</p> <p>It wonders whether one option might be to locate the external entrance to the bike store off the secure yard, thereby achieving two layers of secure entry, while at the same time providing purpose, footfall and natural surveillance of the yard</p>	<p>Cycle store entry relocated to this area to improve ‘ownership’ and security for both, as outlined above.</p>
<p>The panel notes that the brickwork within the precedent images looks good; however, the brickwork shown within the rendered images of the actual scheme looks much flatter and ‘gloomy’. It will be critically important to use a high-quality brick that will provide texture and will visually ‘lift’ the elevation – while providing a contrast with the fenestration.</p>	<p>Lighter stock brick now proposed. Condition attached to approve details to ensure high quality, appropriate finish.</p>

<p>It welcomes the inclusion of a strong, two-storey plinth at the base of the development and feels that this is a positive visual device for the overall scheme, giving both verticality and height to the base. At a detailed level, it would encourage the design team to explore the design of the elevation within the plinth at first floor level and would support adjustments to the double-order visual device to allow the inclusion of larger glazed elements in order to achieve good levels of daylight within the apartments at this level, alongside a more open and generous outlook.</p>	<p>The design has been amended with greater light penetration/outlook for the affect flats as suggested.</p>
<p><i>Design for inclusion, sustainability, and healthy neighbourhoods</i></p>	
<p>The panel questions whether Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) will be incorporated within the scheme</p>	<p>Yes this has been incorporated and allows windows to be closed should occupiers wish for quieter living conditions at noisy times of day/night.</p>
<p>The panel also suggests early consideration of how boiler flues may be integrated within the elevations in the future, in the event that there is a shift within the approach to services.</p>	<p>No boilers are proposed.</p>

*Design assessment*

- 6.41 Objections have been raised concerning the scale and height of the building and its proximity relative to surroundings. The Council’s Urban Design Officer has reviewed the scheme and notes that this scheme has developed and evolved in accordance with community feedback, officer advice and the Quality Review Panel. It is a refined, well thought out addition of high quality affordable new homes which also has a positive placemaking impact on an otherwise disused site.
- 6.42 They note that the proposed nine storey building mediates between the Victorian houses across Bounds Green and the 15 storey blocks of Finsbury and Newbury House. The articulation of a double height plinth at the base of the building responds directly to the adjacent terrace of houses, and to the wider context and streetscape across Bounds Green Road.
- 6.43 Officers consider a ‘regular’ shaped building would look awkward and contrived here and instead, by following the approximate shape and layout of these streets

which frame the site, the form and layout of the proposed building would successfully respond and contribute to this context. The triangular footprint of the building enables its form to respond positively to its context by addressing the corner plot and aligning sensibly with neighbouring plots.

- 6.44 The Design Officer notes that the recessed balconies, framed by thick brick piers emphasis the strong form of the building, and offer greater privacy for residents. This depth in the facade also helps reduce solar gain, helping to keep the living spaces cool in the summer. The vertical circulation is articulated through the brick detailing and fenestration above the well detailed entrance which is a key architectural feature.
- 6.45 In terms of the detailed design the Design Officer notes that the recessed balconies, framed by thick brick piers emphasis the strong form of the building, and offer greater privacy for residents. This depth in the facade also helps reduce solar gain, helping to keep the living spaces cool in the summer. The vertical circulation is articulated through the brick detailing and fenestration above the well detailed entrance which is a key architectural feature.
- 6.46 They note that the main entrance to the building is clearly demarcated with recessed brick detailing and the design of openings on the ground floor facade offers active frontages to Bounds Green Road. The bike stores and post room, the more active ground floor uses in a residential scheme, are locating on the most prominent corner of the site to further activate the street. The location and scale of post room is a positive, forward thinking provision for servicing modern life. The dual entrances to the bike store, with the external entrance away from the street for additional security and usability.
- 6.47 In terms of materials the building does not seek to duplicate the taller residential blocks on the other side of Partridge Way, but rather represents a considered design which seeks to achieve a high-quality finish which does not detract from, and contributes to, the character and appearance of its area. The design officer notes that the building sits in a context that is architecturally diverse in terms of styles and ages, so the material palette of brick and metal is a restrained and contemporary addition to this eclectic mix. The brick is an understated, muted stock with multi-tonal quality that has visual interest, variation and character. The remaining architectural elements (window frames, balustrades, doors, trims and signage) are in black aluminium which complements and contrasts with the brickwork. A condition is attached to secure details of the external materials to be approved by Officers before the works are carried out.
- 6.48 The design officer notes that quality of the internal layouts, the circulation core is dual aspect so the communal areas of the building, creating a well daylit, pleasant and safer journey to each home. Each home is well laid out for modern life, with open plan living spaces, from which a private balcony is accessed.

6.49 The proximity of the development to its surroundings and general 'overdevelopment' issues were raised as objections in the representations received. In this respect, the proposed building is also not considered uncharacteristic or atypical of residential development in this area. This is because the building would be detached from the terrace, and its alignment respects its pattern of development of their plots (front to rear fences). The building's proximity to others is not uncharacteristic of the area. The impact on residential amenity is addressed below.

#### *Conclusion*

6.50 This proposal reflects the design elements suggested at pre-application stage and incorporates the final suggestions of the Quality Review Panel (detailed earlier in this report) who support the scheme. It is a considered scheme which respects and relates to the character, appearance, and context of its location and surroundings. It is appropriate in scale, form, massing and appearance and would represent a positive contribution to the character of the area, without detracting from the significance or special attributes of nearby conservation areas. The scheme represents a successful design-led scheme which will optimise the potential of the site to create a high-quality development of a density appropriate to its location. The proposal fulfils the aims of the above planning policy framework and is therefore acceptable in this regard.

#### **Landscaping, public realm, amenity and play space and associated works**

6.51 The application site is split into two parts. The existing area of hardstanding and garaging on the corner is considered to detract from the quality of the local environment whilst the communal green space presents an opportunity to enhance this amenity for the benefit of existing residents and those of the proposed new homes.

#### *Policy context*

6.52 In addition to the general design-led policies in the previous section, London Plan (2021) Policy G4 seeks to "*promote the creation of new areas of publicly-accessible open space*" as well as "*enhance open spaces to provide a wider range of benefits for Londoners*". London Plan Policy G5 requires major development proposals to contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of site and building design.

6.53 London Plan Policy G6 seeks to manage impacts on biodiversity and aims to secure biodiversity net gain. London Plan Policy S4 states the need to provide new play facilities as part of development proposals, with at least 10m<sup>2</sup> of play space per child provided which meets several criteria.

- 6.54 Local Plan Policy SP11 promotes high quality landscaping on and off-site and Policy SP13 seeks to protect and improve open space and providing opportunities for biodiversity and nature conservation, including provision of formal play space to standards set out in the Mayor's SPG Providing for Children's and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation.
- 6.55 DPD Policy DM1 requires proposals to demonstrate how landscape and planting are integrated into the development and expects development proposals to respond to trees on or close to a site. Policy DM21 expects proposals to maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity on-site.
- 6.56 The proposal would redevelop the existing area of hardstanding and garages to provide the new housing. Having regard to the existing nature of this existing part of the site, the new building and landscaping are considered to represent a significant improvement to the character and appearance of the built environment. The hard and soft landscaping elements around the building's frontage would improve the public realm.
- 6.57 Improvements to the existing footpath at the junction of Partridge Way and Trinity Road are proposed. Existing bins at the junction of Trinity Road and Partridge Way would be replaced with a new purpose-built facility adjacent to Finsbury House providing a convenient purpose-built provision. A new footpath would be provided along Partridge Way, where none currently exists due to the presence of the garages, which would run along the side of the building and lead to the existing/improved communal amenity space nearby to the rear. Two car parking spaces serving the development would be provided on Partridge Way. These would all further improve the built environment of the area around the site and in particular, the existing tower block and the road junction.
- 6.58 A range of landscaping improvements, including the provision of a new children's play space, are proposed in the second part of the application site, which comprises the green space to the rear/north-east. This area and its improved play facilities would be provided for the residents of the new housing, and existing residents in the area. New tree, shrub and groundcover planting and seating in this area will provide a more attractive green and useable space and a broader range of habitats and ecological opportunities, improving biodiversity in accordance with the aims of the above planning policies
- 6.59 The application proposes natural play elements (play boulders, logs and possibly a mound) to cater for children up to 11 years of age only. This provides a centrally located 'door-step' type space with a travel distance of approximately 50 metres from the proposed new homes and is a facility that children in existing buildings can also use. It is expected that older children (12-15 years) and young adults would use the surrounding open space, play and sports facilities targeted at these age groups that exist within convenient and safe walking distance from Partridge Way.

- 6.60 No existing trees would be removed under this proposal and to enhance the public realm within and promote biodiversity, the application proposes to plant more trees on the opposite corner of Partridge Way and along the verge to Bounds Green Road. The new and relocated bin store adjacent to Finsbury House will also be screened with new trees. In total, approximately 24 new trees are proposed to be planted locally and the precise nature and position is to be agreed with Haringey's Tree Officer.

#### Urban Greening Factor

- 6.61 The urban greening factor (UGF) identifies the appropriate amount of urban 'greening' required in new developments. The UGF is based on factors set out in the London Plan such as the amount of vegetation, permeable paving, tree planting, or green roof cover, tailored to local conditions. The London Plan recommends a target score of 0.4 for developments which are predominately residential.
- 6.62 An assessment of the Urban Greening Factor (UGF) has been undertaken, based on the surface cover types and areas within the application boundary. The proposals deliver an UGF of 0.456, which is above the requirement for residential development of 0.4 as set out in London Plan policy G5 and therefore satisfy this requirement
- 6.63 The above landscaping details can be secured by condition to ensure Officers review the proposals in greater detail and with necessary consultation as required in order to secure a high-quality scheme and a long-term, viable implementation. Subject to this, the proposal represents marked improvements to the hard and soft landscaping on-site and in its immediate environs and would result in play/children's space provision which is considered acceptable for this location, housing size/population, and typology. The proposal satisfies the above planning policies in this regard.

#### **Housing mix, tenure and quality of accommodation**

##### *Housing mix*

- 6.64 London Plan (2021) Policy H10 states that schemes should generally consist of a range of unit sizes. To determine the appropriate mix of unit sizes in relation to the number of bedrooms for a scheme, it advises that regard is made to several factors. These include robust evidence of local need, the requirement to deliver mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods, the nature and location of the site (with a higher proportion of one and two bed units generally more appropriate in locations which are closer to a town centre or station or with higher public transport access and connectivity), and the aim to optimise housing potential on sites.

- 6.65 The 2021 London Plan states that boroughs may wish to prioritise meeting the most urgent needs earlier in the Plan period, which may mean prioritising low-cost rented units of particular sizes.
- 6.66 Local Plan Policy SP2 and DPD Policy DM11 of the Council's Development Management DPD adopt a similar approach.
- 6.67 DPD Policy DM11 states that the Council will not support proposals which result in an over concentration of 1 or 2 bed units overall unless they are part of larger developments or located within neighbourhoods where such provision would deliver a better mix of unit sizes.
- 6.68 The proposal is for 23 units. The dwelling mix is as follows;
- 14 x one-bed two-person units
  - 7 x two-bed four-person units
  - 1 x two-bed three-person wheelchair unit
  - 1 x two-bed four-person wheelchair unit
- 6.69 The opportunity to provide family sized units was explored during the pre-application process, however due to the nature of this site it was not found to be feasible to viably provide a larger unit. The site is small and irregular and the requirements for internal stairwell/lift provision, limits the amount of 'usable' floor area that can be provided. This prevents providing 3 bedroom units that meet relevant standards of accommodation, including minimum space standards and featuring at least dual aspects. Having regard to these considerations, the proposed provision of mostly one-bedroom units, and the remainder at two-bedrooms, is considered acceptable and is also appropriate for the characteristics of this small, constrained site with good proximity to existing transport and services.
- 6.70 Furthermore, Officers point out that this proposal forms part of the Council's Housing Delivery Programme which seeks to optimise the provision of affordable accommodation for Council rent to meet local need. It aims to address the Council's housing waiting list through the provision of a wide range of housing typologies and address issues relating to the over and under occupation of the existing housing stock and ensure the effective use of public assets and funding. In this respect, the units meet an identified need. The proposed housing mix is therefore considered acceptable with regard to the above planning policies.

#### *Quality of accommodation*

- 6.71 The Nationally Described Space Standards set out the minimum space requirements for new housing. The London Plan (2021) standards are consistent with these. London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high-quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and

providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. It provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

- 6.72 The Mayor of London's Housing SPG seeks to ensure that the layout and design of residential and mixed-use development should ensure a coherent, legible, inclusive and secure environment is achieved.

*Indoor and outdoor space/accommodation standards*

- 6.73 All dwellings achieve or exceed minimum space standards including bedroom sizes, gross internal area, and outside amenity space standards (balconies). All dwellings have a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.5m. All dwellings are well laid out to provide useable living spaces and sufficient internal storage space. The units are acceptable in this regard.

*Unit Aspect*

- 6.74 All units would be at least double aspect, with most having a triple aspect. This would ensure good natural light penetration and levels of outlook to help ensure high-quality accommodation.

*Accessible Housing*

- 6.75 London Plan Policy D5 seeks to provide suitable housing and genuine choice for London's diverse population, including disabled people, older people and families with young children. To achieve this, it requires that 10% of new housing is wheelchair accessible and that the remaining 90% is easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. Local Plan Policy SP2 is consistent with this as is DPD Policy DM2 which requires new developments to be designed so that they can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all.

- 6.76 All dwellings achieve compliance with Building Regulations M4 (2) and 10% of units achieve M4 (3) compliance. Two accessible car parking spaces are provided for the two wheelchair accessible units. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard.

*Child Play Space provision*

- 6.77 London Plan Policy S4 seeks to ensure that development proposals include suitable provision for play and recreation. Local Plan Policy SP2 requires residential development proposals to adopt the GLA Child Play Space Standards and Policy SP13 underlines the need to make provision for children's informal or formal play space.

- 6.78 The applicant has produced a child yield calculation for the proposed development based on the mix and tenure of units in accordance with the current GLA population yield calculator. It requires 114.4m<sup>2</sup> of play space based on a yield of 11.4 children with 10m<sup>2</sup> provision per child. The amount of play space provided exceeds this requirement.
- 6.79 While the size of the play space exceeds policy requirements for all children, the applicant expects that older children (12-15) and young adults may be likely to use existing play and sports facilities in the wider area which are targeted at these age groups. This would enable the proposed on-site works to focus on providing space for younger children where space close (approximately 50 metres away) to the flats is necessary for supervision and safety reasons.
- 6.80 Natural play elements (play boulders, logs and possibly a mound) are proposed to cater for children up to 11 years of age only. This provides high quality landscaping to be provided in this area, well-located close to the occupiers of the flats. It also represents an improved facility for existing younger children in the area. This approach is considered to provide greater benefits for both new occupiers and the existing residents nearby. The play space provision is therefore acceptable.

*Daylight/Sunlight/overshadowing – Future Occupiers*

- 6.81 Daylight and sunlight studies have been undertaken to assess the levels of daylight and sunlight within the proposed building. The study is based on the numerical tests laid down in the relevant Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance.
- 6.82 The report confirms that the proposed design satisfies all of the requirements set out in the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. All habitable rooms receive adequate sunlight and daylight. This is to be expected in a building with generous window allocations to all flats, most of which are triple, but at least dual, aspect. The proposal would result in an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers in this regard.

*Noise – Future Occupiers*

- 6.83 The NPPF states, in paragraph 180, that new development should mitigate and reduce to minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life. London Plan Policy D14 specifically concerns noise and requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts. Local Plan Policy DM23 states that the Council will seek to ensure that new noise sensitive development is located away from existing or planned sources of noise pollution. Proposals for potentially noisy development must suitably demonstrate that measures will be implemented to mitigate its impact.

- 6.84 The application is accompanied by an Acoustic Report, which concludes that appropriate internal and external noise levels can be achieved and that the site is therefore suitable for residential development. The building would incorporate mechanical ventilation and heat recovery (MVHR) and give residents the option of opening the windows or keeping them closed. The applicant decided on MVHR for the whole building as it was more efficient from an energy perspective (which the Council's Carbon Team support).
- 6.85 The noise report notes that in some scenarios at certain times, the south elevation windows would be more susceptible to higher levels of noise than ideal, notably when windows are opened to provide ventilation. However, it notes that mechanical ventilation would allow for airflow into the property without reliance on window-opening at louder/more sensitive times (such as at night when passing traffic on Bounds Green Road may be more noticeable).
- 6.86 The report also acknowledges that some of the outside areas (balconies), at some times, would have higher noise levels than desired for a residential property. However, this is not considered materially harmful to living conditions. Officers recognise that it is a by-product of the fact all new dwellings have external amenity spaces and most of the times the balconies would not suffer from excessive noise. The benefits of having such a space outweigh the fact that some of the balconies may experience higher external noise levels at certain times, particularly in a constrained urban site. This is unlike the tower blocks opposite which have no external space and are similarly noise sensitive.
- 6.87 While there are some windows and times that would be sensitive to higher noise levels than desired, on balance the units would retain a good quality of living accommodation in this respect with the MVHR as an alternative 'backup' to opening windows if noise is problematic in certain times, with modern thermally efficient windows also mitigating its impact. On balance, the proposed details are acceptable in this regard.

#### *Housing provision: Summary*

- 6.88 In summary, the standards of accommodation and living conditions proposed are very high and while some parts of the building are more noise sensitive than others, the acoustic performance would be good and not unusual in this regard. For a scheme in this location with its site constraints, the proposal represents very good quality units and living conditions which satisfy planning policy.

#### **Impact on neighbouring amenity**

- 6.89 The NPPF (para.130) requires planning decisions to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing users in the area. London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to

surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours.

*Outlook, and overlooking/privacy*

- 6.90 The proposed building is positioned between and to the south-east of two large 15-storey tower blocks at Finsbury House and Newbury House, across Partridge Way. At its nearest point, it is over 15m and 25m respectively from these blocks, which sit at a slight angle opposite. The building is also over 40m from the nursery facility which is to the rear and between the existing towers.
- 6.91 The scale and location of the proposed development in relation to these neighbouring buildings ensures that a reasonable outlook will be retained for existing residents and users of the nursery facility. For the same reasons set out above the windows and balconies would not be close enough to cause a harmful loss of privacy or overlooking to closest surrounding residents. Nor the other properties at the far end of Partridge Way, obliquely beyond the existing play area, which are much further away.
- 6.92 In relation to the adjoining two-storey terraces on Partridge Way the proposed building stands over 2m north-west from the flank elevation of the nearest property and effectively extends the existing building line at the front and rear. Due to its limited depth beyond the building lines of the terrace, and its set-back from their side boundary, the level of outlook from these properties is not considered to be affected to a degree that warrants material 'harm'. While the nearest corner of the proposed building will be visible from the rear gardens, it would not affect outlook in a significantly detrimental way.
- 6.93 The layout and form of the proposed building have also been designed to prevent unacceptable levels of overlooking by placing non-habitable areas such as the communal lift and the stair core on its north-western elevation facing across to Finsbury House and Newbury House and the nursery facility. The proposed balconies are framed and their openings on this side of the building are smaller to again limit the potential for overlooking.
- 6.94 The south-east elevation facing the adjoining two-storey terrace (most notably, No.2) has been designed with secondary habitable room windows and the balconies on this side incorporate louvres to restrict views out/away from No.2 and the terraced gardens below, and instead towards areas beyond, towards Bounds Green Road. which is considered an acceptable approach to minimise overlooking.

*Daylight/sunlight assessment*

- 6.95 The Mayor's Housing SPG, indicates that BRE guidelines on assessing daylight and sunlight should be applied sensitively to higher density development in London, particularly in central and urban settings, recognising the London Plan's strategic approach to optimise housing output and the need to accommodate additional housing supply in locations with good accessibility suitable for higher density development. Quantitative standards on daylight and sunlight should not be applied rigidly within built up urban areas, without carefully considering the location and context and standards experienced in broadly comparable housing typologies in London.
- 6.96 The design of the proposed development has also been informed by detailed sunlight and daylight analysis to ensure that neighbouring properties, including the nursery receive sufficient sunlight and daylight. It considers the impact of the development on the light receivable by the neighbouring properties at 1 Northcott Avenue, 1 to 84 Finsbury House, 1 to 84 Newbury House, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14 Partridge Way, 2 Cornwall Avenue, Seventh Day Adventist Church and Wood Green Pre School Playgroup.
- 6.97 All neighbouring windows (that have a requirement for daylight or sunlight) pass the relevant BRE daylight and direct sunlight tests. The development also passes the BRE standards in relation to the overshadowing of gardens and open spaces.
- 6.98 There is a degree of non-compliance with the BRE criteria, limited to the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test in respect to four windows on Finsbury House. Having regard however to the overall very high level of compliance with the BRE recommendations, the mitigating factors and the aforementioned Mayor's Housing SPG guidance that such standards are not applied rigidly within built up urban areas, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on existing daylight and sunlight levels received by neighbouring properties.

#### *Noise*

- 6.99 While concerns about noise from occupants are noted, the proposal is not considered to increase noise levels beyond those expected in a residential area and the proposal is not considered to result in harm to neighbouring living conditions in this regard.

#### *Summary*

- 6.100 In summary, the proposal would not result in detrimental harm to neighbouring living conditions/accommodation. The proposal satisfies relevant planning policy in this regard.

### **Impact on nearby Conservation areas**

- 6.101 DPD Policy DM9 states that development should sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets. The site lies near three conservation areas (CA). Trinity Gardens CA lies beyond the site and its boundary, towards the south-east and east. Bowes Park CA lies beyond the site and its boundary, to the north-east and north (on the far side of the two Partridge Way tall buildings). Wood Green Common CA extends approximately 260m to the south and south-east of the application site.
- 6.102 The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the glossary to the NPPF as: "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral". There is also the statutory requirement to ensure that proposals 'preserve or enhance' the conservation area.
- 6.103 The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposal and notes that it would have an impact on the significance of the Wood Green Common CA and associated historic buildings. This is due to its distance from the Wood Green Common CA, the intervening railway infrastructure and development, and the height, mass and scale of the proposal and its location and context adjacent to the two existing 15-storey tower blocks.
- 6.104 Views looking into and out of the Bowes Park CA are limited and the special interest of the CA lies in the surviving Victorian and Edwardian residential development there. This proposal would only be partially visible from limited locations and given its context adjacent to the existing tall buildings, the Officer notes that it would not appear prominent or overbearing. For this reason, they consider that it would not substantially detract from the Bowes Park CA.
- 6.105 Trinity Gardens CA has a more open character and allows for more views out of it. Views are afforded along Bounds Green Road towards the application site, most notably from Nightingale Gardens and Trinity Gardens. The proposed nine storey building would be visible here in the setting of this CA which has low-rise development and open spaces. However, again, it would be seen in the context of the existing taller buildings which already influence these views. For this reason, the harm to the significance of this CA is considered by the Conservation Officer to be limited.
- 6.106 In summary, the proposal would have a negligible impact on the surrounding heritage assets. In line with Para 202 of the NPPF this must be treated as less than substantial harm, when weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, it is considered acceptable and sufficient to satisfy planning policy. The proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation areas.

## **Transport, parking, highway safety, waste/recycling and servicing**

- 6.107 Paragraph 110 of the NPPF (2021) states that in assessing development proposals, decision makers should ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes have been taken up, given the type of development and its location. It prioritises pedestrian and cycle movements, followed by access to public transport, including facilities to encourage this.
- 6.108 London Plan Policy T1 sets out the Mayor's strategic target for 80% of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. This policy also promotes development that makes the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport. Policy T6 sets out cycle parking requirements for developments, including minimum standards. T7 concerns car parking and sets out that 'car-free' development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are well-connected by public transport. Policy T6.1 sets out requirements for car parking spaces that are proposed.
- 6.109 Local Plan Policy SP7 states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This approach is continued in DM DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM33.
- 6.110 DM32 is particularly relevant and 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, a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be provided prior to the occupation of the development, parking is provided for disabled people; and parking is designated for occupiers of developments specified as car capped.
- 6.111 The site is located with easy access to a range of local amenities, has a PTAL of 4/5 and good pedestrian and cycle links. The site and roads adjoining the site are within the Wood Green (WG) Outer controlled parking zone (CPZ) where regulations apply Monday to Saturday 8am to 6.30pm. So the proposal meets the relevant policy criteria for Car-free development.
- 6.112 The application was submitted with a comprehensive transport statement/assessment which includes a trip generation assessment which has shown that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on local roads and public transport services. Due to the loss of parking (the garages on site) a Parking Survey following the 'Lambeth Methodology' which is typically used

in assessing parking stress/impacts of proposals in the borough has been carried out.

- 6.113 The parking surveys found that the average overnight parking stress of Controlled Parking Zone WG where permit holding residents can park within the survey area, was found to be 69% or 77% when splitting kerb space into increments of 5 metres or 6 metres respectively. Of the 156 total Zone WG Permit Holder kerb side parking opportunities within the study area (5 metre increments), an average of 108 cars have been observed to be parked leaving 48 available spaces.
- 6.114 Based on the worst-case assessment that 18 cars will be displaced from the current site, because of the demolition of the existing 18 garages, overnight parking stress on Zone WG Permit holder spaces would increase from the current level of 69% to 81% for the 5m bay length assessment, and from 77% to 90% for the 6m sensitivity test bay length assessment. In reality some of the current 'lock-up' garages may already be vacant or used for storage.
- 6.115 As outlined above, planning policy sets out that residential developments in PTAL 4 and 5 areas should be 'car free'. The proposed development will be car-free in that no on-site parking is provided (other than 2 wheelchair bays which are a requirement for the two accessible flats), and residents would not be permitted to apply for on-street CPZ parking permits. Subject to this, the proposal would not increase overnight parking stress on CPZ permit-controlled spaces nearby, above the level described above for the worst-case displacement of 18 cars from the current site.
- 6.116 The site is close to Bounds Green Road bus routes and the wider transport routes at Bounds Green and Wood Green nearby. Furthermore, the unit make up of 1-2 bedroom units typically have lower car-use than 'family sized' (3 bed +) units.
- 6.117 However, to supplement this, and encourage sustainable travel choices/options for residents, cycle parking is provided for 39 cycles and two mobility scooters within a secure communal cycle store in accordance with the planning policy requirements above. Visitor cycle parking is also provided, in accordance with policy requirements, and new communal cycle storage hangars will be located within the adjoining development for the benefit of existing residents.
- 6.118 The Council's Transportation Officers have reviewed the scheme. They note that even in the 'worse case' scenario, the scheme is not considered to result in unacceptable highway safety, capacity or parking impacts. They are satisfied with the above parking assessment, a car-free development, and the cycle parking provision. The car-free status will be secured via a unilateral undertaking. The cycle parking will be secured by condition to confirm the details.
- 6.119 Officers are aware of concerns raised in objections received from the public where it was queried what will replace these garages for bulk storage (indicating some

are used for storage), and parking provision. Bulk storage is not the primary intention for garages and these garages are a public good on an under-utilised site, where the borough is under pressure to provide housing to accommodate an identified and significant need to ease housing pressure. Given the high PTAL of the site, Officers consider the need for housing to outweigh the ability of the public to hire/use a garage for parking/bulk storage here.

#### *Waste/recycling and servicing*

- 6.120 London Plan Policy D6 requires suitable waste and recycling storage facilities in all new developments, Local Plan Policy SP6 requires well designed recycling facilities to be integrated into all new developments, and DPD Policy DM4 requires all proposals to make on-site provision for general waste and separate recycling provision. Further guidance of waste and refuse is set out in Haringey's Sustainable Design SPD and its Waste Management Services guidance note.
- 6.121 The waste storage arrangements are detailed in the Design and Access Statement and Transport Statement. The building would have integral internal waste storage (accommodating general waste, food waste, and recycling waste), accessible internally for residents, and externally for collection via a ground floor door to the street in close proximity.
- 6.122 Bins are proposed to be collected from Partridge Way as part of existing refuse collection schedules. They would be within a transfer distance of 15m from kerbside to refuse vehicle. The proposed scheme will not affect the ability of refuse or servicing vehicles from entering, exiting and turning in Partridge Way.
- 6.123 A current recycling store for Finsbury House, which is located adjacent to the site, would be moved to a position adjacent to Finsbury House and screened by landscaping.
- 6.124 The Council's Transportation Officers have indicated that the distance the bins would be transferred to the street should be referred to the Council's Cleansing Officers. They raise no objection in-principle to the proposals but have queried several matters.
- 6.125 They have reviewed the scheme and advise that a distance of 10m is required. The bin distance, types, approval with homes for Haringey to relocate the tower block bins from in front of this site to a purpose built store next to that block opposite, and are issues with are still being resolved by the applicant.
- 6.126 Subject to resolving these matters the proposal can be considered to be in accordance with the planning polices outlined above, subject to details within a unilateral undertaking and planning conditions, the proposal would be acceptable on highways, parking, and waste/recycling/servicing grounds.

## **Sustainability, Energy and Climate Change**

- 6.127 The proposed development has sought to adopt a progressive approach in relation to sustainability and energy to ensure that the most viable and effective solution is delivered to reduce carbon emissions. The NPPF requires development to contribute to the transition to a low carbon future, reduce energy consumption and contribute to and conserve the natural environment.
- 6.128 London Plan Policy SI 2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions, states that major developments should be zero carbon, and in meeting the zero-carbon target a minimum on-site reduction of at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations is expected. Local Plan Policy SP4 requires all new developments to introduce measures that reduce energy use and carbon emissions. Residential development is required to achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions. Local Plan Policy SP11 requires all development to adopt sustainable design and construction techniques to minimise impacts on climate change and natural resources.
- 6.129 DPD Policy DM1 states that the Council will support design-led proposals that incorporate sustainable design and construction principles and Policy DM21 expects new development to consider and implement sustainable design, layout and construction techniques.
- 6.130 An energy statement was submitted with the application which demonstrates that consideration has been given to sustainable design principles throughout the design of the proposed scheme. The building is designed to minimise its environmental impact through various means and minimise carbon dioxide emissions in line with the prescribed energy hierarchy. The scheme achieves a 64% improvement in CO2 emissions over the baseline requirements within Building Regulations Approved Document Part L1A. The development will further achieve 'zero carbon' through an offset payment in line with the London Plan guidance.
- 6.131 The development employs an efficient building fabric, including well insulated walls and highly efficient glazing, efficient systems. Air source heat pumps and PV Panels are specified to maximise carbon savings for the site. An Overheating Assessment has been submitted which details various measures that have been incorporated to minimise the risk of overheating as part of the overall energy strategy. All rooms are shown to provide a good level of thermal comfort for new residents.
- 6.132 The Council's Carbon Management Team have been consulted on the application. In summary, they support the scheme based on its carbon reductions. They have requested further information which can be dealt with by conditions. A carbon offset contribution of £25,764 + 10% monitoring fee can be secured in the agreement. This would be secured as £14,170, based on 50% of expected carbon offset based on the energy report, payable on implementation. Followed by a deferred carbon

offset contribution of £14,170+ based on 50% of expected carbon offset based on the energy report, plus any additional carbon offset charges required following energy testing based on £90/per tonne of carbon.

- 6.133 Subject to these, the proposal represents a zero carbon scheme which significantly exceeds the Local Plan Policy requirements of a 35% reduction and therefore represents an exemplar scheme which not only satisfies, but exceeds, the requirements of relevant planning policy in this regard.

### **Crime prevention**

- 6.134 London Plan Policy D3 states that development proposal should achieve safe, secure and inclusive environments. Local Plan Policy 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. DPD Policy DM2 seeks to ensure that new developments have regard to the principles set out in 'Secured by Design'.

- 6.135 The design has been influenced by the 'Secure by Design' (SBD) principles and in doing so seeks to design out crime. SBD principles have been considered and incorporated from the pre-application stage where the Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer and a Constable were consulted and provided advice, commentary on the indicative proposals, and recommendations on what measures to include in the scheme. They indicated that the proposal was capable of SBD accreditation. These measures and approaches have been incorporated into this proposal. The Design and Access Statement provides information on the way the proposed development seeks to enhance security through the design of the building and treatment of the public realm.

- 6.136 The applicant advises that they aim to achieve a SBD Silver Award, with the aspiration to achieve an SBD Gold Award.

- 6.137 The Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO) was consulted on this final design. They raise no objection in principle to the proposal and recommend planning condition(s) to secure accreditation prior to commencement. Subject to SBD measures by condition, Officers consider the proposal would create a safe secure environment, satisfy the planning policies requirements and would be acceptable in this regard.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 6.138 Local Plan Policy SP5 and DPD Policy DM24 seek to ensure that new development reduces the risk of flooding and provide suitable measures for drainage.

6.139 A Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out for the site which highlights it as being in Flood Zone 1. All sites are in a flood zone categorised between 1 and 3, with 1 having the least risk. It concludes that the risk of flooding is low. It demonstrates that the effect of the proposed development on off-site flood risk is also low and that there is a decrease of surface water run-off rates and run-off volume as a result of the development.

The proposal would incorporate sustainable drainage (SUDs) and water runoff measures. The approach taken for the drainage of all new surfaces is to create a management train from run-off source to site outfall, incorporating attenuation and treatment wherever possible. The proposal is to use permeable paving and to use threshold drainage installed on entrances to the building.

6.140 The Council's drainage Officers have reviewed the scheme and agree that the above approach is acceptable subject to securing details of the long-term management of the sustainable urban drainage systems in-place to remain in place for the lifetime the development. Subject to this, the proposal satisfies relevant planning policy and is acceptable in this regard.

### **Air quality**

6.141 DPD Policy DM23 requires all development to consider air quality and improve or mitigate the impact on air quality in the borough and users of the development. An Air Quality Assessment ('AQA') was prepared to support the planning application and concluded that the site is suitable for residential use and that the proposed development would not expose existing residents or future occupants to unacceptable air quality. It also highlighted that the air quality impacts from the proposed development during its construction phase would not be significant and that in air quality terms it would not conflict with national or local planning policies.

6.142 Officers have reviewed this assessment and agree that while concerns raised about construction works are noted, these are temporary and can be mitigated through the requirements of the construction logistics plan to include air quality control measures such as dust suppression. The proposal is not considered an air quality risk or harm to nearby residents, or future occupiers. The proposal is acceptable in this regard.

### **Ecology**

6.143 Consistent with the NPPF, London Plan Policy G6 seeks to ensure that development proposals manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain, while G5 requires major developments to contribute to urban greening. DPD Policy DM6 requires proposals for taller buildings to consider their ecological impact.

- 6.144 An ecology survey was carried out to determine the presence of any important habitats or species which might be impacted by the proposed development. The report concludes that the existing site is of negligible value to wildlife, as it consists largely of hardstanding and building, with only a small section of grass in a raised bed. Soft landscaping in the wider area includes only blocks of mown amenity grass, scattered broadleaved trees, and circular arrangement of trimmed introduced shrubs.
- 6.145 No birds were observed on site during the survey, nor any old or in-use birds' nests, although common species were observed in the wider area. The garages are not suitable for bat use and were not identified as a bat roost or hibernation site. None of the trees in the surrounding area were found to contain features such as decay cavities, woodpecker holes, fissures and exfoliating bark, that would be considered suitable for bat roosting and/or hibernation.
- 6.146 The report highlights that the site itself is of no value to foraging bats, as it is very small with little vegetation. No evidence of badgers was found, and the site is unsuitable for otters and water voles. There is no standing water on the site for breeding amphibians, and with very limited foraging opportunities and no suitable habitats, the land is considered unsuitable for them. The site is also considered to be unsuitable for reptiles for the same reason, and they are considered to be absent. The report concluded that there was low potential for significant invertebrate assemblages, in particular those species listed as a priority in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and/or Local Biodiversity Action Plan. As such, the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

### **Land contamination**

- 6.147 DPD Policy DM23 (Part G) requires proposals to demonstrate that any risks associated with land contamination can be adequately addressed to make the development safe.
- 6.148 A desk study preliminary risk assessment has been carried and which has identified several potential sources of contamination including:
- Contaminated ground associated with previous site use (roadway / verge, lock-up garages)
  - Potential for Made Ground associated with previous development operations
  - Potential asbestos containing materials within existing buildings
- 6.149 The risk of contamination identified in the report is moderate to low.
- 6.150 Officers consulted the Council's Environmental Health service on this proposal. Their Officers reviewed the scheme in detail and agree that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions which would initially require a site investigation to

be conducted, to allow a risk assessment to be undertaken, refinement of the Conceptual Model, and the development of a Method Statement detailing any remediation requirements if necessary. An asbestos survey is also advised to be undertaken prior to any demolition works, to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials would be required to be removed from safely from the site. Subject to appropriate conditions to deal with land-contamination risk, the proposal would satisfy the above planning policy requirements and is acceptable in this regard.

## 6.151 **Conclusion**

- The development would provide a high standard of accommodation that serves an identified need and represents an opportunity to provide a notable contribution towards affordable housing delivery targets in the borough.
- Although the scheme results in a taller building than those adjacent to the east, the proposal responds to its context and is of high design quality and equally provides a high quality of accommodation for future occupiers.
- The building would not appear overly intrusive or overbearing in views from the surrounding conservation areas when viewed in the context of the existing 15-storey Finsbury House and Newbury House nearby. Its visibility and presence would have a negligible impact on the historic built environment which is considered acceptable when it is weighted against the public benefits of the proposal.
- The design, layout and orientation of the buildings and separation distances to neighbouring properties are satisfactory to protect the amenities of the neighbouring occupier.
- Environmental impacts and factors have been appropriately managed and considered and conditions are in place to control these.

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 CIL**

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £125,762 (2077 residential sqm x £60.55 and the Haringey CIL charge will be £477,502 (2077 sqm x £229.90). This 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. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this

charge. The development is likely to be eligible for Social Housing Relief from CIL due to the affordable housing proposed, subject to the relevant serving of notices.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions in Appendix 1 and subject to Unilateral Undertaking

Applicant's drawing No.(s) Design and Access Statement, July 2021; 'MLM Group' Sustainability Statement REV.01 dated 21/07/2021'; 'MLM Group' Noise Impact Assessment Report REV.C03 dated 27/05/2021; 'MLM Group' Air Quality Assessment REV.C03 dated 25/05/2021; TH 2674 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan) dated 03/06/2021; Outline Construction Logistics Plan, July 2021; 21152/E1 ('Indigo Surveys' Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report); 'MLM Group' Energy Statement REV.03 dated 23/06/2021'; 'Ellis + Moore' Flood Risk Assessment dated 05/10/2020; Statement of Community Involvement, July 2021; Planning Statement, July 2021; Landscape Proposals & Play Space Strategy, 28 June 2021; 'MLM Group' Energy Statement REV.03 dated 23/06/2021'; 'MLM Group' Summer Overheating Assessment in Dwellings - CIBSE TM59 Compliance for Partridge Way, Haringey, REV.01 dated 14/12/2020; 'JOMAS Engineering Environmental' Desk Study/Preliminary Risk Assessment Report, V2.0 dated 07/10/2020 and accompanying appendices and drawings; Daylight and Sunlight Study (Neighbouring Properties), 8 December 2020; Daylight and Sunlight Study (Within Development), 1 June 2021; Transport Statement, June 2021; TX 141445 (Issue 05) 'London Plan Fire Statement' dated 09/07/2021; TX 141445 (Issue 04) 'Fire Safety Strategy Report, RIBA Stage 3' dated 09/07/2021; ; 'JOMAS Engineering Environmental' Exploded Ordnance Desk Top Risk Assessment; BRE Client Report ref: P118564, Issue 3, dated 01/06/2021;0187\_100 REV.A;0226-001 REV.P02; 0226-002 REV.P01; 0226-008 REV.P01; 0226-009 REV.P01; 0226-010 REV.P01; 0226-121 REV P01; 0226-101 REV.P01; 0226-104 REV.P01; 0226-103 REV.P01; 0226-104 REV.P01; 0226-106 REV.P02; 0226-109 REV.P01; 0226-107 REV.P02; 0226-105 REV.P01; 0226-102 REV.P01; 0226-110 REV.P01; 0226-108 REV.P01; 0226-120 REV.P01