

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2011/1094	Ward: Bounds Green
<p>Address: Wood Green Police Station, 347 High Road N22</p> <p>Proposal: Replacement of existing police station with new custody facility and office accommodation in four storey building for police use, including retention of façade of the original building</p> <p>Existing Use: Police Station Proposed Use: Police Station</p> <p>Applicant: Mr Ian Mcpherson Metropolitan Police Service</p> <p>Ownership: Metropolitan Police</p>	
<p>Date received: 10/06/2011 Last amended date: N/A</p> <p>Drawing number of plans: 990.P.700 REV P1; 001 REV P1; 102 REV P1; 103 REV P1; 104 REV P1; 105 REV P1; 106 REV P1; 107 REV P1; 110 REV P1; 111 REV P1 and 112 REV P1</p>	
<p>Case Officer Contact: Michelle Bradshaw</p>	
<p>PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:</p> <p>Road Network: Classified Road</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions</p>	

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The report summary and conclusion are set out at section 7.0 of this report.

That the Planning Committee be minded to grant planning permission for application HGY/2011/1094 subject to conditions and the signing of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 as set out in section 6.7 of this report and in the event that the said legal agreement is not signed and completed by 14th February 2012 the application shall be deemed refused and the Assistant Director of Planning & Regeneration shall issue the appropriate notice of refusal of planning permission.

Along with the relevant plans the applicant has submitted the following documentation in support of the application:

- Design and Access Statement prepared by the Raymond Smith Partnership
- Transport Assessment prepared by WSP
- Energy Assessment & Renewable Technology Strategy prepared by Anderson Green Ltd
- Statement of Community Involvement prepared by London Communications Agency
- Haringey Sustainability Checklist
- BREEAM bespoke Pre-Assessment

In determining this application, officers have had regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

On balance it is considered that the scheme is consistent with planning policy and in the public interest. Therefore, subject to appropriate conditions and s106 contributions the application is considered acceptable and on this basis, it is recommended that the application be granted planning permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
2.0	PLANNING HISTORY
3.0	RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY
4.0	CONSULTATION
5.0	RESPONSES
6.0	ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION
6.1	Principle of Development
6.2	Design, Mass, Bulk and Scale
6.3	Transport, Traffic and Parking
6.4	Waste Management
6.5	Energy and Sustainability
6.6	Equalities Impact Assessment
6.7	Planning Obligations - Section 106
7.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
8.0	HUMAN RIGHTS
9.0	RECOMMENDATION 1
10.0	RECOMMENDATION 2 INCLUDING CONDITIONS
11.0	REASONS FOR APPROVAL
12.0	APPENDICES
12.1	Appendix 1: Consultation Responses
12.2	Appendix 2: Planning Policies
12.3	Appendix 3: Development Management Forum Minutes
12.4	Appendix 4: Design Panel Minutes

1.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The site is located at 347 High Road, N22 in the Bounds Green ward. The site is located on the corner of the High Road (also known as the A105 Green Lanes) and Nightingale Road. The main police station fronts the High Road and is an attractive red brick period building which is locally listed (as of 27th January 1997). The site is not within a conservation area but is within close proximity to the Bowes Park Conservation Area which includes part of Nightingale Road.
- 1.2 Immediately to the south and abutting the site is a glass fronted, former commercial building now in use as a church. On the opposite side of the High Road are the flank elevations of houses in Earlam Grove together with a single storey restaurant building and Woodside Park beyond. On the opposite corner is a 4/5 storey block of flats known as Robin Court and two and three storey houses in Portree Close behind. Immediately to the west of the site is a parking area and beyond it a three storey residential building (two floors of residential above ground floor garaging) fronting Nightingale Road.

- 1.3 The police station at Wood Green has been vacant for over a year since the front counter service was moved to the Safer Neighbourhood Base at Fishmonger Arms, some 100 metres along the High Road to the south and patrol facilities for the borough operating out of Quicksilver Place on Western Road. The site contains a variety of buildings ranging from the original police station to single storey portacabins.
- 1.4 The site has good public transport links being in close proximity to Wood Green Underground Station, Alexandra Palace Overland Railway Station and a number of local bus routes.

2.0 HISTORY

- 2.1 Planning history for the site dates back to 1973 and includes the following applications:
- OLD/1973/0608 Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road N22 - Rebuilding of Wood Green Police Station. GRANTED
 - OLD/1975/0513 Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road N22 Erection of a 4 storey police station at rear of existing station. GRANTED
 - HGY/1992/0302 Metropolitan Police, Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road London N22 8HZ - Erection of an extension to the existing canteen block and a new disabled access ramp to the front of the building. NO DECISION
 - HGY/1999/1229 Metropolitan Police, Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road London N22 8HZ London Metropolitan Police Erection of three portacabins in existing police station car park – GRANTED
 - HGY/2001/1317 Metropolitan Police, Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road London N22 8HZ London Provision of two portacabins and new acoustic housing for generator – GRANTED
 - HGY/2002/1623 Metropolitan Police, Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road London N22 8HZ London Erection of 4 temporary portacabin units GRANTED
 - HGY/2004/1457 Wood Green Police Station 347 High Road London N22 8HZ London Installation of standby generator in yard, 20,000 litre fuel tank and formation of concrete walkway to car park GRANTED
 - HGY/2006/0759 12-09-06 Outside Police Station, High Road London Display of 2 x poster panels (1760mm x 1160mm), internally illuminated, forming an integral part of bus shelter GRANTED

- HGY/2008/0113 07-04-08 Wood Green Police Station, 347 High Road London Demolition of existing police station and associated outbuildings. Erection of part two, part three and part four storey building to provide policing facility with associated parking WITHDRAWN

2.2 Planning Enforcement History

2.2.1 No planning enforcement history exists for this site

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The planning application is assessed against relevant National, Regional and Local planning policy, including relevant:

- National Planning Policy Guidance
- National Planning Policy Statements
- The London Plan 2011 (Published 22 July 2011)

Following consultation in 2008, the Mayor decided to create a replacement Plan rather than amend the previous London Plan. Public consultation on the Draft London Plan took place until January 2010 and its Examination in Public closed on 8 December 2010. The panel report was published by the Mayor on 3rd May 2011. The final report was published on 22nd July 2011. The London Plan (July 2011) is now the adopted regional plan.

- Haringey Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2006)
- Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents
- Haringey Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Proposals Map (Published for Consultation May 2010; Submitted for Examination March 2011)

Haringey's draft Core Strategy submitted to the Secretary of State in March for Examination in Public (EiP). This EiP commenced on 28th June and concluded on 7th July with the binding Inspector's report expected in October/November 2011. As a matter of law, some weight should be attached to the Core Strategy policies which have been submitted for EiP however they cannot in themselves override Haringey's Unitary Development Plan (2006) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- Haringey Draft Development Management Policies (Published for Consultation May 2010)

The consultation draft of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) was issued in May 2010 following the responses received. The proposed submission draft will be published in summer 2011. The DM DPD is at an earlier stage than the Core Strategy and therefore can only be accorded limited weight at this point in time.

3.2 A full list of relevant planning policy can be found in Appendix 2.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 The Council has undertaken wide consultation including Statutory Consultees and Internal Consultees, Ward Councillors, Residents Groups and Local Residents. A list of Consultees is provided below.

4.1.1 Statutory Consultees

- London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)
- Crime Prevention Officer

4.1.2 Internal Consultees

- Haringey Building Control
- Haringey Transportation
- Haringey Waste Management
- Haringey Design and Conservation

4.13 External Consultees–Ward Councillors, Residents Groups & other Stakeholders

- Ward Councillors – Bounds Green
- Ward Councillors – Woodside
- Friends of Woodside Park
- Haringey Association of Voluntary and Community Organisations (HAVCO)

Local Residents

ADAMS MEWS, N22

1 – 5 (c) Adams Mews, N22

CAMERON CLOSE, N22

1 – 6 (c) Cameron Close, N22

CANNING CRESCENT, N22

Flat A, B, C, 1 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A, FFF, 2 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A, GFF, 3 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1, 2, 4 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A, 1, 2 5 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1 – 4 (c) 6 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A, 7 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1 – 4 (c) 8 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A 9 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat A, FFF, SFF, TFF 11 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1 – 6 (c) 12 Canning Crescent, N22

1 – 4 (c) Canning Crescent House, 13 Canning Crescent, N22

14 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1 – 5 (c) 15 Canning Crescent, N22

16 Canning Crescent, N22

Flat 1 – 3 (c) 17 Canning Crescent, N22

18 – 46 (e) Canning Crescent, N22

19, 21, 23, Canning Crescent, N22

GFF, FFF 21 Canning Crescent, N22

Store, Flat 1, Flat 2, 5A Canning Crescent, N22

1 – 12 (c) Janet Court Canning Crescent, N22

Canning Mews Canning Crescent, N22

COMMERCE ROAD, N22

4 – 50 (e) Commerce Road, N22

1 – 85 (c) John Keats House Commerce Road, N22

1 – 85 (c) Thomas Hardy House Commerce Road, N22

14A John Keats House Commerce Road, N22

14A Thomas Hardy House Commerce Road, N22

Commerce Road Social Club John Keats House, Commerce Road N22

Community Centre Commerce Road, N22

CROFTS LANE, N22

1 – 6 (c) Fylan Terrace, Crofts Lane, N22

EARLHAM GROVE, N22

1-15 (c) Earlham Grove, N22
6B Earlham Grove N22
Flat 1 – 6 (c) Earlham Grove N22
Flat A, B 12 Earlham Grove N22
1A, B, C, D, E, F Earlham Grove N22
Caretakers Flat, Earlham Primary School, Earlham Grove N22
Cypriot Community Centre Earlham Grove N22
Earlham Primary School Earlham Grove N22

GLENDALE AVENUE, N22

9 – 15 (c) Glendale Avenue, N22
St Thomas More Catholic School Glendale Avenue N22
The Bungalow Glendale Avenue, N22

HIGH ROAD, N22

272-290 High Road, N22
Flat 1, 272 High Road, N22
Flat 2, 272 High Road, N22
Flat A, 298 High Road, N22
Flat B, 298 High Road, N22
Café, 272 High Road, N22
Shop 274 High Road, N22
Health Centre, 276 High Road, N22
Mushroom House, 296 High Road, N22
351-391 High Road, N22
Nightingale Tavern, 349 High Road, N22
Vehicle Repair Workshop adjoining 349 High Road, N22
Shop 351, 353, 355, 359, 363, 365, 385 High Road, N22
Shop A, 357, 367, 389 High Road, N22
First Floor Rear Flat, 353 High Road, N22
Ground Floor Rear Flat A, 357 High Road, N22
Flat 1, 357, 365, 369, 371, 385, 391 High Road, N22
Flat 2, 355, 357, 365, 371, 385, 391 High Road, N22
Flat 3, 355, 357, 365, 371, 385, 391 High Road, N22
Flat 4, 391 High Road, N22
Flat 5, 391 High Road, N22
Flat A, 359, 361, 363, 377, 379, 381, 387 High Road, N22
Flat B, 359, 361, 377, 379, 381, 387, 389 High Road, N22
Flat C, 361, 377, 379, 387 High Road, N22
Flat D, 387, 389 High Road, N22
Flat E, 387, 389 High Road, N22
Basement Flat, 367, 381 High Road, N22
Ground Floor Flat, 367, 389 High Road, N22
Second Floor Flat, 389 High Road, N22
Top Floor Flat, 367 High Road, N22
Third Floor Flat 369, 389 High Road, N22

Workshop 369 High Road, N22
Flat 1-9 (c) 373 High Road, N22
Flat 1-9 (c) 375 High Road, N22
Surgery, 391 High Road, N22
333 TO 339 High Road, N22
Café, 357 High Road, N22
Upper Flat, 351 High Road, N22
First Floor Rear Flat, 353 High Road, N22
349 A High Road, N22
349C High Road, N22
Unit 1-9 (c) 349C High Road, N22
387B High Road, N22
Flat 1-4, 387B High Road, N22

WOODSIDE PARK, N22

Bowling Pavilion, Woodside Park, High Road, N22
Woodside House, Woodside Park, High Road, N22
Woodside House Depot, Woodside Park, High Road, N22
Woodside House Flat, Woodside Park, High Road, N22

NIGHTINGALE ROAD

1-23 (c) Robin Court, 2 Nightingale Road, N22
2-54 (e) Nightingale Road, N22
1-67 (o) Nightingale Road, N22
Flat A, 42 Nightingale Road, N22
Flat B, Nightingale Road, N22
Ground Floor Flat, 44 Nightingale Road, N22
First and Second Floor Flat, 44 Nightingale Road, N22
Flat 1-6 (c), 46 Nightingale Road, N22
1-22 (c) Mohr Court, Nightingale Road, N22
1-4 (c) St Leonards House, Nightingale Road, N22
1-6 (c) Fuller Almshouses, Nightingale Road, N22
Flat 1-16 (c) Porters and Walters Almshouses, Nightingale Road, N22

NEVILLE PLACE

Unit 1-4, Neville House, Neville Place, N22

MORANT PLACE

1-90 (c) Morant Place, N22

WOODSIDE ROAD, N22

2-26 Woodside Road, N22
Flat A, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 22, 24 Woodside Road, N22
Ground Floor Flat, 8 Woodside Road, N22

First Floor Flat, 14 Woodside Road, N22
Ground Floor Flat A, 12 Woodside Road, N22
First Floor Flat B, 12 Woodside Road, N22
First Floor Flat C, 12 Woodside Road, N22

WOODSIDE PARK, N22

Woodside House Depot, Woodside Park, N22
Woodside House Flat, Woodside Park, N22

PORTTREE CLOSE, N22

1-11 (c) Porttree Close, N22

TRURO ROAD, N22

1-39 Truro Road, N22
2-34 Truro Road, N22
The Mews, 1 Truro Road, N22
Ground Floor Shop A, 2 Truro Road, N22
Ground Floor Shop B, 2 Truro Road, N22
Flat A, 2, 18, 23, 30, 31, 32 42, 44, 48, 50, 54 Truro Road, N22
Flat B, 2, 16, 18, 23, 30, 31, 32 42, 44, 48, 50, 52, 54 Truro Road, N22
Flat C, 2, 18, 44, 48, 50, 52 Truro Road, N22
Flat D, 18 Truro Road, N22
Flat E, 18 Truro Road, N22
Ground Floor Flat, 46, 52, 59 Truro Road, N22
First Floor Flat, 46, 53, 59 Truro Road, N22
Second Floor Flat, 59 Truro Road, N22
Flat 1-9 (c) 29 Truro Road, N22
Flat 1-6 (c), 51 Truro Road, N22
1-6 (c) Lloyd Thomas Court, Truro Road, N22
1-9 (c) Marlow House, Truro Road, N22

- 4.2 This application was publicised by a press notice and site notices.
- 4.3 The application was put out to consultation by the London Borough of Haringey in June 2011 following the validation of the application. The consultation generated 5 responses (4 letters from local residents and 1 letter from a local residents association).
- 4.4 While the statutory consultation period is 21 days from the receipt of the consultation letter, the planning service has a policy of accepting comments right up until the Planning Sub-Committee meeting and in view of this the number of letters received may rise further after the officer's report is finalised but before the planning application is determined. Any additional comments received will be reported verbally to the planning sub-committed.

- 4.5 The scheme was presented to the Haringey Design Panel on 14th April 2011 and the feedback received from the panel was broadly positive. The minutes of the meeting are attached as Appendix 4 of this report.
- 4.6 A Development management Forum was held on the 4th July 2011 at the Cypriot Centre Wood Green. The meeting was attended by 3 Councillors and approximately 6 local residents. The minutes of the Development Management Forum are attached as Appendix 3 of this report.
- 4.7 The agents/applicant have undertaken separate community consultation which has included a public exhibition of the scheme at Wood Green Police Station on 6th and 7th May 2011 and details of the current proposals have been published in local newspapers. Full details are contained within the applicant's "Statement of Community Involvement – June 2011" submitted in support of the application.

5. RESPONSES

- 5.1 A summary of all Statutory Consultees, Internal Consultees and Residents/Stakeholders comments and objections can be found in Appendix 1. The issues raised in the consultation responses raise the following broad issues:

- Design – Only the principle façade is being retained – the interior should be kept
- Design – Proposed roof form of extension
- Design – Alignment of proposed building fronting the High Road
- Design – Original timber windows in the existing façade should be retained and repaired if necessary
- Bulk and Scale – The new elements would dominate the retained façade
- Landscaping – Trees should be planted along High Road and Nightingale Road
- Original Features – The blue lamp and "Police" sign should be retained.

- 5.2 Planning Officers have considered all consultation responses and have commented on these both in Appendix 1 and where relevant within the analysis/assessment section of this report.

6.0 ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Principle of Development
- Design, Mass, Bulk and Scale
- Transport, Traffic and Parking
- Waste Management
- Energy and Sustainability
- Equalities Impact Assessment

- Planning Obligations - Section 106

6.1 Principle of Development

- 6.1.1 The London Plan (2011) Policy 3.16 states that “Development proposals should support the provision of additional social infrastructure in light of local and strategic needs assessments”. The commentary accompanying the policy makes clear that policing and other criminal justice or community safety facilities are considered to be social infrastructure for the purpose of the policy.
- 6.1.2 In terms of local planning policy, the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) does not have policies specifically relating to policing and emergency services. It does however generally support the provision of community facilities in policy CW1 “New Community/Health Facilities” and CW2 “Protecting Existing Community Facilities”.
- 6.1.3 The emerging Core Strategy contains specific references to emergency services, including the police service. Paragraph 8.1.23 of the Core Strategy states: “Haringey Metropolitan Police Estate Asset Management Plan (2007) sets out future trends and implications for asset management in Haringey. The new long term provision aims to separate functions which are currently delivered in multi function buildings...” It continues “Haringey will work with the Police to help deliver their planned improvements once they have been agreed.”
- 6.1.4 Within the London Borough of Haringey Community Infrastructure Study (Draft March 2010) a section entitled “Future Trends in Policing in Haringey” Paragraph 9.9 acknowledges that the long term plan for the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is to separate functions. It states “A consolidated police estate would see a shift from the existing multi site custody cells to a centralised custody cells structure, one patrol centre, and one back office accommodation”. It acknowledges that “The Metropolitan Police has looked at locating a 40 cell Custody centre in the borough”.
- 6.1.5 The MPA have reviewed their estate strategy and are currently in the process of reorganising their facilities to improve policing and custody provision in order to achieve significant operational and environmental benefits. The proposed improvements to the Police Station at Wood Green form an essential part of this initiative and police personnel previously based at the police station have been relocated to another facility in Haringey to enable the necessary improvements to be realised. The continued use of this site as a police facility is required by the Metropolitan Police Service as it is ideally suited in relation to accessibility, availability and is already designated for police use.
- 6.1.6 On this basis, the proposed development is deemed to be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with other relevant planning policies, as discussed in the following sections of this report.

6.2 Design, Mass, Bulk and Scale

6.2.1 Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design' and SPG1a 'Design Guidance' set out the Council's general design principles for new development in the Borough. The applicant has submitted a detailed Design and Access Statement (DAS) in support of the application. The DAS documents the process of determining the current design up to submission including the design response to the comments received following the Haringey Design Panel meeting in April of this year.

6.2.2 A previous application for this site was originally submitted to the Council in January 2008 (Ref: HGY/2008/0113) however was subsequently withdrawn following concerns from the design panel, planning officers and residents. The application proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site for use as a joint custody and patrol facility. The main concerns regarding the previous scheme were:

- Demolition of all buildings including the existing police station
- Use as a joint custody and patrol facility in this location
- Bulk and scale of the development
- Traffic generation

6.2.3 The current application differs from the 2008 application in the following ways:

- A 24 hour patrol service is no longer submitted as part of the development. All patrolling facilities for the borough will continue to operate from the temporary Patrol Base at Quicksilver Place on Western Road.
- The main façade of the original police station will be retained.
- The approach to the design and bulk of the new proposals has been reconsidered and new architects appointed

6.2.4 The current application proposes to demolish the buildings to the rear of the site, including the rear façade and internal fabric of the existing building. A part one/two/three and four storey building would replace those buildings to be demolished and would be connected to the retained building by a three storey glazed link. A curved single storey building would extend along the High Road frontage, set back from the front elevation of the original police station building.

6.2.5 In terms of site layout the lower ground floor will contain car parking and plant areas. The new custody suites (40 cells) would be provided at ground level at the south western end of the site with plant located above. Associated facilities such as consultation and interview rooms, property storage and healthcare areas would also be located on the ground floor level behind the retained police station building. Staff facilities and offices for Prosecution teams, Investigators, CID and Management teams etc would be located on the upper floors. The full details of the internal layouts have not been provided on the submitted plans in the interest of security, given the nature of the proposed use.

- 6.2.6 The existing public entrance of the Police Station will remain the public entrance to the new building. Staff access to the site would remain from Nightingale Road with a separate entrance and exit point for operational vehicles. There would be no public general inquiries front counter and police patrol staff would not be based at this site. As such, low level on-site parking (24 spaces at basement level) is proposed. A service yard to the rear, accessible from Nightingale Road, would be a drop off and collection point for detainees within an enclosed van dock area.
- 6.2.7 In terms of design, the retention of the main façade, including the roof, end gables and the associated chimneys, is welcomed and supported and overcomes one of the principle objections to the previous scheme. As is the retention of other historical features such as the memorial plaque and the traditional blue police lamp will be retained.
- 6.2.8 The alterations to the existing building would include the partial demolition of the side return facing Nightingale Road and significant internal alterations including changes to existing floor levels. It is unfortunate that the existing internal floor levels and partitions could not be retained within the main police station building, a point reiterated by the design panel and residents. However, the applicant argues that the feasibility of retaining the internal floors and partitions behind the original façade has been considered but it was found to be impractical. The DAS states that “The MPA require open plan facilities to enable agile working in order to deliver the anticipated efficiencies and level access with stairs meeting the requirements Part M of the Building Regulations are a minimum requirement for any new MPA building. The retention of the existing floor and stairs would significantly compromise these requirements”.
- 6.2.9 On the High Road elevation, the ground floor accommodation forms a single storey masonry plinth which extends from the gable end of the original police station building. The custody suite to the south-west corner with plant above would be two storeys in height and would be screened from view from both the High Road and Nightingale Road by the rest of proposed development. A three storey glazed link would connect the existing building to the proposed building. The four storey element would extend from Nightingale Road to the opposite side of the site, set back behind the original Police Station building.
- 6.2.10 There has been some debate regarding the design of the proposed building and the current design is considered to be an improvement on the previous 2008 scheme which proposed a somewhat hard, imposing and utilitarian design. The design now under consideration is a much lighter looking structure more in keeping with the original building and surroundings by reason of the variation in heights breaking up the bulk of the building and glazed link along with materials which are to complement the retained façade. The new brick plinth will be constructed from brickwork with cast stone bands to match the materials of the original façade. The upper elevations would be clad with terracotta tiles to match the colour of the original brickwork. The proposed pitched roof would be clad in grey metal to compliment the grey slate roof of

the original building. A condition of consent will require submission of all proposed materials so that the precise details of materials and finishes can be controlled.

- 6.2.11 One of the most contentious aspects of the development is the design of the roof of the four storey building to the rear. The applicants originally sought to have a mansard style roof with small dormers as the top floor roof treatment. On submission to the Design Panel in April the panel members asserted that the mansard form of the roof to the third storey was 'excoriated' as an unnecessary attempt to disguise the top floor. The Panel considered it would be better to be bold and express the building across the middle of the site. Some panel members even felt this element could be higher than the scheme presented to them. These comments informed the design of the scheme subsequently submitted as the planning application. The development now, rather than the original mansard, proposes a "lightweight top floor with predominantly glazed ribbon window treatment under a low pitched metal roof". There are however a number of members of the public who prefer the mansard design submitted to the design panel and have put forward their view on this aspect of the application at both the Development Management Forum and in the consultation letters submitted as part of the consultation process on this planning application.
- 6.2.12 In terms of the scale and massing and the amount of development, the new office building would be set well back from the frontage on the High Road thus allowing a separation from the existing building. The height of this block at four storeys reflects the number of storeys of the residential block on the opposite side of Nightingale Road. Notwithstanding this, the proposed building would be visible above the roofline of the existing police station building, particularly in long views from Woodside Park.
- 6.2.13 The planned building would have an internal floor area of approximately 5100m² split across five floors. The size of the footprint of the building at ground floor level is determined by the Home Office floor area requirement for the custodial facilities required.
- 6.2.14 With regards to landscaping, the new office block is set well back from the High Road frontage providing the opportunity to create green roofs. An extensive green roof will be provided to the first and third floor flat roof terraces which would provide a pleasant outlook from the adjacent office areas and to encourage biodiversity. Existing street tree planting along Nightingale Road will be maintained. One existing tree will be removed as shown on the Site Plan 990.P.001. (The drawing shows the location of all the existing trees on the site). Conditions of consent will require full details of the proposed landscaping scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 6.2.15 In relation to the impact on residential amenity the use of the property as a custody suite has been considered in the context of its previous use as a police station with 24 hour activity and patrolling facilities and the associated traffic and frequent blue light and siren noise.
- 6.2.16 While the proposed custody suites would also operate 24 hours a day, operational vehicles arriving at the site would generally not require blue light or sirens and unloading of those being brought into custody will be undertaken within the enclosed dock for security purposes. The location of the custody suites and their proposed design and layout will ensure that there will not be any noise disturbance from within the building. Once operational, the Custody Centre would be staffed by police staff 24 hours a day and the police presence should also help to keep noise to a minimum around the facility. For these reasons, the proposed development is not considered to result in any significant impact on the amenity of residents in terms of disturbance and noise, particularly compared to the most recent use.
- 6.2.17 The new buildings themselves would not cause any significant adverse issues of overlooking or overshadowing/loss of light to any of the existing residential properties around the site. The residential properties to the rear (western) end of the site are of a sufficient distance away to remain unaffected by the development. The relationship of the new buildings to Robin Court on the northern side of Nightingale Avenue would, in the main, be similar to the existing. The four storey building may result in a small decrease in direct sunlight to the flats during the winter months but would not be significantly adverse. The new three storey building plus clerestory element would be higher than the existing building but, in light of the distance across Nightingale Road, would maintain an acceptable relationship. There would be no issues relating to properties across the other side of the High Road or to those to the south of the site, by reason of distance and orientation.
- 6.2.18 There would be some temporary impact on residential amenity during the construction period however a number of requirements, including registration with the Considerate Contractors scheme and submission of a Site Construction Management Plan, will be imposed via conditions of consent, in order to minimise the impacts as far as possible.

6.3 Transport, Traffic and Parking

- 6.3.1 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan both prepared by WSP Development and Transportation. The Transport Assessment (TA) considers the effects of the proposed scheme on the surrounding road network.
- 6.3.2 Haringey Transportation Team has been consulted on this application and raise no objection to the development, subject to a number of conditions and s106 obligations.

- 6.3.3 The proposal site is in an area with a high public transport accessibility level (PTAL 5) and is served by some 56 buses per hour (two-way) for regular bus connections to Wood Green town centre; the site is also within 700 metres of Wood Green Underground Station and within close proximity to Alexandra Palace Overland Railway Station.

Highways Impacts

- 6.3.4 The existing facility during the previous use as a police station had some 340 staff and 32 parking spaces plus overspill van parking into the surrounding area. The proposed development is for a custody centre with 40 custody cells which would operate 24 hour a day with 3 shifts which start at 6am, 2pm and 10pm. The majority of the staff trip generated traffic would be outside the peak operational hour of the transport and highway network. However the 6am to 2pm shift may not have the option of the full complement of the public transport services normally available at that time (4:30am to 6am). This will have a greater effect on staff that start their journeys from outer London Boroughs and outside London. Haringey Transportation Team therefore considers that the majority of staff travelling from outer London Boroughs or outside London will use cars as the main mode of transport for their journey to the site for the 6am shift. This statement is further supported by the Transport Assessment, which suggests that some 49% of staff travelled to work by car at the previous facility. However, the previous police use operated with 340 staff and therefore the proposed use would operate with approximately 300 staff it is considered the level of vehicular movements would be reduced in comparison to the previous use and the new development would not materially impact the highway network.

Operational vehicular Trip Generation

- 6.3.5 The vehicular trip generation from the Transport Assessment has been calculated using a similar custody cell facility located in Leyton (London Borough of Waltham Forest). The results of the surveys when applied to the proposed Wood Green facility suggest that the custody cells would generate some 343 vehicular trips per day. The Leyton trip distribution suggests that the maximum number of trips would be generated between 12:00-18:00 with some 121 in/out trips over a 6 hour period, which equates to 20 in/out trips per hour.
- 6.3.6 The Haringey Transportation Team agree with the applicants trip generation forecast. However the trips over the 6 hour period would not be uniform and therefore Haringey Transportation Team require measures to ensure that pedestrian movements are prioritised and safeguarded.

Parking

- 6.3.7 The scheme would provide 31 car parking spaces plus an additional area for van parking. An enclosed parking area for the transfer of detainees has also been proposed. The 31 car parking spaces are for the operational use of the facility only and would not be used as staff car parking. Of the 31 spaces the developer has proposed, only one of the car parking spaces will be for disabled parking. Whilst Haringey Transportation Team acknowledges that the site is constrained and there is limited car parking space available they have requested an increase in the number of disabled parking spaces. A condition of consent will be added to this effect.
- 6.3.8 In addition, the developer also proposes to provide 30 cycle parking spaces. The cycle parking facilities along with lockers, changing rooms, showers and drying facilities will be provided in the new building for those staff who choose to cycle to work. A condition of consent will require the provision of 30 cycle spaces within the development.
- 6.3.9 Most Metropolitan Police staff are eligible for free travel on public transport within the London network and therefore it is expected that the majority of staff would travel to and from work by sustainable means of transport. However, as noted above, this may not be possible for all staff, particularly those officers who live outside of London and/or those who are scheduled to work the early morning, 6am shift. Whilst the Borough accepts the applicant is not proposing to provide staff parking, the site is on the edge of a CPZ and as such does not have sufficient restraint to constrain the trips that would be generated by the proposal. A condition of consent will require the submission and approval of a Travel Plan in order to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport for journeys to/from the site. Section 106 monies are also sought for the implement of management measures to restrict parking outside the site on Nightingale Road.
- 6.3.10 In addition, the Haringey Transportation Team requires the applicant to enter into a s.106 agreement to provide a raised entry treatment to the site and improved footway conditions on Nightingale Road. To ensure that the forward visibility of the site and the visibility of vehicles exiting the site are not obstructed, enhanced traffic calming measures to reduce vehicular speed and improve lighting in and around the entrances to the site will be required. Furthermore the agreement shall also include a traffic order to restrict parking outside the site on Nightingale Road.
- 6.3.11 The proposal, in terms of transport, traffic, parking and access is deemed to be acceptable and in line with the relevant planning policies subject to the imposition of a number of planning conditions and a section 106 agreement as outlined in sections 6.8 and 10.0 respectively, of this report.

6.5 Waste Management

Demolition and Construction Waste

- 6.5.1 The proposed development would generate waste during demolition and construction. A condition of consent will require the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which is to include a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP).

Operational Waste

- 6.5.2 The operational waste streams would be similar in nature to the operational waste streams within the previous police use. These are likely to comprise paper and plastics from packaging materials, food waste, glass and cardboard.
- 6.5.3 Haringey Waste Management Team has been consulted and raised no objection to the proposed development. Notwithstanding this, a condition of consent will require full details of the scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site, including location, design, screening, and operation, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details. Arrangements will need to be made with an authorised/ licensed waste carrier for trade to collect refuse and recycling from the premises.
- 6.5.4 On this basis, subject to conditions, the proposal is deemed to comply with policy UD7 “Waste Storage” and SPG8a Waste and Recycling (Adopted 2006).

6.6 Energy and Sustainability

- 6.6.1 PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development confirms sustainable development as the core principle underpinning planning and sets out the Government’s principles for delivering sustainable development by way of the planning system. PPS1 advises that planning should promote sustainable development and inclusive patterns of development by:

- Making land available for development
- Contributing to sustainable economic development
- Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment
- Ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design
- Ensuring that development supports existing communities

- 6.6.2 The proposed scheme should comply with the requirements of The London Plan (2011) and the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006), Supplementary Planning guidance (SPG’s) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD’s) in terms of sustainability.

- 6.6.3 Wates Construction has commissioned Anderson Green to prepare an Energy Assessment and Renewables strategy in support of the application.
- 6.6.4 The project aims to reduce carbon emissions by 20% and achieve a BREEAM rating of Excellent for the building. "A" rated materials as categorised in the BRE Green Guide will be specified wherever possible.
- 6.6.5 The new building has been arranged to maximise natural daylighting and ventilation to occupied spaces. A 300 square meters array of Photovoltaic panels will be installed on the roof of the building in addition to an Air Source Heat Pump.
- 6.6.6 Green Roofs have been incorporated to assist with surface water attenuation and an attenuation tank will be provided below ground in the yard (as shown on drawing 990.P.103),
- 6.6.7 By installing both Photo-voltaic panels and an Air Source Heat Pump systems the Energy Assessment and Renewables Strategy calculates that it would be possible to meet 20% reduction in CO₂ via renewable technology. Other non-renewable technology improvements are also required in order to pass Part L 2010 building regulations, these include:
- Improved u-values for building fabric
 - Improved air-tightness of building
 - Very efficient ventilation heat-recovery (77%)
 - High efficient gas-fired boilers (with oil back-up boilers to ground floor)
 - Reduced ductwork velocities (reduced fan power consumption)
 - High efficient fan coil units (reduced fan power consumption)
- 6.6.8 The new Part L 2010 building regulations requires a 25% improvement over a building built to 2006 regulations (in terms of reduction of carbon). The proposed building with all the renewable and non-renewable technologies incorporated would achieve an improvement of 2.4% above Part L 2010 which is a 27.4% overall improvement above Part L 2006, therefore the building also achieves the 15% improvement above Part L 2006 set as a target by the MPS.
- 6.6.9 In terms of access the MPS require all their buildings to be fully accessible to the public and staff. Level access would be provided both to the original public entrance and to the new staff entrance. The public reception counter will be designed to suit both ambulant and wheelchair bound staff and visitors. A number of disabled persons parking bays would be located in the car park with access to the adjacent stair and lift which provide access to all floors. Accessible WC facilities and showers are included within the building for use by staff and visitors. The new custody facilities are designed to accommodate disabled detainees.

6.7 Equalities Impact Assessment

- 6.7.1 In determining this planning application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under equalities legislation including the obligations under section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976. An Equalities Impact Assessment is undertaken to evaluate the effects of the proposed scheme on people depending on their ethnicity, gender, age, disability, religion and belief or sexual orientation.
- 6.7.2 In carrying out the Council's functions due regard must be had, firstly to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, and secondly to the need to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different equalities groups. Members must have regard to these obligations in taking a decision on this application.
- 6.7.3 Some policies, projects, functions, major developments or planning applications may have a greater impact on equality and diversity than others. The Council has developed a screening tool to help identify whether a full Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) should be undertaken. An EqIA screening has been undertaken and found that there are no adverse or unequal impacts identified across each of the equality strand and that a full EqIA is not considered necessary for this particular application.

6.7 Planning Obligations - Section 106

- 6.7.1 Policy UD8 requires development, where appropriate, to be subject to a Section 106 agreement in order to secure appropriate benefits in line with guidance set out in SPG10a and SPG10e.
- 6.7.2 The Council is seeking the following s106 contributions:
1. Highway Works including: Creation of a raised entry treatment to the site to improve footway conditions on Nightingale Road; Implementation of management measures to restrict parking outside the site on Nightingale Road; Introduction of traffic calming measures to reduce vehicular speed and improve lighting in and around the entrance, for a sum of sixty eight thousand pounds £68,000.
 2. Administration charge of £2,000 as required by SPG10a.
- 6.7.3 The total amount of s106 contribution would be £70,000

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The use of the property as a police facility is considered to be acceptable in principle. The need for the Metropolitan Police Service to develop a more effective centralised custody suite to assist policing is acknowledged by the Council and planning policy. The re-use of an unused former police station for such a purpose is an efficient use of the property. The impact of the proposed use would not be as intrusive as previous fully active police station in terms of noise, disturbance and traffic.
- 7.2 The submitted scheme is considered to address the concerns raised at the time of the 2008 planning application submission. The proposed development includes the retention and refurbishment of the original Police Station façade which is a valued component of the Wood Green High Road. The massing, scale, layout and appearance of the proposed building is considered to be in sympathy with the original Police Station and its neighbours and preserve and enhance the character of the street scene. The roof design as currently proposed has taken into account the comments of the Haringey Design Panel.
- 7.3 The proposed development, which would be used for custody and office based police activities is not considered to result in any significant impact on the highway network or on the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance. The design, siting, bulk and scale of the development is not considered to result in any significant adverse impacts in terms of overlooking or overshadowing.
- 7.4 The proposed facility is considered to be acceptable in terms of waste management, sustainability and access, subject to conditions.
- 7.5 The transport, traffic and parking arrangements are considered to be acceptable subject to conditions and a s106 agreement.
- 7.6 Overall, the proposed development would provide a modern Police Building in accordance with the guidance of the Home Office and enable the MPA to deliver a more efficient and effective police service in Haringey for the benefit of the local community.

8.0 HUMAN RIGHTS

- 8.1 All applications are considered against a background of the Human Rights Act 1998 and in accordance with Article 22(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003 where there is a requirement to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. Reasons for refusal are always given and are set out on the decision notice. Unless any report specifically indicates otherwise all decisions of this Committee will accord with the requirements of the above Act and Order.

RECOMMENDATION 1

That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference HGY/2011/1094 subject to a pre-condition that the applicant shall first have entered into an agreement or agreements with the London Borough of Haringey (under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) 1990) in order to secure the following general items:

- Highways, Transport and Access Improvements
- Administration Charge

Monitoring

To ensure that the s106 obligations are honoured in a full and timely manner, implementation of the s106 obligations will be subject to regular monitoring and target dates will be set where appropriate.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION 2

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to section 106 Legal Agreement in accordance with the approved plans and documentation as follows:

Applicant's drawing No's: 990.P.700 REV P1; 001 REV P1; 102 REV P1; 103 REV P1; 104 REV P1; 105 REV P1; 106 REV P1; 107 REV P1; 110 REV P1; 111 REV P1 and 112 REV P1

Subject to the following conditions:

COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT

1. The development to which this permission relates must be commenced 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 Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS

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.

DETAILS OF MATERIALS

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no construction shall be commenced until precise details and samples of the facing materials and roofing materials to be used for the external construction of the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.

CONTROL OF EXTERNAL NOISE

4. The design and installation of new items of fixed plant shall be such that, when in operation, the cumulative noise level LAeq Tr arising from the proposed plant, measured or predicted at 1m from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive premises shall be a rating level of at least 5dB(A) below the background noise level LAF90 Tbg. The measurement and/or prediction of the noise should be carried out in accordance with the methodology contained within BS 4142: 1997. A noise report shall be produced by a competent person(s) to demonstrate compliance with the above criteria, and shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

LIGHTING PLAN

5. Notwithstanding the details of lighting referred to in the application submission, full details of a lighting plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, prior to the occupation of the premises.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties.

LANDSCAPING – LANDSCAPING SCHEME

6. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application the development shall not be brought into use until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for landscaping, which shall include a) those existing trees to be retained; b) those existing trees to be removed; c) those new trees and shrubs to be planted together (including green roofs) with a schedule of species d) hard surfacing.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development and in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of residents in the area.

LANDSCAPING – IMPLEMENTATION/MAINTENANCE

7. All landscaping and ecological enhancement works, including planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be completed no later than the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of FIVE years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. All hard landscaping and means of enclosure shall be completed before the development is occupied.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

LANDSCAPING – PROTECTION OF EXISTING TREES

8. No development shall commence until an Arboricultural method statement, including a tree protection plan, has been prepared in accordance with BS5837:2005 "Trees in Relation to Construction", and approved by the Local Planning Authority. A pre-commencement site meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturalist, Council Arboriculturalist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees. Robust protective fencing / ground protection must be installed prior to commencement of construction activities on site and retained until completion. It must be designed and installed as recommended in the method statement. The protective fencing must be inspected by the Council Arboriculturalist, prior to any works commencing on site and remain in place until works are complete.

Reason: To protect the trees which are to be retained and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

BOUNDARY TREATMENT

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

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

WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING

10. A detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site, including location, design, screening, and operation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details. Arrangements will need to be made with an authorised/ licensed waste carrier for trade to collect refuse and recycling from the premises.

Reason: To ensure good design, to safeguard the amenity of the area and ensure that the development is sustainable and has adequate facilities.

HOARDINGS

11. Prior to the commencement of development full details of a scheme for the provision of hoardings to be erected around the site from the commencement of works and to be retained during the construction period including details of design, height, materials and lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the scheme as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to have regard to the visual amenity of the locality and the amenity of local residents, businesses and visitors during construction works.

CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

12. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan, including Site Waste Management Plan and a Site Management Plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include but not be limited to the following: a) Public Safety, Amenity and Site Security; b) Operating Hours, Noise and Vibration Controls; c) Air and Dust Management; d) Storm water and Sediment Control and e) Waste and Materials Re-use. The Site Waste Management Plan will demonstrate compliance with an appropriate Demolition Protocol. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to have regard to the amenities of local residents, businesses, visitors and construction sites in the area during construction works.

CONSTRUCTION DUST MITIGATION

13. No development shall commence until the appropriate mitigation measures to minimise dust and emissions are incorporated into the site specific Construction Management Plan based on the Mayor's Best Practice Guidance (The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition). This should include an inventory and timetable of dust generating activities, emission control methods and where appropriate air quality monitoring). This must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to any works being carried out on the site.

Reason: To protect the environment and amenities of the locality.

CONSTRUCTION – CONSIDERATE CONTRACTORS

14. The site or Contractor Company must be registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the LPA prior to any works being carried out on the site.

Reason: In the interest of amenity.

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN & CONSTRUCTION LOGISTICS PLAN

15. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (incorporating Travel Plan), including a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a construction vehicle routing plan, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved details shall be implemented at all times during the construction of the development, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and highway safety and to promote sustainable transport and in order to confine construction traffic to permitted routes so as not to prejudice the free flow of traffic or pose any potential highway and safety hazards for all other road users.

CONSTRUCTION HOURS

16. 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.

CCTV AND SECURITY LIGHTING

17. Prior to occupation of the development a scheme showing full details for the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- a) CCTV;
- b) Security lighting

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development achieves the safer places attributes as detailed by Planning Policy Statement 1: Safer Places: The Planning System & Crime Prevention and to prevent crime and create safer, sustainable communities and in order to ensure the location of CCTV protects the privacy of neighbouring residential properties.

CYCLE PARKING

18. The development hereby approval shall include the provision of 30 (thirty) cycle racks which shall be enclosed within a lockable shelter.

Reason: To increase the use of sustainable travel modes by staff of this development.

DISABLED PARKING

19. The development hereby approved shall include the provision of 4 (four) disabled car parking bays within the site.

Reason: To assist the mobility-impaired staff and patrons of this development.

TRAVEL PLAN

20. A Travel Plan, in compliance with Transport for London Guidance, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, at least 3 months in advance of occupation of the development.

Reason: In order to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport for journeys to/from the site.

SIGNAGE

21. Prior to occupation of the development, precise details of any signage proposed as part of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to achieve good design throughout the development and to protect the visual amenity of the locality.

BREEAM – DESIGN STAGE ASSESSMENT

22. The development hereby permitted shall be built to a minimum standard of “Very Good” under the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) 2008 Scheme. Notwithstanding the BREEAM pre-assessment referred to in the submitted Sustainability Statement (Document Ref: REP-PL-HOR-011A), a BREEAM design stage assessment will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction. The BREEAM design stage assessment will be carried out by a licensed assessor.

Reason: To ensure that development takes place in an environmentally sensitive way.

BREEAM CERTIFICATE

23. The development hereby permitted shall be built to a minimum standard of “Excellent” under the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM). Within three months of the occupation of the completed development, a copy of the Post Construction Completion Certificate for the relevant building verifying that the “Excellent” BREEAM rating has been achieved shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The Certificate shall be completed by a licensed assessor.

Reason: To ensure that development takes place in an environmentally sensitive way.

LONDON FIRE AND EMERGENCY PLANNING AUTHORITY

24. Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall consult the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) regarding fire fighting access and arrangements and a letter confirming that the LFEPA is satisfied with the proposal shall be submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure suitable fire fighting access and arrangements are provided.

INFORMATIVES:

INFORMATIVE – REMOVAL OR VARIATION OF CONDITIONS

The applicant is advised that Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Determination of applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) requires formal permission to be granted by the Local Planning Authority for the removal or variation of a condition following grant of planning permission.

INFORMATIVE:

The development hereby approved shall include the retention of historic internal features such as the memorial plaque and external historic features such as the traditional blue police lamp.

11.0 REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The reasons for the grant of planning permission are as follows:

- a) It is considered that the principle of this development is supported by National, Regional and Local Planning policies which seek to support the provision of social infrastructure, including police facilities.
- b) The building and its proposed use are considered to be suitably located in respect of the surroundings, impact on neighbouring properties and site constraints and it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts in terms of noise, disturbance, overlooking or overshadowing.
- c) The Planning Application has been assessed against and is considered to be in general accordance with the intent of National, Regional and Local Planning Policies requirements including London Borough of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006, policy G1 Environment, G2 'Development and Urban Design', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 Waste Storage, UD8 Planning Obligations, M2 'Public Transport Network', M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility', M5 Protection, Improvement & Creation of Pedestrian & Cycle Routes, M10 'Parking for Development', CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas, CSV3 'Locally listed buildings & designated sites of industrial heritage interest '.

12.0 APPENDICES:

- 12.1 Appendix 1: Consultation Responses
- 12.2 Appendix 2: Planning Policies
- 12.3 Appendix 3: Development Management Forum Minutes
- 12.4 Appendix 4: Design Panel Minutes

APPENDIX 1

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	STATUTORY		
1	London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)	No objection	Noted
2	Crime Prevention Officer	The crime prevention department can give specific advice as required and can be contacted on 02083452167. We have no objection to the proposals.	Noted
	INTERNAL		
1	Haringey Building Control	Comment on Fire Brigade Access B5 only - Fire Brigade access appears satisfactory. Full consultation with the Fire Authority should be carried out with regards to the means of escape in case of fire and the Fire Brigade access.	The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority has been consulted and raise no objection.
2	Haringey Transportation Team	No objection subject to conditions/s106 legal agreement.	Full details of comments provided in section 6.3 of this report
3	Haringey Waste Management	No objection	Noted
4	Haringey Design and Conservation	Design Panel comments should be included in officer's report	The Design Panel Report is provided in Appendix 4 of this report.
	EXTERNAL		
	<u>Ward Councillors</u>	No comments received	N/A
	<u>Residents/Amenity Groups</u>		
	Avenue Gardens Residents Association	We are pleased to note that the previous application has been withdrawn and a new proposal developed. However, there are significant	Noted

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>concerns with this new proposal, which should be addressed in the context of the Authority's adopted policies.</p> <p>1. The new proposal retains only the principle facades of the existing building. Given the substantial nature and good structural condition of the existing building it should be retained; this would be more sustainable. Facadism is not a welcome solution. The applicant should address this matter in line with policy on sustainability.</p> <p>2. The new proposal is for a relatively massive building. The application submission does not enable one to assess the proposal in context. There are no perspectives, context photomontages or computer generated images. The location of the building at the bend of the road is a key townscape location. The applicant should be asked to provide images from several different points in the High Road and also from the adjoining street. This is a normal part of such applications.</p> <p>3. The new built elements fronting the High Road are set back at the upper levels from the retained original building. However, the new is not set to align with the original frontage. This is not obvious from the submission a three dimensional view would make this clear. The new being set at an angle to the retained façade will result in poor built form. It should be noted that the building line of buildings on opposite sides of the road make</p>	<p>Design issues are addressed in section 6.2 of this report.</p> <p>The plans and supporting documentation submitted is deemed to be sufficient to undertake a complete assessment of the planning application.</p> <p>Design issues are addressed in section 6.2 of this report. The proposed building line fronting the High Road is deemed to be acceptable.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>an ordered street. The new should align so that there is a good relationship with the retained and also with the buildings on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>4. Approaching the site from the south along the High Road, the pedestrian has a wide view of the entire site, especially from the east side of the High Road. The new elements would dominate the retained facade. This could be mitigated by tree planting along the boundary of the site. This would also have the advantage of improving the environment and aspect from the High Road.</p> <p>5. Tree planting at the Nightingale Road boundary would also mitigate the potentially very harsh aspect of the proposed building in views along the street.</p>	<p>A condition of consent will require full details of proposed landscaping to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.</p> <p>As above.</p>
	<u>Local Residents</u>		
1	292 High Road N22	I am in favour of the development. I look forward to the development taking place. I think it will be a benefit to the area.	Noted
	Jasper Woodcock – No address provided	What we object to about the revised roof is not so much the change in architectural style, but the way it increases the bulkiness of the new build in relation to the existing building.	Noted. Issues of Design, Bulk and Scale are addressed in section 6.2 of this report.
	Architect of Jasper Woodcock	The new building should respect the existing building by not dominating it with the new building. To do this it is necessary to do two things: firstly, minimise the actual bulk and height of the new building, and secondly, to use materials and forms that complement the old building. The architectural design of the new building should complement the	Design issues are addressed in section 6.2 of this report.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>existing building. However, it should also work in its broader urban context.</p> <p>The police station when built was the tallest building in its immediate vicinity, and its roof forms have been designed to make it appear smaller by the use of a mansard design. Thus, because the new building is a storey taller than the old police station, a roof form should be used that minimises its apparent bulk and height. The architects should seek to minimise the height and bulk.</p> <p>The alternative design being currently presented makes the bulk and height of the new building appear greater than in the previously presented design because it has projecting eaves above a band of vertical window-wall in the topmost storey - it literally is larger, but the aggregation of the windows in the upper storey in this way will create the sense of a larger building compared to breaking them down into smaller units and making them part of a receding roof form of some kind.</p>	
	2 Cornwall Avenue	<p>The plans show that it is intended to replace the windows in the existing facade with metal framed windows, each with a single horizontal glazing bar. The pattern of timber glazing bars is an important part of the character of the original facade and replacement windows will significantly alter its appearance. Regard should be given to the fact that the original building is on the Register of Local Listed Buildings of Merit. The original</p>	<p>The plans do not propose to retain the original windows however other elements of historic interest will be retained where possible such as the internal plaque and the police blue lamp.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>timber windows in the existing facade should be retained and repaired if necessary.</p>	
	<p>105 Maryland Road, N22</p>	<p>I welcome the preservation of the exterior of the original building and generally, this is a far better proposal than the previous one.</p> <p>With regard to the old Police Station, I agree with the Design Panel that it is 'lamentable to strip out its interior partitions and even floors, and think also that 'the cellular interior should be kept and suitable cellular uses found'.</p> <p>I also agree that the retention of the blue lamp and 'Police' sign is important and should not confuse people.</p> <p>It requires signage to direct callers to the front desk services a few metres away at The Fishmongers' Arms.</p> <p>The area has local historical significance and should be developed sensitively.</p> <p>The proposed development is in an area which is largely residential and overlooks our local park. I take some issue with the dismissal of the roof design as a 'weak, mock mansard'. On the contrary, I would suggest that the retention of this style of roof is essential if the building is to fit in to its surroundings. It is a very large building which is being proposed here, and the mansard style roof will serve to lessen its visual impact on the local environment. I feel this to be very</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Design issues are addressed in section 6.2 of this report.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain historical features such as the blue police lamp.</p> <p>A condition of consent will require the submission and approval of precise details of any signage proposed.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Design issues, including roof design are addressed in section 6.2 of this report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		important. Without the mansard roof, the revised design, in my view, is overbearing and overly authoritarian in appearance, one of the main reasons local residents objected to the 2007 plan.	

APPENDIX 2 PLANNING POLICIES

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

National Planning Policy Statements and Guidance

- Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
- Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change-Supplement to PPS1
- Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
- Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment
- Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise

REGIONAL PLANNING POLICY

London Plan 2011

- Policy 3.16 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- Policy 6.1 Integrating transport & development
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.3 Secured by design
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
- Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

The Mayor's Sustainable Design & Construction SPG (2006)

The Mayor's Culture Strategy: Realising the potential of a world class city (2004)

The Mayor's Planning for Equality & Diversity in Meeting the Spatial Needs of London's Diverse Communities SPG

The Mayor's Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG

The Mayor and London Councils' Best Practice Guide on the Control of Dust & Emissions during Construction

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (Adopted July 2006; Saved July 2009)

- G1 Environment
- G2 Development and Urban Design
- G4 Employment
- G9 Community Well Being
- G10 Conservation
- UD1 Planning Statements
- UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction
- UD3 General Principles
- UD4 Quality Design
- UD7 Waste Storage

- UD8 Planning Obligations
- ENV2 Surface Water Runoff
- ENV4 Enhancing and Protecting the Water Environment
- ENV6 Noise Pollution
- ENV7 Air, Water and Light Pollution
- ENV11 Contaminated Land
- ENV13 Sustainable Waste Management
- M2 Public Transport Network
- M3 New Development Location and Accessibility
- M5 Protection, Improvement & Creation of Pedestrian & Cycle Routes
- M8 Access Roads
- M10 Parking for Development
- CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas
- CSV3 Locally listed buildings & designated sites of industrial heritage interest

Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006)

- SPG1a Design Guidance (Adopted 2006)
- SPG2 Conservation and Archaeology (Draft 2006)
- SPG4 Access for All (Mobility Standards) (Draft 2006)
- SPG5 Safety By Design (Draft 2006)
- SPG7a Vehicle and Pedestrian Movements (Draft 2006)
- SPG7b Travel Plans (Draft 2006)
- SPG7c Transport Assessment (Draft 2006)
- SPG8a Waste and Recycling (Adopted 2006)
- SPG8b Materials (Draft 2006)
- SPG8c Environmental Performance (Draft 2006)
- SPG8d Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees (Draft 2006)
- SPG8e Light Pollution (Draft 2006)
- SPG9 Sustainability Statement Guidance Notes & Checklist (Draft 2006)
- SPG10a Negotiation, Mgt & Monitoring of Obligation (Adopted 2006)
- SPG10e Improvements Public Transport Infrast. & Services (Draft 2006)
- SPD Housing

Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Proposals Map (Published for Consultation May 2010; Submitted for Examination March 2011. EiP July 2011)

- SP1 Managing Growth
- SP4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey
- SP6 Waste and Recycling
- SP8 Employment
- SP10 Town Centres
- SP11 Design
- SP12 Conservation
- SP16 Community Infrastructure

Draft Development Management Policies (Published for Consultation May 2010)

- DMP9 New Development Location and Accessibility
- DMP13 Sustainable Design and Construction
- DMP15 Environmental Protection
- DMP16 Development Within & Outside of Town & Local Shopping Centres
- DMP19 Employment Land & Premises
- DMP20 General Principles
- DMP21 Quality Design
- DMP22 Waste Storage

Draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (October 2010)

London Borough of Haringey - Community Infrastructure Study (Draft March 2010)

OTHER DOCUMENTS

CABE Design and Access Statements

Diversity and Equality in Planning: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)

Planning and Access for disabled people: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)

Demolition Protocol Developed by London Remade

Secured by Design

APPENDIX 3
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT FORUM
MINUTES



**PLANNING & REGENERATION
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

MINUTES

Meeting : Development Management Forum - Wood Green Police Station -
347
High Road; London; N22 8HZ

Date : 4th July 2011

Place : Cypriot Centre, Earlham Grove, Wood Green, N22

Present : Paul Smith (Chair), Architect Agent, Cllr Engert, Cllr Newton, Cllr
Meehan and approx 6 Local Residents

Minutes by : Tay Makoon

Distribution :

<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>Paul Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced officers, members and the applicant's representatives. He explained the purpose of the meeting that it was not a decision making meeting, the house keeping rules, he explained the agenda and that the meeting will be minuted and attached to the officers report for the Planning Committee.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>Replacement of existing police station with new custody facility and office accommodation in four storey building for police use, including retention of façade of the original building</p> <p>Presentation by Architects</p> <p>We are here to present to you the new proposal for Wood Green Police Station to be built on the site of the existing police station which has been empty for over a year. We held pre application consultations in the summer and some of you I know as attended our exhibition in Wood Green. The plans today have been shaped from the previous planning application that we previously wanted to submit 2/3 years ago which was a glass building and it going to be all singing and all dancing site. It was going to have the patrol functions, custody functions everything inside it. To say it went down like a lead balloon with the local community would be an understatement. Before submitting an application everything got shelved, we went away and back to the drawing board to see if we could take on the community concerns and what we could do and this is what we have come back with as a result of those community concerns and issues raised.</p> <p>Why do we need a new custody site?</p> <p>At the moment we have 18 cells for the borough and that is not enough cells for today needs. Haringey is increasing in size and there are more local residents, more residential developments going on and 18 cells is not enough for us to cope. 2/3 times week we are taking detainees to out borough and other stations which means officers are moving out of the borough and not in where they should be which is in the borough. The facilities we've got is Tottenham Police Station which is an aging station and Hornsey Police Station we really need to update and modernise and be able to provide fast speedy access to health services, mental health, drug workers and such like which will be brought in to this new building. The location is that at the moment it will be Tottenham and Hornsey police station locally, we have units that deal with investigations with prisoners based at St Ann's. Regency Chambers Tottenham, Hornsey and all spread about which means everybody has to travel to deal with the prisoners and not economic use of time, this will bring everything into one spot and we will be able to stream line our processes and save time travelling about the borough. We will also bring the Crown prosecution Service in this site where the prisoners are held to speed up face to face conversations and decisions</p>	<p>Action</p>
---------------------	--	----------------------

for charging people. Those are the benefits for us for the new site.

New future for wood Green Police station, it looks quite a sizable structure on the original plans for the exhibition and on the third slide it shows a different style of roof than this one, this roof has been changed as a result of consultation with the design panel and they wanted us to have this sort of roof instead of the Mansard roof before. It's a high quality design, it keeps the frontage and keeps everything in theme in the front o

of the building which was a major concern of the previous design. It is going to be an additional cell capacity 40 cells which is build to future proof the premises .it is based on Haringey's demands not everywhere else in the service. It will be a highly sustainable building, with 20% by renewable energy and solar panels and heat source pumps and the actual build will be conducted by actual weights contracting who are a considerate building firm even during the build hopefully once we have the planning permission nuisance to local residents will be minimise.

The site carefully selected, we own the land and because it is central to the borough it has easy access to travel, it has underground station near by,

overground station at Alexandra Palace, and regular bus routes up and down the high road bringing in staff and people visiting the station.

The former station has been out of use for over a year and it's right now for redevelopment. This is an opportunity to for us to provide a new policing facility for the borough to bring everything together as well as separating out the victims of crime and the general public from people coming

into custody or returning custody. We have acted on initial feedback and we are keeping the whole of the front of the original building. There is a district link between old original building and the modern structure that sits behind with the open planning office space that we require. The change of the roof come about due Design panel recommendation, and the change from the design of the glass frontage came about from local concerns , so

we are listening and are prepare to listen to your views. We have reviewed the proposed building materials to make sure the facilities fit better with its surroundings

Conclusion this building will enable us to bring everything into one site, it will allow us to provide a more efficient service and use our resources more efficiently. it will allow us to make savings on our energy costs and our vehicle costs and enable us to provide improved service for the community. At present our staff are operating in old style buildings and this facility will provide them with modern way of working with everything under one roof. Better working facilities for staff and for the detainees, we can bring partners, the mental health, the drug workers to bring early intervention

to brake the cycle of re-offending. It's not just about solving the crime but to prevent the crime as well as we can do that with the site. We can also get speedy access to Justice; one thing planned here is a virtual court which will be a TV linked to the magistrate, where offenders with minor offences can be justice dispensed there and then without them leaving the station.

Question from Floor

Q1 You have two versions of the roof which is the one that is preferred?

Ans: The original version is shown on this slide and the design panel asked us to change it to the new roof.

Q2 I am still not clear as to why they prefer the other one, the old design is more infield version as far as I can see.

Ans: The design panel is made up of Architects and applicants and people interested in design, and they felt the block behind would be more modern. They didn't like the mansard roof and felt this is more modern. That is why we changed it. It is in an advisory capacity and they are independent advisors. You can agree to disagree with the design panel. The panel advised that traditional in the front and modern at the back would be best.

Q3: Are you saying the mansard roof is less of a powerful building than the more traditional ridge roof with glazing around it.

Ans: That is why we designed it initially we suspected that would be the opinion of the people living nearby and then we presented it to the design panel and we felt we had to take on those recommendations and made the change to the scheme.

Q5: I suppose you have sunlight and daylight study and you want to maximise the daylight coming in and which design gives you better daylight

Ans: I think it would be a better office to work in with the view all around without it being fully glazed at top level. It does give it a more modern appearance. You still will get enough daylight.

Q6: I would have concerns about the amount of glass being used - is that sustainable?

Ans: We are designing with the highest sustainable standards and are judged by British Research Establishment criteria and they are put in certain categories and it is the highest categories and we will achieve that. Yes with more glass it does allow more natural ventilation and less light. On the ground floor less likely as you cannot open windows for safety reasons.

Paul Smith said - can you say what gives you BREAAAM Excellence and what are the features.

Ans: We have a renewable heat source report. It is an airtight building

and we are having high level of insulation within the envelope we are including 300sqm solar voltaic panels on the roof of the custody block and you can see that from the elevation and couple with the air source heat pump 20% of the energy used will be from sources generated on site. It is of a high standard we are achieving 20% above what the building regulations do in co2 emissions and we also achieving 20% renewable on this site.

Q7: Cllr Engert - what is the fenestration difference on left hand picture of the old building and the right hand picture. what is the fenestration like on the original building?

Ans: There is an inconsistency between the drawing but we are replacing all the existing windows with new windows, They do not have the glazing bard in the planning application which are on the existing, is there a reason why it couldn't have.

Ans: There is no reason why.

Cllr Engert: It seems that if people like the original building with its glazing bars then that is part of its character and it should form part of the new scheme.

Ans: We are trying to have a modern building with the bars.

Paul Smith asked: Do you want the bar re-introduced even though it is a modern building.

Cllr Engert: People like the building it is a pity to encroach on the integrity of the building and the bars are very much a part of its integrity.

Statement from the floor: From a heritage point of view - she has a point , you would try and keep the new building as true to the old building, keep as much of its original features and it should be respected.

Ans The windows do not meet modern standards in terms of airtight, thermal performance. We can certainly replicate the look of the existing windows in the new windows.

Q8: Roof Mansard, Glass, can you not push it a bit and make it a contemporary building?

Ans: Our approach was not to do a contemporary building; we do not want to make an architectural statement with it. It is a police station and it needs to be familiar.

Q9: Local Resident I am interested in the security that goes with it, I was very sad when this building shut down. I am very concerned about the security for this little jail, you are bringing my property value down, you are endangering my safety on the streets we are going to have

police cars bringing people in day and night, reservations about the virtual courts nothing on the plans about what will happen when families are coming to visit, lawyers coming wanting park to visit their clients. What will happen to problems, and now with it's facility it will affect me us who want to go about our daily business. I would have like to see a more active police station instead of this mini jail you are creating and administration building, doesn't make me feel safe to walk around Wood Green.

Ans: Yes, it is an administration building with the detainees a 24hr 7 days a week facility. There will be officers in this building 24hrs, 7days a week

The officers coming to and fro the building will not be using the sirens. people coming in and out, vans come in go up the ramp and when doors are closed

then the detainees come out of the van, the area is totally secured so nobody can escape, no one will open the doors of the van until the doors of yard

is closed. We do not have visiting facilities within the station, it is not a prison people are not detained here people do come and drop clothing off.

Q10. That in itself is worrying; they will park in my road. I am happy there will be officers all the time but will they be outside In case there is ramrading.

Ans: No stations has ever been ramraded, there has been a couple of drive by shooting but not many shooting in Haringey. Haringey is safer than it was 4/5 years ago.

Q11: You have an increase in gangs?

Ans: yes we do, but gangs are against gangs not you and I.

Ans: We have had to call officers as far away as Barnet to attend to emergencies, this is why we need to have this police station here

Detainees are coming and going in the van they are not being released into the community. The dangerous ones will be charged and taken away from here by van to court; they cannot get out of a caged.

Q12: Is there enough parking for lawyers

Ans: There is limited parking inside the facility, 28 vehicles with be housed underneath the custody facility.

Statement: Nightingale road will have parking problems and with this scheme it will affect me greatly.

Ans: We will support any parking measures local residents want to have us look at.

Statement: I am very worried that police will no be readily available, with this station here ,will you be saying we don't need our fair share of officers as police officers will be coming and going.

Ans: No criminal elements will want to hang around a police station; they don't want to be seen so the last place would be outside a Police Station.

Q13: Are there any more building like this elsewhere?
Yes in Leyton, Barking, with 40 cells.

Q14: Why Terracotta bricks?

Ans: The design panel want a more modern appearance.

Q15: Is the glazing mirror glass?

Ans: You will see people moving on upper floors only and the ground floor charging facilities will have film on the windows for security.

Paul Smith reminded everyone to submit their comments to the Planning Service if not already done so and further representations can be made at Planning Committee. He thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.

End of meeting

APPENDIX 4 DESIGN PANEL MINUTES



Haringey

Design Panel no. 26

Thursday 14th April 2011

ATTENDANCE

Panel

Ruth Blum
Gordon Forbes
Michael Hammerson
Leo Hammond
Chris Mason
Peter Sanders
Paul Simms

Observers

Marc Dorfman (Chair) Assistant Director, Planning and Regeneration
Haringey Council
Richard Truscott (Facilitator) Haringey Council
Mortimer MacSweeney Haringey Council
Sule Nisancioglu Haringey Council

1) Presentation of proposals for Wood Green Custody Suite (former Police Station)

Simon Whitmill Architect, Raymond Smith Partnership L.L.P
Robert Atkinson Metropolitan Police
Ian McPherson Metropolitan Police

Before and after discussion of the schemes - Panel Format & Terms of Reference:

Marc introduced his proposals for changes to the panel format, possible future links between the panel and the Planning Forum and Conservation Area Advisory Committees, and Richard introduced his draft revised Terms of Reference. After a short discussion it was agreed that both would be considered by all the panel members between this and the next panel, when there would be further discussion and the panel's decision.

1) Presentation of proposals for Wood Green Custody Suite (former Police Station) and questions

Simon Whitmill of Raymond Smith Partnership L.L.P, architects of the latest proposals, presented the scheme, with contributions from Robert Atkinson of the project managers and Ian McPherson of the Metropolitan Police. They were able to show that the new proposals were completely changed from those seen by the panel in 2007, including as specifically requested by the panel, the retention of the main entrance and exterior fabric of the original building.

Panel members questions included whether neighbours were aware of the use of the detention element, high security suspect would be accommodated and retaining the carved sign & “police” blue lamp would be confusing; they confirmed it would only be short term detention for non high security but felt retaining the signs would not be confusing. The extent of the glazed “link” block from an overheating point of view and daylighting to deep spaces was questioned; they demonstrated good provision of rooflights and light wells to satisfy the latter point. On whether relevant different sorts of office accommodation; cellular in the old building, linking / shared uses in the “link” and general office space in the main new block could be possible, they said they had been asked to only provide open plan generic office space throughout for maximum efficiency and internal floors and walls in the existing would not be retained as levels would be inconvenient.

Panel Observations

Concept & Context

1. The panel all agreed this proposal was a *considerable* improvement on that presented to the panel previously (in 2007), in particular for the decision to retain the original late nineteenth century police station building and incorporate it into the proposal.
2. However the approach to incorporating the existing structure was a point of some concern. It forms the main point of reference for context, the surrounding buildings being variable and uninspiring. But panel members felt it was lamentable to strip out its interior partitions and even floors. They suggested the cellular interior should be kept and suitable cellular uses found.

Form, Massing & Materials

3. The overall approach to massing and organisation, of separate clearly articulated existing and new elements, with a differently articulated linking element and ground floor plinth was welcomed. However the panel strongly expressed concern that the glazed link was unconvincing; it did not house linking uses but just more undifferentiated open plan office space, extending an uncomfortable “leg” in front of the main office element and leaving a row of brickwork nervously exposing itself above. If it is a link, the panel urged it be a link. Also a section is essential to demonstrate and resolve integration of existing, new and link.
4. The false mansard of the top floor of main office element was also excoriated as an unnecessary attempt to disguise the top floor. Better to be bold and express the building across the middle of the site, behind the retained old building, as a separate element; not to disguise the top floor in a weak, mock mansard. If the applicants illustrated their proposal in its wider context of the surrounding areas scale, mass and height it would be helpful. The applicants are urged to change

this half hearted “historic” treatment. Some felt this could be a higher element than proposed, others that it should be lower but could be a deeper plan.

5. The ground floor “plinth” element enclosing the site from the street and continuing the forms and materials of the existing was acceptable in principle but the limited fenestration and use of materials and details to match was regretted by some; it can be difficult to match new materials to old and therefore could be better purposely new. Its roof will be highly visible from the link and offices; if it was accessible and/or green that would be welcomed.
6. Panel members understood the preference for the cell block element to be unfenestrated, provided, as proposed, there are extensive generous and effective roof lights giving good daylight to every cell and other spaces in the custody and processing areas. However the appearance of the elevations of the cell block needs consideration; blank masonry walls would probably be unacceptable. Green walls might be the best alternative, especially as an outlook from the neighbouring housing.

Approach & Spaces around the development

7. Whilst there was some concern that retaining the characteristic blue “Police” lamp and carved “Police” in the stonework over the door could be confusing as the building would no longer operate a “neighbourhoods” desk (which has already been relocated a short distance away), it was agreed these historic elements should be retained.
8. Welcoming retention of the existing main entrance for the public (for families and solicitors of detainees; staff would enter from the side and detainees via the vehicle dock), the proposal to insert a ramp was regretted but understood. However the panel would like to see the steps retained.
9. The side “alleyway” where the new building stepped 1m or so away from the property boundary was regretted and questioned for necessity; such spaces are usually neglected and rubbish strewn and should be avoided.

Consensus and Conclusions

10. The panel felt there were welcomed improvements in the proposal but a number of serious shortcomings in the design, particularly in the Form, Massing and Materials, that should be addressed. But *if* these were addressed then the proposal would be worthy of approval.