

## Pre-Application Planning Advice Note PRE/2010/0031



**Date of meeting:** Monday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2010 (14.30) **Site Visit:** 121<sup>st</sup> December 2010 **Haringey Council**

**Site Address:** Land at Coppetts Road, N10 1JP (Part of Former Lynx Depot)

### **Attendants:**

- Matthew Gunning – Team Leader/ Development Management (North Area)
- Rob Huntley – Planning Consultant/ RHPC
- Oliver Dyson – Land Manager/ Taylor Wimpey
- Jeremy Rippon – Architect / Architectus
- Earl Lipman- Safeland Plc

### **Site Description**

The application site is 0.35 hectares in size and is located on the western side of Coppetts Road in between a recently completed residential scheme (know as Gilson Place) and a narrow access route which provide access to Muswell Hill Playing Fields. There is a small terrace of residential properties immediately to the south of this site (No's 135 – 141 Coppetts Road) as well as a sports pavilion and educational facility. The site is located in the very northern extremity of the Borough.

In 2004 planning permission was granted for the demolition of the former Lynx Depot buildings (which form part of the site in question) and for the construction of a new residential development comprising 128 residential units with the retention of part of the land for employment purposes.

#### **1. Overview of proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a part 4 storey, part 3 storey and 2 storey residential buildings to accommodate 43 one and two bedroom flats with the associated car parking and landscaping.

#### **2. Planning History**

HGY/2004/1943 - Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 128 residential units with associated car parking and landscaping and with retention of land for employment purposes amended plans) – Approved 15/12/2005 - Subject to S106/Legal Agreement

HGY/2008/0718 - Amendment to approved scheme HGY/2004/1943 proposing replan for 18 dwellings (Blocks F, E, H and J), parking, access and associated landscaping. – Approved 27/06/2008

HGY/2008/0112 - Erection of new part 4 storey, part 3 storey and 2 storey office buildings (gross floor area 4,400sqm) with ancillary parking and circulation areas. – Refused 31/03/2008

HGY/2008/1484 - Erection of new part 4 storey, part 3 storey and single storey office buildings (gross floor area 3,456sqm) with ancillary parking, secure cycle storage and circulation areas. – Approved 10/09/2008

HGY/2009/0963 - Erection of 4 x four storey new office buildings with 34 parking spaces and screened refuse / recycling bin enclosure - 04/09/2009

### **3. Relevant Planning Policy**

#### National Planning Policy

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS 3: Housing  
PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth  
PPG13: Transport  
PPG17: Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation  
PPG22: Renewable Energy

#### London Plan 2008 (consolidated with Alterations)

Policy 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing  
Policy 3A.2 Borough housing targets  
Policy 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites  
Policy 3A.6 Quality of new housing provision  
Policy 3A.9 Affordable housing targets  
Policy 3A.10 Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes  
Policy 3A.11 Affordable housing thresholds  
Policy 4A.2 Mitigating climate change  
Policy 4A.3 Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 4A.4 Energy assessment  
Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city

#### Adopted Unitary Development Plan, 2006

Policy G1 Environment  
Policy G3 Housing Supply  
Policy UD1 Planning Statement  
Policy UD2 Sustainable Design & Construction  
Policy UD3 General Principles  
Policy UD4 Quality Design  
Policy UD7 Waste Storage  
Policy UD8 Planning Obligations  
Policy ENV11 Contaminated Land  
Policy HSG1 New Housing Development  
Policy HSG4 Affordable Housing  
Policy HSG9 Density Standards  
Policy HSG10 Dwelling Mix  
Policy EMP4 Non Employment Uses  
Policy EMP5 Promoting Employment Uses  
Policy ENV13 Sustainable Waste Management  
Policy M4 Pedestrian and Cyclists  
Policy M5 Protection, Improvement and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes  
Policy M10 Parking for Development

Unitary Development Plan - [Click here](#)

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

Development Control, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 639 High Road, Tottenham, N17 8BD  
[Development.control@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:Development.control@haringey.gov.uk)

SPG1a Design Guidance and Design Statements  
SPD Housing – containing advice on “Privacy/Overlooking Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight”  
SPG5 Safety by Design  
SPG7a Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement  
SPG8c Environmental Performance  
SPG9 Sustainability Statement – Including Checklist  
SPG10a The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations  
SPG10b Affordable Housing  
SPG10c Educational Needs Generated by New Housing

Supplementary Planning Guidance - [Click here](#)

#### Other

Mayor of London ‘London Housing Design Guide’ 2010

Haringey ‘Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Sustainable Design and Construction’

Haringey ‘Open Space and Recreation Standards SPD’

#### **4. Key Issues**

##### Principal of Residential Use

The very first issue in considering an application of this nature is the change of the use of the land from its intended use (B1/B8) and previous use (B8) to residential use. While the application site does not fall within a defined employment area (DEA) the requirement of policy EMP4, which outlines criteria for the change of use of land and buildings currently/ previously in employment generation apply in this case. The policy states that planning permission will be granted to redevelop or change the use of land and buildings in an employment generating use provided:

- a) the land or building is no longer suitable for business or industry use on environmental, amenity and transport grounds in the short, medium and long term; and
- b) there is well documented evidence of an unsuccessful marketing/advertisement campaign, including price sought over a period of normally 18 months in areas outside the DEAs, or 3 years within a DEA; or
- c) the redevelopment or re-use of all employment generating land and premises would retain or increase the number of jobs permanently provided on the site, and result in wider regeneration benefits.

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) recognise that the site is not very accessible and the site is now surrounded by residential use, however as per the policy requirements as outlined above, documentary evidence to show that there is no interest in using this land for employment purposes will need to be submitted as part of a planning application.

In the event that a residential scheme is approved the existing S106 agreement will need to be modified to remove the commitment to the provision of the ‘Commercial Land’ for employment purposes.

### Design, Form & Layout

Policy G2 'Development and Urban Design' and UD4 'Quality Design' states that development should be of high quality design and contribute to the character of the local environment in order to enhance the overall quality, sustainability, attractiveness, and amenity of the built environment. The objectives of the policy are to promote high quality design which is sustainable in terms of form, function and impact, meeting the principles of inclusive design and supporting sustainable development.

Haven visited the site and discussed the proposal with other Officers within the LPA, we recognise that a proposal for this site is essentially the completion of an incomplete element, and therefore matching the form, materials and detailing of the existing scheme represents a practical solution in this case.

Notwithstanding this, and as discussed at our meeting, Officers recognise that there are a number of flaws in the design of the implemented scheme: i.e. the car dominated central court area, the insufficient set back of buildings from the back edge of pavements and lack of soft landscaping. While we recognise that permission was granted in 2008 for office space on this site, the creation of a solely residential scheme introduces additional requirements/ complexities which need to be overcome in order to provide a scheme of good quality design and satisfactory living accommodation.

An accompanying note has been written by the Council's Urban Design Officer which provides further advice on the form and siting of buildings for this site. The LPA can provide further advice on any forthcoming schemes for the site and can arrange for further meetings to discuss such proposals.

### Density, Dwelling Mix & Tenure

The density of the proposed scheme needs to be carefully looked at as the density of the proposed is in excess of the density range for a suburban location of this nature, taking account of its PTAL rating (in this case 1a). The density of the proposed scheme is calculated to be approximately 350 habitable rooms per hectare which is the very upper range limit for a residential scheme in a suburban location with a medium to high level of accessibility.

**table 3A.2 Density matrix (habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare)**

Setting	Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL)		
	0 to 1	2 to 3	4 to 6
<b>Suburban</b>	<b>150 – 200 hr/ha</b>	<b>150 – 250 hr/ha</b>	<b>200 – 350 hr/ha</b>
3.8 – 4.6 hr/unit	35 – 55 u/ha	35 – 65 u/ha	45 – 90 u/ha
3.1 – 3.7 hr/unit	40 – 65 u/ha	40 – 80 u/ha	55 – 115 u/ha
2.7 – 3.0 hr/unit	50 – 75 u/ha	50 – 95 u/ha	70 – 130 u/ha
<b>Urban</b>	<b>150 – 250 hr/ha</b>	<b>200 – 450 hr/ha</b>	<b>200 – 700 hr/ha</b>
3.8 – 4.6 hr/unit	35 – 65 u/ha	45 – 120 u/ha	45 – 185 u/ha
3.1 – 3.7 hr/unit	40 – 80 u/ha	55 – 145 u/ha	55 – 225 u/ha
2.7 – 3.0 hr/unit	50 – 95 u/ha	70 – 170 u/ha	70 – 260 u/ha
<b>Central</b>	<b>150 – 300 hr/ha</b>	<b>300 – 650 hr/ha</b>	<b>650 – 1100 hr/ha</b>
3.8 – 4.6 hr/unit	35 – 80 u/ha	65 – 170 u/ha	140 – 290 u/ha
3.1 – 3.7 hr/unit	40 – 100 u/ha	80 – 210 u/ha	175 – 355 u/ha
2.7 – 3.0 hr/unit	50 – 110 u/ha	100 – 240 u/ha	215 – 405 u/ha

Indicative Average Dwellings Size

Taking the density range of 200 hr/ha as the highest possible for this site and working back from this level, the site at best can only accommodate a scheme with 70 habitable rooms.

Policy HSG10 seeks to ensure a mix of housing types and sizes within developments to meet the range of housing needs in the borough. The recommended mix for private market housing is set out in the Council's 'Housing' SPD and requires a dwelling mix of 37% -1 bedroom units, 30% -2 bedroom units, 22% - 3 bedroom units and 11% 4 bedroom units. The recommended mix for affordable housing development is also set out in the Housing SPD and requires a mix of: 28% for 1 bedroom flats, 20% for 2 bedroom flats, 22% for 3 bedroom flats and 32% for 4 bedroom flats.

On policy grounds and as discussed at our recent meeting a residential scheme for this site should have a higher proportion of family sized units (3 and 4 bed units). The residential units for this site will need to meet the Council's floorspace minima as set out in the Housing SPD and show in the table below.

Figure 8.1: Minimum floor area for residential accommodation

Number of persons	Dwelling size (net internal floor area in sq.m.)						
	1p	2p	3p	4p	5p	6p	7p
Bedrooms	1	1	2	2/3	3	3/4	4
Kitchen / Dining / Living area	20	22	24	27	30	33	36
Main bedroom	8	11	11	11	11	11	11
Other double bedrooms	-	-	-	10	10	10	10
Single bedroom	-	-	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5
Indicative total floor area	32.5	48	60	73	82	90	95

### Affordable Housing

Policy HSG4 states that housing developments capable of providing 10 or more units will be required to include a proportion of affordable housing to meet an overall borough target of 50%. We note that in the preliminary scheme discussed at our meeting 21 of the 43 units are identified to be affordable units.

Given the comments outlined in regards to the layout, density and residential mix the scheme for this site will need to change substantially, which will inevitably affect the viability and provision of affordable housing on site.

As per the consent issued in 2005 for the broader site the LPA are likely to accept a similar proportion of affordable housing (40% of habitable rooms). As discussed at our meeting a very similar level of affordable housing provision was secured in a scheme (LPA Ref: HGY/2008/2196) for a nearby site (Coppetts Wood Hospital site).

### Car Parking & Transportation

At this point we have not formally consulted our Highways & Transportation Team on this scheme other than having an initial discussion with a member of the team. While we accept that the level of car parking provision proposed is very similar to that provided on the Gilson Place scheme, in the interest of achieving a good layout and design, a level of parking provision below 1 per 1 may be considered acceptable in this case. At this same time the LPA recognise that the site has a poor accessibility level and expect a high level of future occupant to be dependent on private cars for journeys to and from the site.

The LPA would require all of the large family size units to have an allocated car parking space. In terms of the smaller units the LPA would be willing to allow a reduced level of car parking for the flatted units (which we can provide further clarification on) subject to a 'car club scheme' being part of the proposal. Secure cycle storage would need to be provided with the scheme (typically 1 per unit). A transport assessment will need to be submitted with such an application.

## Environmental & Sustainability Issues

Policy G1 “Environment”, states that development should contribute towards protecting and enhancing the local and global environment and make efficient use of available resources. The objective of the policy is to facilitate developments which protect and enhance the environment and operate in a sustainable and environmentally friendly manner. The Council will seek to ensure development schemes take into account, where feasible: environmentally friendly materials, water conservation and recycling, sustainable drainage systems, permeable hard surfacing and energy efficient boiler systems.

In line with the requirements of the London Plan, an assessment of the potential contribution of renewable energy technologies for this development will need to be undertaken and an Energy Report submitted with such an application; prepared in line with the London Renewable Toolkit. A sustainability checklist will also need to be completed and submitted as part of the planning application.

## Planning Obligations

In line with Supplementary Planning Guidance 10a planning obligations/contributions will need to be secured arising from the development of this site.

The LPA will seek an educational contribution in connection with this development, which will be calculated inline with SPG 10c ‘Educational Needs Generated by New Housing’. We can provide you with a breakdown/ figure for this once a scheme for submission has been arrived at.

The LPA will also seek a contribution either through S.106 agreement/ S278 agreement for work involving the creation/ upgrading of pedestrian footpaths in the vicinity of the site and towards the cost of works to upgrade the mini-roundabout at the junction of Coppetts Road and Trott Road. The LPA will provide you with further information on this matter very shortly.

Depending on the scheme that comes forward for this site the LPA will provide an indication as to whether an open space and recreation contribution will be required in this case.

## **5. Consultation**

Prior to the submission of a planning application the LPA would advise you to undertake some initial public consultation with local amenity groups (Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Residents Association) and with neighbouring residents. In addition the LPA would advise you to speak to Haringey’s Crime Prevention Officer in developing a scheme for this site.

Any application would undergo normal consultation procedures – a minimum of 21 days for neighbours and other statutory and non-statutory consultee’s. Given the size of the site and the nature of the scheme such a planning application for this site would have to go before the Planning Committee for determination. In such a case the LPA would endeavour to ensure that a formal decision is issued within the statutory 13 week period, however this is contingent on Planning Committee dates.

## **6. Information required for the Planning Application**

The following information will be required for registration of the planning application in respect of this site.

1. Planning Application Form - appropriately filled;
2. A site location plan (scale 1:1250), identifying the application site edged in red and other adjoining land(s) in the ownership of the applicant edged in blue;
3. Planning Statement in support of the application (including evidence to show that the land has been actively marketed for more than 18 months);
4. Design & Access Statement;
5. Fully annotated and scaled (@ 1:100, 200) drawings showing, floor plans, sections elevations of the proposed building as well as drawings showing site sections and relationship with neighbouring buildings;
6. Reduced plans to fit on an A3 size paper or reduced to scale 1:200;
7. Energy Report/ A completed Sustainability Checklist;
8. Transport Assessment.

## **7. List of Relevant Contacts**

Paul Smith – Head of Development Management - Tel: 020-8489 5507

Matthew Gunning – Team Leader/ Principal Planner - 020-8489 5290

Richard Truscot - Urban Design Officer 020 8489 5241

Maurice Richards - Principal Transportation Planner - 020 8489 5575

Mark Davies – Waste Management - 020 8489 5659

Andrew Snape – Crime Prevention Officer - Muswell Hill Police Station, 115 Fortis Green, Muswell Hill, London N2 9HW

Telephone: 020 8340-1212 Facsimile: 020 8345-2190

Direct 020 8345-2164 Metphone: 22164 Metfax: 22190

## **INFORMATIVE**

Whilst this advice is offered in good faith and to best of ability it neither conveys planning permission nor binds the Local Planning Authority to the grant of permission, which will be subject to public consultation and ultimately decided by a relevant Council Committee.



## **APPENDIX A - Urban Design Comments**

### **Summary**

The proposals presented are unacceptable because they fail to relate well to the existing estate in massing and disposition of blocks, fail to improve the poor connections of the estate to public routes, the wider community and local amenities, and do not protect the privacy and amenities of its neighbours.

However it could be modified to provide an acceptable development from an Urban Design point of view if the applicant moved away from the “perimeter block” model to create streets and spaces with a clear hierarchy of front and back, public and private and used a greater variety of urban forms (not necessarily different to those used already in the rest of the estate) to meet needs and policy requirements and provide more satisfactory spaces and buildings.

Provided the principle of residential development is acceptable (which is not an Urban Design consideration), this development presents an opportunity to correct some of the mistakes in the existing housing development. In particular, the lack of connections in the existing estate could be corrected and the public face of the wider estate improved.

### **Location, Site and Planning History**

This pre-application enquiry is for a residential development on a site in the north westernmost corner of the borough, beside Coppetts Road not far from where it meets Pinkham Way, part of the North Circular road. Coppetts Road runs in a North West - South east direction, and the rectangular site faces Coppetts Road on the South West side across a narrow strip of dense trees and shrubs. A single vehicular access to the neighbouring existing housing runs off Coppetts Road along the North West boundary of the site.

The site forms one remaining unbuilt “quarter” of an otherwise completed residential development. The existing housing, to the North West and South West of the site, was built in accordance with previous approvals HGY/2004/1943 granted 15/12/2005 and amended housing layout HGY/2008/0718 granted 27/06/2008. The development forms a distinct estate; the access road runs off Coppetts Road perpendicular direction, then meets a T junction with a parallel road. Housing forms a perimeter block of 4 story blocks of flats North West of the site with communal parking in the middle and a long terrace of three story town houses with garages on the other side of the road to the south west, continuing along the whole of that edge. There is also a pair of two story houses to the immediate south west of the site that back on to the high brick wall that forms the South East boundary of the site. The high brick wall, presumably a survivor of the previous industrial / warehouse use of the wider site, is about 2m high from in the site but lower on the other side.

It was a requirement, secured by condition and Section 106 agreement, in both previous applications for the remainder of the development that the site the subject of this enquiry was to be used for employment uses. Permission was granted, HGY/2008/1484, for office buildings of a similar style and layout to the housing; the blocks being arranged as a perimeter block with parking in the centre. Architectural style would have followed the housing; a variety of different coloured bricks, pitched roofs with heavy expressed curved white fascias to their overhangs, white doors and windows in a simplified classical style which extends to the mini-pediments over entrance doors.

## **Context**

The wider site is at almost the very northern end of Coppetts Road, just before it joins Pinkham Way, the North Circular Road. It fronts on to Coppetts Road behind a broad densely vegetated verge. The opposite side of the narrow and quiet road has a dense hedge at the kerb separating it from a large area of allotments; this gives the road a decidedly pastoral rural feel that is shockingly overturned the moment it bursts out onto the thunderous near-motorway of the North Circular.

To immediate south on Coppetts Road is a short terrace of 4no. 2 story houses. A narrow track or alleyway, which is a right of way, separates the site from these houses; behind the houses the track opens out into an informal parking area with a single story sports pavilion building of a temporary appearance, before ending in a gate to Muswell Hill Sports Ground. This adjoins the entire South Western boundary of the wider site and stretches away to the South West ultimately connecting to Coldfall Wood. Although most of Muswell Hill Sports Ground is laid out for flat sports pitches in a series of terraces, it has recently been augmented with play equipment and considerably more trees and now presents an attractive outlook as well as a tremendous local amenity.

Beyond the Muswell Hill Sports Ground and the band of trees along the north western edge of the site the St Pancras and Islington Cemetery. Apart from its gates at the junction with Coppetts Road and Pinkham Way, north of the wider site, one is hardly aware of the cemetery's presence but it contributes to the openness of the area.

Behind the sports pavilion on the alleyway is a former school site identified in the Sites DPD for development, behind which and also adjoining the south eastern side of the Muswell Hill Sports Ground is a recent housing estate similar in appearance to the housing already built on the site under consideration

## **Compatibility with the existing development**

The existing residential development displays a strong architectural style; it would be best if any new residential development on the site fitted in well with the existing housing on the wider site. It would not normally be a requirement; as far as I am concerned this site could have been developed in a more modern style or in a different style according to the applicants taste, but as this proposed development is essentially the completion of an incomplete development, I would have thought matching form, materials and detailing would be wise.

That is not to say the "perimeter block" development form used in the part of the wider site to the immediate North West is necessarily best followed slavishly. However the 3 to 4 story blocks of flats and 2 story terraced houses form good house type precedents for development of this site as residential. In contrast, I do not consider the car dominated central court area to be a good precedent to follow; such parking as has to be provided as communal would be better arranged broken up, spread out, at the front of blocks and as conventional on-street parking if possible.

I would accept it would be reasonable to match the height of existing blocks across the site roads; the 3 and 4 story blocks, could be matched along the main site road, and 2 story terraces with accommodation within the roof space and private garden along the southern boundary of the site. However if the proximity of the flatted blocks across the access road were matched, the distance between them would be too close and would create problems of overlooking.

It is also notable that despite the “neo-classical” detailing, symmetry and axes have not been consistently exploited as an estate wide organising principle so far. This development does present an opportunity to create a more attractive “entrance” to the “estate” with a broader main access road, wide enough to be tree lined and axial to the middle of the terrace at its end, by simply setting the proposed block a little further away from the existing road and with judicial car parking layout and tree planting. Alternatively, a development that proposed a block at the entrance to the estate of the same set back as the existing blocks would create a “gateway” effect. This could also be an attractive feature, but should open out into an attractive space once through the “gateway”; we would prefer the development to therefore create a communal amenity space; a “square” at the north western corner of their site if this model was chosen.

Overall, though, despite the flaws in the design of the existing site, this proposal will be most successful if it integrates well into the existing estate and becomes seen as seamlessly a part of it.

### **Urban Design - Connectivity**

The existing wider site has been developed as very much an exclusive, distinctive estate consciously separated from the context. It has a single vehicular entrance near the centre of its north eastern edge that also forms the only practical pedestrian entrance. The north eastern edge forms a very attractive pedestrian terrace as the land banks above the road, separated by a steep wooded bank and ditch, but there is no way out in the north east corner. Notwithstanding that, we would expect any successful proposal to follow the principle of maintaining and enhancing the landscaped strip between the housing blocks and Coppetts Road, and to provide an attractive pedestrian route and front doors along that edge.

Improvements to connectivity to the north east would be desirable; it would considerably improve the wider estate if there were steps down to Coppetts Road from the end of the raised terrace at the north eastern corner of the site; this would provide an attractive pedestrian route towards the North Circular and its footbridge just to the west of the Coppetts Road junction. However this is well outside of the current application site.

There is a pedestrian access to the park through the middle of the south western boundary, but it does not connect to paths in the park, is inconveniently sited and does not appear to be well used. No opportunities have been taken to link to the track along the south eastern edge; despite a site access road touching the boundary there is no opening in the high brick wall.

The proposed development provides an excellent opportunity to correct the error of not providing a connection from the wider estate to the track to the south east, which would also provide the best possible, most pedestrian friendly connection from the wider estate to the excellent leisure facilities in the park. However the best possible location for such a connection would not be on the current application site, but closer to the south western corner at the end of the long road in front of the long terrace of 3 story town houses.

### **Urban Design - Neighbourliness**

Any development on this application site will have to be careful not to harm the amenities and privacy of the existing residences to the south east, on the other side of the track. I would suggest a block in the south eastern corner of the application site should drop to no higher eaves level than these houses.

However it should also avoid having windows that overlook the rear windows of these houses. Therefore I would have thought there should be no block close to the south eastern boundary of the application site west of the rear of these houses. As the track is a public right of way, houses or blocks facing onto and opening on to the track might have been possible, but I think the nature of this track is not the same as a public road, more it is like a mews or lane and rear gardens would be a more suitable neighbour.

This reinforces my strong view that the proposal should include terraced housing along most of the south eastern edge of the site, picking up the precedent of the two existing houses built as part of the original development and extending along that side, with a terrace being "completed" with a block of flats at the Coppetts Road end, that turn the corner and close the end of the terrace. This terrace should probably be mostly 2 story but could have accommodation with the roofspace if privacy distances were satisfied. Such properties should have decent private rear gardens which would contribute to meeting the requirement for larger family sized units and would represent the best neighbourly relationship.

Richard Truscott    Design & Conservation Team    Monday, 24 January 2011