Planning Applications Sub Committee 25 July 2006

Item No. 7

# REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2006/0902

Ward: St. Ann's

**Date received:** 10/05/2006

Last amended date: 05/07/06

Drawing number of plans 0616(PL)010, 011, 012, 013a, 030a, 031a, 040, 041; 06/1947

Address: Units 2, 4 & 5, 103 - 149 Cornwall Road & Land Adjoining 2 Falmer Road N15

Demolition of existing industrial units and erection of a part 3/part 4 storey Proposal: building comprising 7 x one bed, 15 x two bed flats with refuse and bicycle storage and associated car parking spaces.

**Existing Use:** Vacant storage

Proposed Use: Residential

Applicant: Urban Land Developments Ltd.

Ownership: Private

#### PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Road - Borough Conservation Area Area of Community Regeneration Significant Local Open Land

Officer Contact:

Oliver Christian

### RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to Section 106 Legal Agreement.

# SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located on Cornwall Road – a link road between West Green Road and St Ann's Road.

The proposal site consist of buildings of approximately 2/3 storeys in height mainly used for industrial purposes mainly storage. This section of Cornwall Road consist primarily of 2 and 3 storey terrace houses many of which contain purpose built flats and maisonettes.

The property is part vacant and has been so for sometime.

The property is not located within any designated conservation area but adjoins Chestnuts Public Park a significant and valuable open space.

The site is within easy reach of buses, shops, a health centre and a hospital is also close by.

#### PLANNING HISTORY

Planning history relates to the use of the property as industrial use.

#### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The current proposal seeks the demolition of existing building and erection of 3 storey building comprising of 7 x 1 bed, 15 x two bedroom flats with refuse enclosure also off-street car parking spaces and cycle storage.

The scheme has been revised from that originally submitted - The bulk of the building has been reduced, the car parking layout and waste storage provision has been revised – A pedestrian access to the park from Cornwall Road has been negotiated.

#### CONSULTATION

69 Local residents
Council's Arboriculturist
Building Control
Recreation Service
Transportation Group
Waste Management
Major/minor
Ward Councillors

# **RESPONSES**

Recreation Service - The above application potentially gives rise to the opportunity for a new entrance from Cornwall Road into Chestnuts Park. This is a long held aspiration for the park and strongly supported by the Friends of Chestnuts Park. We have discussed the application with the Crime Prevention Design Adviser from the MET who advises in his view that it would not be appropriate to have an entrance that passes through the development and into the park, as this would make the new properties in the development vulnerable to crime. On the basis of this advice, we would like to see the potential explored for a new entrance to be developed at either end of the new development as there may not be a further opportunity to achieve this goal.

Friends of Chestnuts Park - We are looking at the planning application for 103 Cornwall Rd and will be discussing the plans at our next meeting on Saturday 29th April. From the website link it is not clear to us what the plans are for constructing a brick wall between the garden area of the new building and the park. This is an important aspect of the proposal, and we would need to see those plans, and the plans for the interface between the new development and the adjacent buildings in Cornwall Rd, before we can make our proper response. For years now the stakeholders involved in the park have been waiting for the factory site to come on the market, as this gives a unique opportunity to provide a much needed exit path from the park onto Cornwall Rd, thus rendering the park safer to users. I would also imagine that it would be a popular addition to the purchasers of the new flats their own handy entrance to the park and tennis courts.

**Crime Prevention Officer** - I believe that certain aspects of the design of the site will attract crime and anti-social behaviour.

- 1. The proximity of the site to Chestnuts Recreation Ground which has experienced anti-social behaviour and several burglaries to the community buildings heightens my concern.
- 2. It is crucial that the communal door entry systems are high quality security doors. Poor quality door systems lead to crime and high maintenance costs for the owner and are not in any way part of a sustainable development.
- 3. I approve of the fenestration to the west elevation, as this would improve natural surveillance of the park. However there would need to be a good boundary treatment to balance the security of the site with clear demarcation between site and park. Without this clear boundary the site will encounter regular intrusion from the park.
- 4. The dwellings would benefit from the enhanced security standards detailed in the "Secured by Design Scheme" (<a href="www.securedbydesign.com">www.securedbydesign.com</a>). However, in my opinion, the design of the site does not comply with the layout conditions of a Secured by Design development.

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

**Transportation Group** – This site is located in an area where the public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is low.

Our interrogation with TRAVL database suggests that based on comparative sites (Lee Conservancy-E9, Porter Sq-N19, Rootes Estate-W10 and Yeats Close - NW10), the residential element of this development, some 900sqm GFA, would only generate a combined traffic inflow and outflow of some 3 vehicles during the critical am peak hour. Likewise, the office aspect of this development, some 324sqm GFA, would only generate a combined traffic

inflow and outflow of some 4 vehicles in the same period (using comparative sites BBC-W12, BT Power Eng - N19, Gt.Harbour Enterprises - E14 and Hounslow Civic Centre-TW3). It is therefore deemed that this level of vehicular trips (7 in/out vehicle movement in the am peak) would not have any significant adverse effect on the adjacent roads.

Furthermore, the applicant has proposed off-street car parking spaces and some bicycle racks with secure shelter for the flats. These in our opinion are adequate and in line with the maximum car parking standard stipulated in the Council's UDP and SPG and, would minimise the car parking impact of this development on the adjoining highway network. It is also worth noting that this area has not been identified within the Council's UDP as that with car parking pressure and the car parking provision reflects the PTAL for this area.

1. We also feel that pedestrian conditions on this road need to be improved especially as the associated traffic calming measures are sub-standard and bollards/signs, which have been incorrectly sited, encroach footway on both sides of this road. Nevertheless, this can be dealt with by some S.106 contribution from the applicant towards rectifying these highway safety problems.

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

(1) The applicant contributes £5,000 (five thousand pounds) towards improving the footway and constructing traffic calming measures on Cornwall Rd, as part of S.106 agreement associated with this proposal. Reason: To improve the condition for pedestrians at this location.

#### **DC Forum**

A DC forum was held in June 2006 – The minutes are attached as an appendix to this report.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

#### **National Policies**

The policies relevant to the current proposal are as follows:

Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing. This PPG provides guidance on a range of issues relating to the provision of housing. PPG3 states that Local planning authorities should:

Plan to meet the housing requirements of the whole community, including those in need of affordable and special needs housing;

Secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability in both new developments and conversions to meet the changing

composition of households in their area in the light of the likely assessed need;

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;

Introduce greater flexibility in the application of parking standards, which the Government expects to be significantly lower than at present.

Para 61 recommends that local authorities should revise their parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off-street parking provision, particularly for developments in locations, where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport.

PPG13 provides additional guidance on the relationship between residential development and transport provision, indicating that when considering planning applications, local authorities should:

"accommodate housing principally within existing urban areas, planning for increased intensity of development for both housing and other uses at locations which are highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling" (para.6)

#### THE LONDON PLAN

The London Plan has now been adopted by the Greater London Authority and forms the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London. It contains key policies covering housing, transport, design and sustainability in the capital. It replaces Regional Planning Guidance Note 3 - Regional Planning Guidance for London.

The London Plan sets housing targets for individual boroughs for the period up to 2017. The original target for Haringey was 19370 additional 'homes' (970 per year) out of a target for London of 457950 (23000 per year). This target has subsequently been reduced to 6200 (620 per year). However, future target will include the more efficient use of existing stock as well as new-build.

#### **LOCAL POLICIES**

Policy HSG1.3 Changes of Use to Residential refers to changes of use where the buildings or sites concerned are, or have been, in B1, B2 or B8 use ans specifies when a change can be allowed i.e. if the site does not lie within a Defined Employment Area, where there would be no serious adverse impact on the local environment or traffic conditions, if the land or buildings are no longer considered suitable on economical, environmental, amenity or transport grounds for continued employment and there would be no loss of urban space.

Policy EMP1.1 Employment protection relates to: Land or buildings in employment generating use, for which there is a clear demand, will be retained in that use.

Policy DES1.1 Good Design and How Design Will Be Assessed states that the Council will require development to be of good design and set out how design quality will be assessed. In particular development should relate to site character and its potentiality and should seek to improve the quality of the local environment and urban landscape.

Policy DES1.2 Assessment of Design Quality (1): Fitting New Buildings into the Surrounding Area, sets out the criteria for assessing design quality.

Policy DES1.3 Assessment of Design Quality (2): Enclosure, Height and Scale state how the Council assess the design of development schemes in relation to the following: Enclosure, height, scale and human scale.

Policy DES1.9 Privacy and Amenity of Neighbours refers to the protection of amenity of neighbours in repect of proposed developments or change of use and the criteria that should be met.

Policy HSG2.2 Residential Densities refers to the density consideration of applications for residential development (including redevelopments, conversions and mixed-used schemes) the density of the development should normally be in the density range of 175 hrh- 250 hrh (70 hra-100 hra).

Policy TSP7.1 Car Parking Standards – outlines the car parking required for differing developments and locations.

# **Emerging UDP Policies**

UD3 Quality Design – Sets the standard of design required on all new development within the borough.

UD6 Waste Storage – requires accessible and appropriate storage facility to be provided on all schemes.

HSG4 Affordable housing – Housing development capable of providing 10 or more units will be required to provide a proportion of affordable housing to meet the borough target of 50%.

ENV6 Energy Efficiency – The Council will encourage energy efficiency and a reduction in CO2 emissions.

ENV6A Renew Energy and Mitigating Climate Change – The Council will seek applicants to show an on-site provision of 10% where feasible of their projected energy requirement from renewable sources.

#### **ASSESSMENT**

It is considered that the site is well placed for redevelopment in planning terms, being a previously used site on a road that is primarily residential in character that has access to open space according with many of the development principles being espoused by central government. However, the redevelopment of the site does raise a number of issues and these can be considered under the following headings:

- i) Principle of residential use on the site.
- ii) Design
- iii) Density
- iv) Amenity
- v) Parking
- vi) Waste Management
- vii) Sustainability and energy renewal
- viii) Response to objector comments
- ix) Affordable housing
- x) Section106 obligations

# i) Principle of residential use

The site is in the middle of a predominantly residential area and is not within a Designated Employment Area (DEA) — The proposed residential use would have no adverse impact on local amenity or traffic conditions as such is considered suitable for the proposed development and not contrary to the aims of Policy EMP1.1 Employment protection. Additionally, the buildings have been part vacant and underused for some time.

The London Plan sets housing targets for Local Authorities for the period up to 2016. The target for Haringey is 19,370 additional 'homes' (970 per year). These targets are generally reflected in Unitary Development Plan policy HSG 1.1: 'Strategic Housing Target'. This development will contribute toward the Council meeting its target.

Policy DES 1.9 'Privacy and Amenity of Neighbours' recognises this pressure and seeks to ensure an appropriate level of development for these sites which ensures that existing amenity is not harmed. In this case, the proposed development has been designed to fit in without compromising the Council's standards of distances between houses or having an unduly overbearing affect on the neighbouring properties.

Policy HSG 2.1 'Dwelling Mix for New Build Housing' requires a mix of unit sizes to provide some family, (i.e. over 1-bed), units. This scheme proposes 15 x two bedroom and 7 x one bedroom flats, which generally meet the flat size and room size requirements of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2.3 'Standards for New Build Residential Development'. The proposal proposes 48% affordable units going some way to meet the Council's

affordable housing target of 50% as set out in Policy HSG 2.23 'Affordable Housing'.

There will be off-street car parking, secure cycle storage, landscaping and a 2.00 metre high rear boundary fence providing barriers between the development, the park and the adjoining properties.

It is considered that residential development of the site is therefore acceptable in principle.

# ii) Design, Bulk, Massing & Height

The design of the development will be assessed against the criteria included in Policy DES1.1. The existing building is poor in quality. Policies 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' 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 fit in with the surrounding area.

The proposed residential building is 3 storeys in height which generally reflects the 2/3 storey height of the industrial buildings that currently occupy the site. Prevailing development in the vicinity is two storeys; however, these mostly Victorian terrace dwellings are very tall. The height of the proposed building is considered to relate well to the site's setting, the streetscape, scale and contrast well with the architecture of the existing buildings.

The result is a contemporary building, which respect and assimilate with the prevailing development in the area. It is considered that the development will not have an adverse affect on any adjoining property. In fact it will have a positive regenerative impact on the streetscape and the amenity of the area.

It is considered that the proposed elevation enhances the street scene.

The proposed frontage will provide considerable improvement to the existing situation thereby improving the positive impression of the surrounding area.

It is considered that the development has been designed to respect the surrounding built form. Meeting the aim of the draft UDP policy UD3 Quality Design, UDP policy DES1.2 Assessment of Design Quality (1): Fitting New Buildings into the Surrounding Area also DES1.3 Assessment of Design Quality (2): Enclosure, Height and Scale: These policies set the standard of design required on all new development within the borough and PPG3.

The scheme proposes a development that is fully accessible, incorporating a lift and level thresholds throughout.

Additionally in order to meet the requirement of 'Secure by Design' the access to the parking area will be gated and controlled.

It is considered that the proposed three storey development provides an appropriate frontage enhancing the streetscape whilst having regard to the immediate locality.

# iii) Density.

The site is on Cornwall Road, there is reasonably good accessibility to local shopping facilities: policy HSG8 Density Standards and the London Plan states higher densities are acceptable. In addition, the proposal incorporates commercial and residential uses; the scheme is of high quality design and will enhance the street scene and the immediate locality.

The site covers an area of 0.132hectares, the proposed scheme is a mix of commercial on the ground floor and residential on the upper floors and proposes a density of 446 habitable rooms to the hectare (hrh). The density is marginally above the Emerging UDP recommended density of 400hrh but within the London Plan guidance. The overall bulk, height and density of this scheme is considered appropriate for the location and as such is considered acceptable in that the proposed development fits well onto the site.

Policy HSG2.2 Residential Densities also states that in considering the density of all schemes the Council will have particular regard to the overall design and layout of the development, availability and capacity of Statutory Undertaker Services, the amenities of adjacent proposal and the area as a whole. It is considered that the proposed development has no adverse impact upon the amenity of adjacent occupiers and the locality.

The proposed density promotes sustainable patterns of development and makes the best use of previously developed urban land. It is maintained that the proposed scheme is wholly appropriate in terms of height and density. It also accords with the emerging Unitary Development Plan and London Plan policies, which promote higher densities for developments that are attractive and well designed.

#### iv) Amenity

It is considered that the proposed scheme has no detrimental impact on the existing privacy enjoyed by the adjoining residents of Cornwall Road, the neighbouring and surrounding properties, as such is not contrary to policy DES1.9 Privacy and amenity in that the windows at the rear of the proposal that have the potential for overlooking are primarily bedroom windows with balconies overlooking the park.

It is considered that although the potential for overlooking exists it is predominantly over the existing public park and is unlikely to cause harm to warrant refusal of the proposal.

In terms of individual amenity of the occupiers of the proposed flats, the units provided are spacious well above the required space standard; additional external amenity is provided in the form of secure balconies and communal garden area at the rear adjacent to the public park.

The site is well serviced by local amenities shops, religious facilities, buses; a local park abuts the rear of the site providing additional amenity facility for residents.

### v) Car Parking.

The Council's Transportation Group supports redevelopment in this location especially as 9 off-street car parking spaces and secure cycle storage is provided within the site.

It is considered that the proposal would not lead to additional on street car parking pressure.

## vi) Waste Management.

There is a dedicated and accessible waste storage facility proposed at ground floor level

It is considered that the proposed waste facility is in an acceptable and appropriate location.

### vii) Sustainability and Energy renewal

The applicant has completed the Council's sustainability checklist.

The individual units have been designed to meet a "very good" ecohomes rating which is in line with the requirement of ENV6a.

Space is provided in the refuse store for a residents recycling scheme. To encourage the use of bicycles secure cycle storage is provided.

#### viii) Response to objector comments

1. Overdevelopment in the area.

The proposal has taken into account prevailing development in the vicinity of the area. It is considered that the number of flats proposed can be adequately contained within the subject site and will not lead to overdevelopment, Policy guidance in the London Plan allows for a higher density of development on the site.

2. Overcrowding in the area.

It is considered that the number of flats proposed and the number of additional persons that results can be adequately contained within the area and as such does not lead to overcrowding, Policy guidance in the London Plan allows for a higher density of development on the site.

3. Increase in traffic and in congestion.

The Council's Transportation Group was consulted and recommends that the proposal will not lead to adverse traffic conditions or congestion in the area.

4. Loss of natural light and privacy and detrimental effect on wildlife and greenery.

It is considered that the proposal does not lead to a detrimental loss of natural light and privacy to neighbouring properties. Landscaping works are proposed which will include replacing any vegetation removed.

5. Loss of amenity.

Although there is a slight increase in bulk and mass on the site, it is considered that there is no detrimental loss of amenity that results. The proposal provides good design that will enhance rather than detract from the streetscape.

6. Cause overlooking

The proposed buildings meet the requirements of Policy and will not result in a significant loss of privacy from overlooking.

7. There must be an agreement to create a public entrance from Falmer Road or Cornwall Road to the park – A residents meeting with the Friends of the park was held also a subsequent DC Forum.

# ix) Affordable housing

HSG4 states that housing developments capable of providing 10 or more units will be required to include a proportion of affordable housing. The proposed development is above the threshold and as such has to contribute toward the provision of affordable units. This is in line with Council policy and supplementary planning guidance11.

The proportion of affordable units on this scheme amounts to 48% of the habitable rooms resulting in  $2 \times 1$  bed and  $8 \times 2$  bed units. The affordable units on a basis of a 70/30% split – Shared ownership/Social rented.

viii) Section 106 obligations – Public Access to Chestnut Park from Cornwall Road - Affordable Housing - Education Contribution – Highway Improvements and Administrative Charges.

Under the terms of Circular 1/97 Planning Obligations, and in line with Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10, The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations, it is appropriate for Local Planning Authorities to seek benefits for the surrounding area appropriate to the size and scale of the development. The Council therefore proposes to enter into an agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to provide the following benefits as part of the proposal.

These are principally:

# **Public Access to Chestnut Park from Cornwall Road**

The applicant has agreed to dedicate a 2.00 metre wide strip of land, the depth of the site allowing the creation of a new public access to Chestnut Park from Cornwall Road,

# Affordable Housing

The proposed development is made up of 1 x 1 bed, 1 x 4 bed house and 18 x 2 bedroom flats, a total of 20 residential units that will contribute 48% affordable housing resulting in 2 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed units..

#### **Education contribution**

 An education contribution of £71,237.41 accordance with the formula in SPG12

```
15 x 2 bedroom flats = 7.395 Children
Total = 7.395 Children
```

Primary contribution:  $7.395 / 16 \times 7$  (number of years of primary education)  $\times £10,378.00$  (three year average amount of DfEE primary funding 05/06) = £33,576.07

Secondary contribution:  $7.395 / 16 \times 5$  (number of years of secondary education) X £16,297.00 (three year average amount of DfEE secondary funding 05/06) = £37,661.34.

```
£33,576.07 + £37,661.34 = £71,237.41
Total Contribution = £71,237.41
```

The applicant has agreed to enter into an agreement to contribute £71,237.41 toward education facilities in line with the requirements of Supplementary Planning Guidance 12.

#### **Highway Improvements**

The applicant has agreed to contribute £5000 toward traffic calming and highway improvement in the immediate locality.

## **Administrative Charges**

The applicant has agreed to pay administrative recovery charges of £2,287.59

The total financial contribution amounts to £78,525

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenity of nearby and adjoining residents especially properties situated adjacent to the proposed development site.

The proposed development is considered consistent with Policy DES 1.9. 'Privacy & Amenity of Neighbours' and Supplementary Planning Guidance 3b'Privacy and Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight'.

Amenity space has been designed into scheme in the form of communal garden and balconies at the rear of the development.

The scheme is in accordance with Council policies in terms of design, height, bulk and massing.

Appropriate car parking and secure cycle storage has been proposed within the site that is considered consistent with Policy TSP 7.1 'Parking for Development' PPG 3 'Housing' and PPG13 'Transport'.

The density of the proposed development is 446 habitable rooms per hectare is considered consistent with the Governments Planning Policy Guidance 3, London Plan also Policy HSG 8 'Density Standards' of the Draft 2004 Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 1**

That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2006/0902, subject to a pre-condition that the owners of the application site shall first have entered into an Agreement or Agreements with the Council under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended).

The report also recommends that under the guidance contained in SPG 8.2, the applicant enter into an Agreement under Section 106 and Section 16 of the recently adopted Greater London Plan to dedicate a 2.00 metre strip of land creating a pedestrian access to Chestnut Park from Cornwall Road, make a contribution of £71,234.41 toward local education facilities, £5000 toward traffic calming/pedestrian improvement also administrative recovery costs of £2287.59.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 2**

- (1) That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2006/0902 subject to a pre-condition that the applicant shall first have entered into an Agreement with the Council under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) and Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974] in order to secure: Affordable housing on a 70/30% split shared ownership/social rented of 2 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed units: Education contribution of £71237.41, £5000 toward traffic calming/pedestrian improvements and recovery/administrative costs of £2287.59.
- 2. That the Agreements referred to in Resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 09/08/2006 or within such extended time as the Council's Assistant Director (Planning, Environmental Policy and Performance) shall in her sole discretion allow; and
- 3. That in the absence of the Agreements referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, the planning application reference number HGY/2006/0902 be refused for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide the education contribution in accordance with the requirements set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance 8.2 ' Education contribution' attached to the emerging Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

- 4. That, following completion of the Agreement referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in Resolution (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2006/0902 & applicant's drawing No's: 0616(PL)010, 011, 012, 013a, 030a, 031a, 040, 041; 06/1947 subject to the following conditions:
- The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.
   Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

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

  Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.
- 3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.
- 4. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
  Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 5. A scheme for the treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development including the planting of trees and/or shrubs shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details.
  Reason: In order to provide a suitable setting for the proposed development in the interests of visual amenity.
- 6. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.
  Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood.
- That not more than 22 separate units, whether flats or houses, shall be constructed on the site.
   Reason: In order to avoid overdevelopment of the site.

- 8. The residential buildings proposed by the development hereby authorised shall comply with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and comply with the aims and objectives of the police requirement of 'Secured By Design' & 'Designing Out Crime' principles.

  Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development achieves the required crime prevention elements as detailed by Circular 5/94 'Planning Out Crime'.
- 9. No development shall take place until site investigation detailing previous and existing land uses, potential land contamination, risk estimation and remediation work if required have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.
  Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to ensure the site is contamination free.

INFORMATIVE: Details of the foundation work on the boundaries and any border treatment should be agreed with the adjoining occupiers before such works commence.

INFORMATIVE: That all works on or associated with the public highway be carried out by The Transportation Group at the full expense of the developer. Before the Council uundertakes any works or inccurs any financial liability the developer will be required to make a deposit equal to the full estimated cost of the works.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require naming/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.

### **REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposal complies with policies HSG1 Strategic Housing Targets, 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' and DES 1.4 'Assessment of Design Quality (3): Building Lines, Layout, Form, Rhythm and Massing' DES1.9 Amenit of neighbours, EMP1.1 Employment Protection, TSP1.1 Parking for Development of Haringey Unitary Development and the polices and Supplementary guidance of the emerging Unitary Development Plan.



# PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL SERVICE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL DIVISION

#### **MINUTES**

Meeting :

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM - 103 -149 Cornwall Road & Land

Adjoining 2 Falmer Rd N15 (Units 2/4/5) - Clrd minutes

Date

8<sup>th</sup> June 2006

Place

**Chestnuts Community Centre** 

Present

Paul Smith (Chair), Tay Makoon, Cllr Canver, Haley Local Residents

(approx 40), applicants Agent

Minutes by

Tay Makoon

Distribution

Item Action Paul Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and explain the purpose of the 1. meeting and the agenda. The Proposal Demolition of existing industrial units and erection of a part 3/part 4 storey building comprising 1 x one bed, 20 x two bed and 1 x four bed dwelling units with refuse and bicycle storage and 8 x car parking spaces. Main issues Design and Density Size and scale Car Parking and access issues Relationship to park Section 106 Presentation by Steven Davy/Peter Smith Architects and Urban Land Developments The presentation explained location of the development, showed aerial photographs, existing and proposed elevations, photos of the existing site, view of the scheme from Cornwall rd, ground floor plan, 1st/2nd plan, view of scheme from Cornwall Rd and view from the park. Issues raised from the floor by Local Residents and Councillors Height of building Entrance to the Park Access into Cornwall Rd Refuse storage/collection - Where will 20 bins be stored - Issue about security - will it be locked Car Parking – Why only eight and what basis to allocate? Disability access – does this scheme meet the GLA Housing policy Overdevelopment

Lost of employment – relocation of jobs  The need to access green space  Education  The need to provide facilities  No consideration taken of the Masterplan  Design  Health and safety  The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality.  Cll Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and secess to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we logether have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.  End of meeting	n l		Action
<ul> <li>Education</li> <li>The need to provide facilities</li> <li>No consideration taken of the Masterplan</li> <li>Design</li> <li>Health and safety</li> </ul> The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality. Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road. The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak. The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	•	= 11 11 projunction of jobs	1 XCCIO
<ul> <li>The need to provide facilities</li> <li>No consideration taken of the Masterplan</li> <li>Design</li> <li>Health and safety</li> </ul> The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality. Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road. The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak. The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	•		
<ul> <li>No consideration taken of the Masterplan</li> <li>Design</li> <li>Health and safety</li> </ul> The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality. Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to comwall road. The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak. The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	•		
• Design • Health and safety  The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality.  Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to comwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.			
• Health and safety  The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality.  Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.			
The applicants agents answered the above concerns by addressing each point. The height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality.  Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	•		
height of the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the park entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware of any Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, the Councils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets government policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. The scheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good design and it does fit well in the locality.  Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	•	Health and safety	
Cllr Haley, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and access to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we together have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	park of an the C gover	tof the new building is in line with the ridges and is not higher. In terms of the entrance, our client don't really feel they want it on their land. We are not aware y Masterplan and will try and get a copy to take on board. In terms of carparking, ouncils transportation section does not have any problems with this as it meets mment policy. Education and security can be addressed through the section 106. cheme is designed to provide affordable housing. We believe this is a good	
scheme does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to have access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.  The meeting ended with the residents agreeing to keep in touch and when the application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	Cllr Hacces	Ialey, Canver and Harris raised issues about carparking, loss of employment and is to Cornwall Rd. It is very important to listen to the local residents as we her have been working for two years to improve the access to the park and this	
application goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.  The meeting ended by Paul Smith thanking everyone for attending the meeting and participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	have a	ne does not provide any value to the residents other than housing. We need to access to green open space and the safest way is to have access to cornwall road.	
participating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if not already done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or listen can do so.	applic	ation goes to committee residents will be attending to speak.	
End of meeting	not ali	pating. He reminded everyone to submit their comments to the planning dept if ready done so. If anyone wishing to attend the planning committee to speak or	
	End o	f meeting	
	j P		
	į		
	20		



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. LB Haringey 100017423 2005

# Site plan

# Units 2, 4 & 5, 103 - 149 Cornwall Road N15 & Land Adjacent 2 Falmer Road N15

# HARINGEY COUNCIL

Directorate of Environmental Services Shifa Mustafa Assistant Director Planning, Environmental Policy & Performance 639 High Road London N17 8BD

Tel 020 8489 0000 Fax 020 8489 5525

		Drawn by	AA
		Scale	1:1250
NOF	RTH	Date	07/07/2006



Unit 2,4,5 – 103-149 Cornwall Rd, N15 – HGY 2006/0902 & HGY 2006/0748