

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING APPLICATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2006/0007

Ward: Hornsey

Date received: 04/01/2006
N/A

Last amended date:

Drawing number of plans: A3596/2.3/001; A3596/2.3/002; A3596/2.3/003; A3596/2.3/004; A3596/2.1/001; A3596/2.1/002; A3596/2.1/003; A3596/2.1/004; A3596/2.1/005; A3596/2.1/006; A3596/2.1/007

Address: Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road N8

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 3 / part 4 storey block comprising 8 x one bed, 23 x two bed and 2 x three bed self contained flats. Provision of 21 car park spaces, refuse storage and communal landscaped courtyard.

Existing Use: Light Industrial
Residential

Proposed Use:

Applicant: Servite Houses

Ownership: Private

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Road - Borough
Urban Heritage Regeneration Area

Officer Contact: Michelle Bradshaw

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The proposal site is Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road, N8 in the Hornsey Ward. Pembroke Works is an employment site located to the north of Hornsey High Street bounded by Campsbourne Road to the west,

Pembroke Road to the north and Myddleton Road to the east. To the south of the site is Audley House which is a four storey residential block.

Campsbourne Road largely comprises two separate terraces of three storey houses some of which are converted into flats. To the north-west is a piece of open space with mature trees. Directly opposite the site to the north is Moore House a three storey development of residential flats. Myddleton Road comprises an open car park and a mortuary building.

The Pembroke Works comprises a building which is part single storey, part two storeys in height. Pembroke works has a number of commercial occupiers. The main tenants include Automerc Service Ltd a vehicle repair company, Soup Dragon a children's goods retailer and Strawberry Bubbles a hand car wash. Details have been forwarded by one of the occupiers indicating that there are 9 firms operating from the premises providing employment for 38 people.

PLANNING HISTORY

1963 OLD/1963/0492	Proposed erection of part one and part two storey factory on land bounded by (19419) Campsbourne, Pembroke & Myddleton Roads (Granted)	Ref:
1972 OLD/1972/0697	Change of use to 8,840 sq. ft of industrial Floor space and proposes incidental there (1888/001 5*8238) to which purposes including 6690sq.ft. storage space and 5000sq.ft. of office floor space (Granted)	Ref:
1980 OLD/1980/0800	Use of part of ground floor premises for Repair maintenance and service of (1888/001/6*22812) motor vehicles (Granted)	Ref:
1990	Erection of single storey pre-cast HGY/1990/0570 Structure Storage (Granted)	Ref:

2005	Demolition of existing buildings and HGY/2005/1811 Erection of a part 3 storey/ part 4 storey block comprising 8 x 1 bed, 23 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed self contained flats. Provision of 21 car park spaces, refuse Storage and communal landscaped courtyard. (Withdrawn)	Ref:
------	--	------

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 3 / part 4 storey block comprising 8 x one bed, 23 x two bed and 2 x three bed self contained flats. Provision of 21 car park spaces, refuse storage and communal landscaped courtyard.

CONSULTATION

Ward Councillors – Hornsey Ward (Cllr Judy Bax, Cllr Richard Milner, Cllr Quincy Prescott)

Haringey Council – Conservation Team

Haringey Council – Transportation Group

Haringey Council – Environmental Health

Haringey Council – Building Control

Haringey Council – Recreation Services – Arboriculturalist

Haringey Council – Regeneration Team

Haringey Council – Children's Service

Haringey Council – Legal Services

Haringey Council – Crime Prevention

C.A.A. C – Hornsey

Owner/Occupier: 1a – 1e (c) Campsbourne Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 1 – 13 (o) Campsbourne Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 1 – 20 (c) Moore House, Pembroke Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 21 – 40 (c) Pembroke Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 1 – 12 (c) Ardley House, Campsbourne Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 1 – 24 (c) Sackville House, Myddleton Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 2, 2a, 4, 2b Campsbourne Road, N8

Owner/Occupier: 2 – 16 (e) The Campsbourne, N8

Owner/Occupier: 1, 3 Myddleton Road, N8

Development Control Forum - 2nd February 2006 - Baptist Church, The Campsbourne, Hornsey High Road, N8 – Minutes attached to report

RESPONSES

Haringey Council – Building Control

Confirm that the proposals have been checked under Regulation B5 – access for the fire service and Building Control do not have any observations

Haringey Council – Transportation Team

Although this development proposal is located where the public transport accessibility level is low, Hornsey High Street which is 'Bus 144' route and offering 15 buses per hour (two-way) between Muswell Hill Broadway and Edmonton Green Station, is within 2 minutes walking distance away. It is therefore considered that this frequent bus service provides a good connection to the nearest Turnpike Lane tube station. Hence, it is inevitable that majority of the residents would use the combination of these travel modes for their journeys to and from this site.

In addition, our interrogation with TRAVL trip prediction software revealed that, based on similar London sites (Porter Square, N19 and Tysoe Avenue, EN3, located where there is no controlled parking and public transport accessibility level is low), a development of this magnitude would only generate a combined traffic inflow/outflow of 5 vehicles in the pm peak hour (worse case).

The applicant has also proposed 21 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled parking), as indicated on Plan No. A3596/2.1/001. This in our opinion is adequate considering that this area is not identified with parking problem and that, as stipulated in the SPG, the Council operates maximum car parking standard. Sixteen bicycle racks have also been proposed.

However, due to increased pedestrian activity ensuing from this development, there is the need for traffic management measures in the immediate area surrounding this development, in the form of creating a one-way gyratory and implementing traffic calming measures, to enhance pedestrian amenities.

Consequently, the highways and transportation authority would not object to this application on the condition that:

The applicant contributes a sum of £100,000 (one hundred thousand pounds) towards traffic management schemes around the immediate highway network. Reason: To improve the conditions for cyclists and pedestrians at this location.

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

Haringey Council – Crime Prevention

The architects have obviously considered security and crime in their design of this scheme and I have no objection to this application. My comments are:

The dwellings would benefit from the enhanced security standards detailed in the "Secured by Design Scheme" (www.securedbydesign.com) and I recommend that consideration is given to achieving the standards.

The use of 1100 railings to mark the boundary of the estate is good design and promotes defensible space without compromising surveillance.

I would be particularly keen that the communal doors are of a high security standard. We will be willing to meet with the developer or architect to discuss security as necessary.

A change of road surface / small ramp would be appropriate where the vehicle entrances adjoin Campsbourne and Myddleton Roads. The architect may also consider good quality, clear signage here too. This would enhance the private nature of the site and to a degree protect the car parking area from casual intrusion.

The design and planning stage of the development is the ideal opportunity to reduce crime opportunities and provide a sustainable environment for the local community.

Haringey Council – Environmental Health (Scientific Officer)

Please condition HGY/2006/0007 to provide site survey report, details of present/previous usage, risk assessment and details of any remediation required.

Haringey Council – Children's Service

Request that if planning permission is granted the full s106 education contribution be applied as the development is considered to result in demand on school places.

Hornsey Conservation Area Advisory Committee

No objection

Residential Owner/Occupier: 8 letters received objecting on the following grounds:

- Loss of established local businesses
- Loss of jobs associated with the established businesses
- Loss of small business office space
- Pressure on local infrastructure e.g. Schools, Healthcare etc
- Increase traffic/parking problems/pollution
- Design out of character with surroundings

Residential Owner/Occupier: 1 letter received in support

- Development of low rise housing preferable to current usage as office and car workshop. At present the site is an eyesore, fly tipping is common.

Employees of Pembroke Works: 4 Letters received objecting on the following grounds:

"I understand from my employer, Automerc Service Ltd, that there is a Planning application to redevelop Pembroke Works, thus putting my employer out of business and jeopardising my job.

I therefore wish to register my objection to the above application.

I cannot afford to lose my job as I have a young family to support. If Automerc Service Ltd is forced out of business by granting of planning permission it will be very difficult for me to find alternative employment as the number of garages in the North London area has recently diminished due to their premises being redevelopment into flats.

Please therefore consider our jobs by refusing planning permission for the application".

Employees of Pembroke Works: 4 Letters received objecting on the following grounds:

"I understand from my employer, Automerc Service Ltd, that there is a Planning application to redevelop Pembroke Works, thus putting my employer out of business and jeopardising my job.

I therefore wish to register my objection to the above application.

I cannot afford to lose my job as I have a young family to support. If Automerc Service Ltd is forced out of business by granting of planning permission it will be very difficult for me to find alternative employment as the number of garages in the North London area has recently diminished due to their premises being redevelopment into flats.

Please therefore consider our jobs by refusing planning permission for the application".

Tenants of Pembroke Works:

During the application process there has been substantial correspondence between the applicants and their agents, the tenants of Pembroke Works and the Council – Planning Department. Two of the three tenants have confirmed that they do not accept the “package” offered by the applicant’s agent, Inner Circle. The packages offered include financial assistance only, rather than including any offers of alternative premises and as such are not acceptable to the tenants. The response from Authomerc Service Limited and Soup Dragon indicate that they are not satisfied with, nor prepared to accept, the financial offer made to them, in the absence of the offer of alternative business premises.

Full details of the correspondence is available in the application file and on the Haringey Council Website:

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS 1 advises that sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning. The guidance advises that, planning should promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban development by:

- Ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with key services for all members of the community.

Planning Policy Guidance 3 - Housing

The principal national policy guidance relating to residential development is contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing. This PPG provides guidance on a range of issues relating to the provision of housing. Circular 6/98 Planning and Affordable Housing will continue to apply, within the framework of policy set out in this guidance. PPG 3 states that Local planning authorities should:

- provide sufficient housing land but give priority to re-using previously-developed land within urban areas, bringing empty homes back into use and converting existing buildings, in preference to the development of greenfield sites;
- promote improved quality of developments which in their design, layout and allocation of space create a sense of community; and
- Introduce greater flexibility in the application of parking standards, which the Government expects to be significantly lower than at present.

Planning Policy Guidance 13 - Transport

Planning Policy Guidance 13 Transport was issued in March 2001. It aims to:

- promote more sustainable transport choices for people & for moving freight
- promote accessibility to jobs, shopping by public transport/walking/ cycling
- reduce the need to travel especially by car

6.1.4 Planning Policy Guidance 22 – Renewable Energy

Planning Policy Guidance 22 Renewable Energy aims to put the UK on a path to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% by 2050. The Government has already set a target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable sources by 2010. PPS22 states that “small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally.

REGIONAL POLICY

The London Plan

The London Plan has now been formally adopted having been issued in draft in June 2002 by the Greater London Authority. The London Plan forms the emerging Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London. It contains key policies covering housing, transport, design and sustainability in the capital. It will replace Regional Planning Guidance Note 3 - Regional Planning Guidance for London.

The London Plan sets housing targets for individual boroughs for the period up to 2016. The target for Haringey is 19370 additional ‘homes’ (970 per year) of a target for London of 457950 (23000 per year).

In terms of density, the London Plan states that appropriate density ranges are dependent on location, setting and public transport accessibility (PTAL) rating. A site in an urban location, with a PTAL rating of 4 and where flats are predominantly proposed the density range suggested is 450 - 700 habitable rooms per hectare. The car parking provision for such locations should be less than 1 space per unit.

The London Plan sets affordable housing targets for individual boroughs. The target for Haringey is 50%. This figure should include a range of affordable housing following the guide 70:30 for social rented to intermediate housing. However, the actual proportions for any individual site will depend on the boroughs housing need priorities, the characteristics of the residential proposal, the level of affordable housing in the surrounding area & the economic viability of the scheme.

LOCAL POLICY

The Council adopted the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in March 1998. The UDP review process is currently underway. The first deposit draft was subject to consultation between September 2003 and December 2003. The second deposit draft was subject to consultation during September 2004 and October 2004.

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (1998)

EMP1.1	Employment Protection
EMP 1.4	Sites Outside Defined Employment Areas
HSG 1.3	Change of Use to Residential
HSG 2.1	Dwelling Mix for New Build Housing
HSG 2.2	Residential Densities
DES 1.1	Good Design and How Design Will Be Assessed
DES 1.2	Assessment of Design Quality (1): Fitting Buildings into Surroundings
DES 1.3	Assessment of Design Quality (2): Enclosure, Height and Scale
DES 1.4	Assessment of Design Quality (3): Building Lines, Layout, Massing
DES 1.5	Assessment of Design Quality (4): Detailing and Materials
DES 1.9	Privacy and Amenity of Neighbours
TSP 7.1	Parking for Development
RIM 3.1	Energy Conservation and Development
SPG 1.3	Privacy and Overlooking
SPG 2.2	Density for Residential and Mixed Use Developments
SPG 2.3	Standards Required in New Residential Development

Haringey Unitary Development Plan – Second Deposit (2004)

UD2	General Principles
UD 3	Quality Design
UD 6	Waste Storage
UD8	New Development Location and Accessibility
UD9	Parking for Development
EMP3R	Non Employment Generating Uses
EMP 4	Relocation of Businesses
HSG 8	Density Standards

HSG 9	Dwelling Mix
ENV 6A	Renewable Energy and Mitigating Climate Change
SPG 3a	Density, Dwelling Mix, Floor space Minima & Lifetime Homes
SPG 3b	Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

There are 11 issues to be addressed:

1. The Principle of Residential Use
2. Density
3. Scale, Height and Massing
4. Privacy and Amenity
5. Design
6. Dwelling Mix and Affordable Housing
7. Unit and Room Size, Layout and Stacking
8. Transport – Traffic, Car – Parking and Cycling
9. Waste Management
10. Sustainability
11. Section 106 Contributions

1. The Principle of Residential Use

The proposal site is currently in employment generating use. The Pembroke Works comprises a building which is part single storey, part two storeys in height. Pembroke works has a number of commercial occupiers. The main tenants include Automerc Service Ltd a vehicle repair company, Soup Dragon a children's goods retailer and Strawberry Bubbles a hand car wash. Details have been forwarded by one of the occupiers indicating that there are 9 firms operating from the premises providing employment for 38 people.

The site is not within a designated Defined Employment Area. Policy EMP 1.4 "Sites Outside Defined Employment Areas" states that "proposals for redevelopment of sites currently in employment generating to a non-employment generating use will be considered against the criteria set out in Policy EMP 1.1."

Policy EMP 1.1 "Employment Protection" states that where the employment generating use of land or buildings ceases, permission for non-employment use will only be given if it is demonstrated that the employment use is no longer suitable or viable. Paragraph 1.27 states that exceptions to retention of land or buildings in employment generating use may be considered where the land or buildings are not considered suitable for continued employment use on environmental, amenity or transport grounds. Policy EMP3R, of the emerging Unitary Development Plan has sufficient weight to be applied for development control purposes. As drafted at the revised deposit stage, September 2004, policy EMP3R in this case, includes the following criteria:

- a) the land or building is no longer suitable for business or industry use; &

- b) there is evidence of unsuccessful marketing over a period of normally 18 months; &
- c) there is well documented evidence that possibilities (every opportunity) to reuse; or redevelop the site for business or industry has been explored; or
- d) proposals contribute to a regeneration programme or is a site specific proposal or
- e) the redevelopment or reuse would retain or increase the number of jobs permanently provided on site.

The proposal does not meet the above criteria. In particular, there is no evidence of marketing being carried out or of redevelopment for business purposes being explored.

The applicant did initially propose a mixed use industrial and residential scheme before the current application was submitted. This was not encouraged for two reasons: i) the industrial and residential uses could have been incompatible, especially in respect of traffic generation and noise conflicts and ii) to have super imposed several floors of residential above a ground or ground and first floor commercial use, would have resulted in an unduly bulky building.

In exceptional circumstances where an applicant has complied with Policy EMP4 "Relocation of Businesses", the criteria outlined in EMP3R may be relaxed. Policy EMP4 states that "where redevelopment proposals will adversely impact upon an existing business to the extent that it will become incompatible with the proposed uses, where appropriate a relocation strategy for the existing businesses should be submitted with the application. The Council wishes to ensure that local firms are not forced out of business by the development proposals, particularly if the firm is an important local employer. It is important that alternative premises are provided, preferably in the local area, which will enable the continued viability of firms and workers to continue in their employment".

The applicant has submitted with the planning application a document "Relocation Strategy in Support of Planning Application for change of use from Commercial to Residential". In this document First Plus Planning state that "The applicant is seeking vacant possession in May 2006 which gives all current occupiers ample time to seek alternative locations. The applicant has appointed Inner Circle to negotiate suitable relocation packages with tenants, subject to legal agreement. The relocation package is financial based on the length of time the tenant has been in occupation. A perusal of estate agents; databases in the area shows that there are vacant units which would be appropriate for the businesses that would be relocating. All tenants agree with the principle of development and ...have expressed a willingness to give vacant possession subject to adequate relocation package being agreed. Both Strawberry Bubbles and Soup Dragon have accepted the relocation offer (subject to legal agreement)... A meeting was held with a representative of Automerc, who agreed in principle to give vacant possession by May 2006 subject to relocation package".

In letters submitted to the Council both Automerc Services Ltd and Soup Dragon dispute the details contained within relocation strategy statement submitted with application (refer to section “Responses” above).

From the substantial correspondence between the applicants, the tenants and the Council (refer to the response section above) it appears that the “package” offered to the three main tenants comprise financial assistance only, rather than including any offers of alternative premises. The response from Authomerc Service Limited and Soup Dragon indicate that they are not satisfied with, nor prepared to accept, the financial offer made to them, in the absence of the offer of alternative business premises.

On the basis of the evidence provided above it is considered that there have not been suitable alternative premises found or offered to the affected tenants. As such, the scheme does not meet the guidance set out in policy EMP4. Since the applicant has not complied with policy EMP4 the criteria in policy EMP3R would apply and have not been complied with. Therefore the proposal, under the current circumstances cannot be supported.

2. Density

PPG3 recommends that more efficient use of land be made by maximising use of previously developed land. It recommends that local planning authorities “avoid housing development which makes inefficient use of land and provide for more intensive housing development in and around existing centres and close to public transport nodes”.

The London Plan sets higher density for developments in urban areas than the local planning policies and recommends a density range of 450 – 700 habitable rooms per hectare for flatted developments in urban areas within 10 minutes walking distance of a town centre.

Policy HSG 2.2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan sets a density range of 175 – 250 habitable rooms per hectare. Where higher densities may be acceptable in all cases the upper limit will be 350 habitable rooms per hectare.

Policy HSG 8 of the emerging plan policy sets the density range between 200 – 400 habitable rooms per hectare. This policy is the most recent local planning policy and therefore more closely reflects the density ranges set at a regional level, in the London Plan.

The scheme proposes to create 33 residential units, comprising 8 x 1 bed units (16 habitable rooms), 23 2 bed units (69 habitable rooms) and 2 x 3 bed units (8 habitable rooms). In total, the scheme would have 93 habitable rooms. The site area is 2760.28m². Therefore, applying the method set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2.2 “Density for Residential and Mixed Use Developments” and 3a “Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes”, the density of the proposed development would be 337 habitable rooms per hectare. This density range is

in line with the density ranges set out in the London Plan, Policy HSG8 of the emerging UDP and the upper ranges set out in policy HSG 2.2 of the adopted UDP. On this basis, the density proposed in this development is found to be acceptable.

3. Scale, Height and Massing

Policy DES 1.1 'Good Design and How Design Will Be Assessed', DES 1.2 'Assessment of Design Quality (1): Fitting New Buildings into the Surrounding Area', DES 1.3 'Assessment of Design Quality (2): Enclosure, Height and Scale' and DES 1.4 'Assessment of Design Quality (3): Building Lines, Layout, Form, Rhythm and Massing' require that new buildings are of an acceptable standard of design and be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The overriding aim of these policies is to encourage good design of new buildings in order to enhance the overall quality of the built environment and the amenity of residents.

The application proposes a part three storey and part four storey residential development. The one block would form a "U" shape with frontages along Campsbourne Road, Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road. This building design would create a central communal courtyard within the development. The majority of the development would be three storeys in height, reflecting the predominant pattern of development in the area. The three storey building would step up to four storeys in height on the corner of Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road where there would not be any conflict with domestic buildings.

The building would be separated from the existing buildings to the south of the site by the car-park proposed to service the development. As such there would be no significant impact on the adjacent buildings in this location.

Overall, it is considered that the scale, height and massing of the development has been designed to fit on the site and relate to the nearby buildings. The residential development proposed for the site is considered to be appropriate in terms of scale, height and massing in compliance with policy DES 1.1, DES 1.2, DES 1.3 and DES 1.4.

4. Privacy and Amenity

Policy DES 1.9 'Privacy and Amenity of Neighbours' and UD2 'General Principles' seek to protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers. SPG3b 'Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight' states that the Council expects new developments not to result in the degree of privacy enjoyed by adjoining properties to be reduced and that new problems of overlooking are not to be created.

The application proposes a part three storey and part four storey residential development. The one block would form a "U" shape with frontages along Campsbourne Road, Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road. This building design would create a central communal courtyard within the development.

The majority of the development would be three storeys in height, reflecting the predominant pattern of development in the area. The three storey building would step up to four storeys in height on the corner of Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road where there would not be any conflict with domestic buildings. The orientation of the building with the south facing courtyard allows glazing and balconies to overlook this communal amenity space.

The scheme has been designed to take into account privacy distances, overlooking, sense of enclosure and daylight/sunlight access. There is not considered to be any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents as a result of the proposed residential development. Overall, the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DES 1.9, UD2 and SPG3b.

5. Design

Policy DES 1.1 'Good Design and How Design Will Be Assessed' and UD3 'Quality Design' state that the council will require development to be of good design, that relates to and fits in with the surrounding area.

The proposal is to use a combination of traditional and contemporary materials to reflect the diverse development in the surrounding area. Overall, the building will be of model which has a modern approach in design. The application proposes a part three storey and part four storey residential development. The one block would form a "U" shape with frontages along Campsbourne Road, Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road. This building design would create a central communal courtyard within the development. The majority of the development would be three storeys in height, reflecting the predominant pattern of development in the area. The three storey building would step up to four storeys in height on the corner of Pembroke Road and Myddleton Road where there would not be any conflict with domestic buildings. The orientation of the building with the south facing courtyard allows glazing and balconies to overlook this communal amenity space.

Policy DES 1.5 'Assessment of Design Quality (4): Detailing and Materials' and SPG8b 'Materials' state that sensitive use of materials can help to integrate an area and contribute to the success of a building within its setting.

The scheme proposes to use a combination of brick, timber and glass. The base of the building is to be a dark red brick with a mixture of render and low maintenance dark stained laminated timber cladding above. The plans indicate that white render will be used to create a visual break in the elevations. The windows are to be timber framed, the balconies metal and the main roof is to be a low pitched standing metal seam system.

In addition, if planning permission were to be granted a condition would be attached to planning permission requiring full details of materials be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing. On this basis, the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DES 1.5 "Assessment of Design Quality (4): Detailing and Materials" and

SPG8b 'Materials'. Overall, the quality of the scheme in terms of design is considered to be high, making a positive contribution to the character of the area and locality generally, in line with policy DES 1.1 "Good Design and How Design Will Be Assessed" and UD3 "Quality Design".

6. Dwelling Mix and Affordable Housing

Policy HSG 2.1 "Dwelling Mix for New Build Housing" and HSG 9 "Dwelling Mix" requires that development include a mix of housing types for both family and non-family households. The scheme comprises 10 x 1 bed units (40%), 12 x 2 bed units (48%) and 3 x 3 bed units (12%).

It is considered that the proposed dwelling mix provides a suitable mixture of housing types in line with the guidance set out in policy HSG 2.1 and HSG 9.

PPG3, Circular 6/98 and local policy HSG 2.23, HSG 4 "Affordable Housing" and SPG10a, require that all major developments include provision of affordable housing.

The proposed scheme for residential accommodation would comprise 33 units, all of which would be affordable housing. The development would have a tenure mix of 18 shared ownership (5 x 1 bed and 13 x 2 bed) and 6 general needs rented (3 x 1 bed, 10 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed). This mix represents a tenure split of 54.55% shared ownership to 45.45% general needs rented. The proposal complies with UDP policy HSG 2.23 and HSG 4 in that it includes in excess of 50% housing to be affordable/provided by a Registered Social Landlord (RSL). Should planning permission be granted, a planning obligation agreement would be required to ensure that the dwellings provided continue to be available as affordable housing for successive occupiers.

7. Unit and Room Size, Layout and Stacking and Amenity

In terms of the standard of accommodation provided, the proposal must be assessed against SPG 2.3 "Standards Required in New Residential Development" and SPG3a "Density, Dwelling Mix, Floor space Minima, Conversions, Extensions & Lifetime Homes". The policy outlines minimum flat and room size requirements for new residential developments, which ensures that the amenity of future occupiers is protected.

SPG 3a recommends that 1 bedroom 2 person units have a floor area of 48m², 2 bedroom 3 person units should have a floor area of 68m², 3 bedroom 5 person units an area of 82m². The one-bedroom units in this development would have a floor area just over 50m². The two-bedroom units range from 66m² to 68m². The three-bedroom units are 90m². Some of the two bed units fall short of the minimum recommended unit sizes as set out in the supplementary planning guidance, however the room sizes meet the room size requirements and the flats are considered to provide a good standard of accommodation.

All of the units would be dual aspect. Due to the southerly orientation of the development, the units will receive very good direct sunlight to the main living spaces.

In terms of amenity the ground floor units each have their own private terrace with direct access to the communal garden. The upper floor flats each have large private balconies each overlooking the street or courtyard. Two flats are provided with private roof terraces. The communal south facing courtyard can be accessed by all residents and will include seating areas surrounded by shrubs and trees.

All units/rooms are considered to have adequate light and ventilation. In addition, the stacking and layout arrangement is deemed to be acceptable. The proposed units provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and internal layout appropriate for the development. The external amenity space sufficient. As such, the residential accommodation is found to comply with policy SPG 2.3 and SPG3a.

8. Transport – Traffic, Car – Parking and Cycling

PPG13 'Transport' aims to promote more sustainable transport choices for people and for moving freight, promote accessibility to jobs, shopping etc by public transport/walking/cycling and reduce the need to travel especially by car. Haringey Unitary Development Plan policy UD 8 'New Development Location and Accessibility' reflects the guidance set out in PPG13. The policy states that the council will require that developments locate where the need for travel by car will be reduced and the use of public transport will be increased and that the development location and design encourage cycling and walking. Policy TSP 7.1 and UD9 "Parking for Development" outline the Councils parking requirements.

Haringey Council – Transportation Team has been consulted on this application and provided the following comments:

"Although this development proposal is located where the public transport accessibility level is low, Hornsey High Street which is 'Bus 144' route and offering 15 buses per hour (two-way) between Muswell Hill Broadway and Edmonton Green Station, is within 2 minutes walking distance away. It is therefore considered that this frequent bus service provides a good connection to the nearest Turnpike Lane tube station. Hence, it is inevitable that majority of the residents would use the combination of these travel modes for their journeys to and from this site.

In addition, our interrogation with TRAVL trip prediction software revealed that, based on similar London sites (Porter Square, N19 and Tysoe Avenue, EN3, located where there is no controlled parking and public transport accessibility level is low), a development of this magnitude would only generate a combined traffic inflow/outflow of 5 vehicles in the pm peak hour (worse case).

The applicant has also proposed 21 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled parking), as indicated on Plan No. A3596/2.1/001. This in our opinion is adequate considering that this area is not identified with parking problem and that, as stipulated in the SPG, the Council operates maximum car parking standard. Sixteen bicycle racks have also been proposed.

However, due to increased pedestrian activity ensuing from this development, there is the need for traffic management measures in the immediate area surrounding this development, in the form of creating a one-way gyratory and implementing traffic calming measures, to enhance pedestrian amenities.

Consequently, the highways and transportation authority would not object to this application on the condition that the applicant contributes a sum of £100,000 (one hundred thousand pounds) towards traffic management schemes around the immediate highway network. Reason: To improve the conditions for cyclists and pedestrians at this location”.

On this basis, the proposed level of car parking on site is deemed to be acceptable, in line with policy TSP 7.1, UD8 and UD9.

9. Waste Management

Policy UD6 ‘Waste Storage’ and SPG 8a ‘Waste and Recycling’ states that all developments is to include appropriate provision for the storage and collection of waste and recycling materials. Adequate recycling storage space within premises is necessary to help meet the Governments recycling targets. By providing sufficient recycling storage space within units, this will greatly encourage people to separate their waste for recycling.

The plans show that bins storage facilities will be provided at the southern end of the courtyard. The stores will be 1800mm brick enclosures with pergola on top with planting at the rear and metal framed doors with perforated steel door panels. Servicing would be via the car-park at the southern end of the site.

Not withstanding this, the council will condition any planning consent to require a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. In addition, such a scheme as approved, shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. On this basis, the scheme is found to comply with policy UD6 “Waste Storage” & SPG 8a.

10. Sustainability

It is a requirement that a sustainability checklist accompany all major planning application. The applicant has not provided a completed sustainability checklist as part of the application submission as required by SPG 8c

“Environmental Performance” and SPG 9 “Sustainability Statement – Including Checklist”.

The applicant has provided a “Sustainable Energy Strategy” compiled by Energy for Sustainable Development Limited (ESD). The strategy concludes that:

1. The proposed building design achieves a high level of energy efficiency as required by the London Borough of Haringey by applying the following measures:
 - i. Specifying a building envelope that achieves EcoHomes ‘Very Good’ on energy with the respective U-values for a range of building elements
 - ii. Flats are served by high efficiency gas combi (or condensing) boilers
 - iii. Passive solar design has been incorporated into the development by utilising the south-facing orientation of the building for maximising daylight and winter solar gain
 - iv. Recovery and recycling of energy from domestic waste water by applying an innovative heat exchanger to the soil stacks
2. It is technically feasible to deliver 10% additional CO² savings from renewable energy technologies using one of the following options:
 - i. Ground source heat pumps in 6 flats (preferably ground floor)
 - ii. Solar water heating in 20-22 flats (or more but with small collector areas each)
 - iii. A mix of ground source heat pumps and solar water heating
3. The use of communal heating and CHP is not considered viable for the following reasons:
 - i. The size and load profile of the development are not sufficiently favourable as to make CHP viable within each plot
 - ii. The current designs do not provide suitable location and sufficient space for installing and operating a communal heating plant in the building.

If planning permission were to be granted a condition should be attached requiring renewable energy to deliver at least 10% of the energy requirements of the scheme, as set out in policy ENV6a.

11. Section 106 Contributions

Since the application is being recommended for refusal details of section 106 contributions will not be relevant at this time.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The application has been assessed against the relevant national, regional and local planning policies. The proposal is found to contravene policy EMP4 and EMP3R of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan – Second Deposit (2004). The applicant's agent has not provided sufficient evidence to show that suitable alternative premises have been sought and offered to the current tenants. In addition, the applicant has not demonstrated that the building is no longer suitable for business or industry use; & provided evidence of unsuccessful marketing over a period of normally 18 months; & That possibilities (every opportunity) to reuse; or redevelop the site for business or industry have been explored. On this basis the proposed development would result in the loss of an employment site without satisfactory steps to relocate the existing businesses. On this basis, it is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No: HGY/2006/0007

Applicant's drawing No's: A3596/2.3/001; A3596/2.3/002; A3596/2.3/003; A3596/2.3/004; A3596/2.1/001; A3596/2.1/002; A3596/2.1/003; A3596/2.1/004; A3596/2.1/005; A3596/2.1/006; A3596/2.1/007 and Relocation Strategy, Sustainable Energy Strategy, Servite Houses Framework, Design Statement,

For the following reasons:

1. There is no evidence to suggest that the employment generating use is no longer suitable or viable and as such contravenes policy EMP 1.1 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (1998).
2. The applicant has not demonstrated that the building is no longer suitable for business or industry use; & provided evidence of unsuccessful marketing over a period of normally 18 months; & That possibilities (every opportunity) to reuse; or redevelop the site for business or industry have been explored as set out in policy EMP3R "Non Employment Generating Uses" of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit (2004).
3. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to show that suitable alternative premises have been sought and offered to the current tenants as set out in policy EMP4 "Relocating Businesses" of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit (2004).

