

## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Reference No:** HGY/2007/2509

**Ward:** Crouch End

**Date received:** 28/11/2007

**Last amended date:**

**Drawing number of plans:** PL3.01 - PL3.19 incl.

**Address:** Roden Court, 113-115 Hornsey Lane N6 5NL

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of one eight-storey and one ten-storey block fronting onto Hornsey Lane, with one 1 to 5 storey projecting block (western block) and one 4 to 7 storey projecting block (eastern block) at the rear; comprising 71 x 1 bed, 18 x 2 bed, 6 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed units, plus 40 extra care units (a total of 136 units) with basement car parking, cycle parking and associated landscaping.

**Existing Use:** Residential

**Proposed Use:** Residential

**Applicant:** Community Housing Association Ltd

**Ownership:** Private

### PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Retrieved from GIS on 04/12/2007  
Tree Preservation Order Tree Preservation Order Road  
Network: C Road

**Officer contact:** Matthew Gunning

### RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and/or subject to Section 106 Legal Agreement

### SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The subject site is known as Roden Court and is located on the northern side of Hornsey Lane. The existing site is 0.88 hectares in size and consists of 98 studio flats, accommodated within buildings of no more than three storeys in height. The application site initially accommodated two large semi-detached properties (Roden and Copthorne), built in the late 1880s and redeveloped in the 1960s with a low rise residential complex built by the YWCA. This site is presently owned by Community Housing Group (CHG) and is occupied by approximately 50 residents who have secured tenancy.

The buildings on site are set back from the main road and are well screened by mature trees. There are a number of mature trees on site, a number of which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The buildings on site are set in mature landscaped gardens. The character of Hornsey Lane is a well planted with development set back either side of the lane. There is a fairly comprehensive mix of development along Hornsey Lane, including some original Victorian villas and 20th Century flatted development. Buildings on the northern side of Hornsey Lane are quite tall and vary in height. The building to the right of Roden Court, Hilltop House, is a twelve storey 1960s residential block with large grounds to the rear. The site to the left is Ridgeway Gardens, a residential scheme completed in the late 1980s consisting of 44 units, made up of a mix of flats and houses. Ridgeway Gardens consists of two six storey blocks to the front and 2 1/2 storey dwellings running parallel to the east and western boundaries to the rear.

The application site, along with the adjoining sites, slope significantly from their frontage onto Hornsey Lane down towards the wooded embankment of the Parkland Walk to the rear. Parkland Walk is a disused railway line which is classified as Metropolitan Open Land, and which is of important ecological value. The application site lies outside the Crouch End Conservation Area, however the area of Islington opposite this site is within a designated Conservation Area.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

HGY/2005/0831 - Tree works to include: crown reduction by 30% and removal of deadwood to 1 x False Acacia T1, removal of deadwood to 1 x False Acacia T4, pruning back of 1 x Sycamore T2 and removal of two sucker growths to 1 x Sycamore T3.- Approved 23/08/2005.

HGY/1993/1407 - Crown thinning and crown lifting by 30% to one Lime, 1 Oak and 1 Sycamore -

HGY/2007/1723 - Tree works to include reduce and reshape 30%, 10% thin, remove low epicormic to crown break of one x Lime tree and reduce and reshape 30%, 10% thin, remove lvy to main union of one x Sycamore tree - Refused 09/10/2007

HGY/2007/1595 - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of one eight-storey and one ten-storey block fronting onto Hornsey Lane, with one 1 to 5 storey projecting block (western block) and one 5 to 7 storey projecting block (eastern block) at the rear, comprising of 68 x 1 bed, 18 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed units, plus 40 extra care units (a total of 139 units) with basement car parking, cycle parking and associated landscaping – Refused

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

This application is for the demolition of the existing buildings and for the erection of one eight-storey and one ten-storey block fronting onto Hornsey Lane, with one 1 to 5 storey projecting block (western block) and one 4 to 7 storey projecting block (eastern block) at the rear. The proposed development of this site will consist of:

- 40 units allocated to an extra care units;
- 44 private sale flats ranging from one to three bedrooms;
- 4 family homes with private gardens;
- 48 one bedroom flats for re-provision;
- over 40 basement car parking spaces and cycle storage;
- Total of 136 units.

## **CONSULTATION**

Ward Councillors  
Building Control  
Legal Services  
Noise and Pollution  
Policy  
Transport for London  
Environmental Agency  
Metropolitan Police  
Units 1-95 Roden Court  
Flats 1 to 48 (c.) Hilltop House, 117 Hornsey Lane  
Flat 1 to 37 Grafton House 119 Hornsey Lane  
No's 1-44 Ridgeway Gardens  
Flats z1-26 Princess Court, 105 to 107 Hornsey Lane  
1-6 Wychwood End  
Flats 1-12 Sandy Lodge, Avenue Road, N6  
Flats 1 to 7 29 Avenue Road, N6  
Flats 1 to 8 Lorelei House, Avenue Road, N6

No's 35-47 Avenue Road, Avenue Road, N8  
Flats 1-15 Baronsclere Court, Avenue Road, N8  
Flats 1-12 Melisa Court, N6  
Flats 1-15 Margaret Mcmillan House, Hornsey Lane  
Flats 1-21 Caroline Martyn House, Hornsey Lane  
Flats 1-12 Arthur Henderson House, Hornsey Lane  
140, 142 Hornsey Lane, N6

## **RESPONSES**

Building Control – Have checked the compliance for 'Regulations B5 Access for Fire Service' and confirm that it appears unsatisfactory.

Transportation – The highway and transportation authority would not object to this application on the conditions that the applicants make a contribution of £50,000 (Fifty thousand pounds) towards the construction of a raised tables/entry treatment at the site access junction with Hornsey Lane and footway improvement as well as an upgrade to the traffic calming measures on Hornsey Lane.

Recreation Services – Comments from the Officer with responsibility for Nature Conservation are summarised as follows:

- highlights the importance of further survey work as recommended in the ecology report, in particular Bats surveys;
- recommends that the garages to the rear are surveyed for bat roosts;
- expresses concern about the light spill onto Parkland Walk, a Local Nature Reserve;
- encourages the extensive use of green roof and highlights the need to make sure this fully implemented as opposed to being scaled back once under construction;
- encourage the incorporation of swift and bat boxes into the fabric of the new building and would be happy to further advise/ liaise on this;
- and recommends further investigation on the small stream drains from the site into the Local Nature Reserve.

### Crime Prevention Design Adviser

The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Officer have already been consulted on the site boundaries by the Developer and had a meeting and walk round the site with them to consider it further. The Crime Prevention Officer ask that this consultation continues throughout the life of the project so that the project can fully comply with the aims and objectives of the Secured by Design scheme. The Officer makes the following observations:

- The underground car parking will need proper access control to prevent casual use and abuse. A roller-shutter will be used in conjunction with an access control system which appears to be a good solution. The car parking should be well lit, consider using the Park Mark Standards for this.
- Good lighting is an excellent crime prevention tool that has been proven to reduce crime at a fraction of the cost of CCTV and other methods. Consider feature lighting the front of the blocks, especially around the communal entrances and other paths around the site that will see pedestrian use.
- Bollard lights (mentioned on page 10 of the Design and Access Statement) are generally not recommended as they are frequently vandalised and offer poor quality light at head height. It will be a key challenge on this site that the lighting is effective and appropriate for its setting.
- Consider the vehicular access to the site. The general rule in crime prevention is to reduce the number of entrances and exits so that there is greater control over them by the residents. Is the vehicle entrance at the east side of the scheme really needed?
- The types of planting should be carefully chosen to enhance security but not become overgrown in future years to offer cover and concealment for a criminal.

- The communal door security and access control systems are a key security measure on this type of development and it is urged the Developer use a high specification of security at these points.
- The design and planning stage of the development is the ideal opportunity to reduce crime

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority - The Brigade is now satisfied with the proposal.

Islington Council – Have no objection

Thames Water – Have recommended a number of informatives.

Local Residents - Letters of objection have been received from the residents of the following properties and are summarised below (letters in respect of the previous and current scheme):

No's 6, 15, 25, 30, 31, 32, 34, 40, 42, 43 & 44 Ridgeway Gardens  
 Flats 10, 11, 13, 25, 37 Hilltop House – On behalf of the Hilltop House Residents Association (25 signatures)  
 17, 25 (accompanied with a petition for 211 signatures) & 26 Princess Court  
 2 Seymour Court, 29 Avenue Road  
 Flat 5, 31 Avenue Road  
 23 Grafton Hall  
 84 Whitehall Park  
 1, 2, 4, 5 & 6 Wychwood End  
 61 Hornsey Lane Gardens  
 15 Milton Park  
 27B North Hill  
 1 Marbleford Court, 123 Hornsey Lane  
 Flat 18, 125 Hornsey Lane  
 13, 49, 50 & 61 Roden Court

1. The reduction in size is marginal;
2. Overdevelopment/ density of the proposal;
3. The proposal is overwhelming, intimidating, particularly the towers to the front;
4. Development is too high a density and unsuitable for a suburban location;
5. Development out character with the area;
6. Hornsey Lane is already highly developed and congested;
7. Towner blocks will be too high;
8. High rise buildings to the front of the site will serve to add to more confused architectural styles to the area;
9. Wind tunnel effect between buildings;
10. Distance between central courtyard is extremely narrow and will result in the loss of daylight and privacy;
11. Buildings will appear dominant and overbearing;
12. Concern about the sites stability and suitability for high rise development;
13. Impact of structural/ pile foundations on neighbouring buildings;
14. Impact on underground stream which runs through the site;
15. Use of zinc cladding to front elevation would not be in keeping with the character of the area;
16. Contrast of zinc cladding and timber cladding would be overbearing;
17. Inappropriate mix (too many 1 bed units) for an areas characterised by family houses;
18. Flats for families directly beneath flats for single people, is impractical;
19. Placing the extra car accommodation to the rear of the site increased isolation often experienced by elderly people;
20. Passing the entrance/ exit to the underground car park is dangerous for pedestrians and wheel chair users;
21. Community would be too mixed;
22. Lack of amenity space for children;
23. Multi-storey development right through to the rear of the site;

24. Multi-storey mega-blocks will be highly visible from the Parkland Walk, interrupting a currently uninterrupted green space;
25. Peculiar sense of joining the tower block form with lower blocks behind and use of sloping roofs.
26. Insufficient car parking spaces on site;
27. Residents of Roden Court express concern about the large car park/ parking provision given that current residents have very low parking need;
28. Loss of outlook, daylight and privacy (Ridgeway Gardens & Hilltop House);
29. Overlooking from terraces/ balconies to Ridgeway Garden properties;
30. Loss of private gardens – insufficient amenity space;
31. Impact on wildlife;
32. Need for provision of bird and bat boxes;
33. Loss of trees, plants, flowers;
34. Impact on Parkland Walk;
35. Multi-storey blocks will be highly visible from Parkland Walk;
36. Impact on the site's quiet environment;
37. Impact on local environment;
38. The proposal will add to parking pressure and traffic along Hornsey Lane;
39. The underground car park will lead to noise, disturbance and pollution associated with cars entering and leaving;
40. Underground car parking poses a risk for users at all times, particularly at night;
41. Noise from roller blind entrance to car park;
42. Noise from air ventilation to the car park;
43. Such a large development will generate a lot of noise;
44. Potential burglaries to properties on Ridgeway Gardens;
45. Request that the substation be re-sited;
46. Electromagnetic radiation from new substation;
47. Water pressure in the area is frequently compromised;
48. Disruption, noise and dust associated with construction;
49. Noise associated with the family units would affect the extra care and re-provision flats;
50. Impact on underground stream in the site;
51. Subsidence.

Letters of support have been received from the residents of No's 31, 33, 36, 42, 44, 55, 58, 65, 66 & 88 Roden Court, Roden Court Residents Association and the over of 11 Sandy Lodge, Avenue Road and are summarised as follows:

- Flats are in a poor condition and small in size;
- Blocks fit in with neighbouring blocks;
- Need for better quality social housing in this part of the Borough;
- The proposal is imaginative and makes good use of available space whilst being sympathetic to wildlife and the environment;

One resident's of Roden Court, who is in support of the principle of redevelopment, has concern about the size of the 'extra care' block and the impact this will have on light levels and outlook to the re-provision flats. This resident has also expressed concern about the fact that there will be no communal room for the re-provision residents, the principle of separate accesses to the re-provision flats and the family housing units and the loss of the yew tree.

Another resident of Roden Court, who is in support of the principle of redevelopment, has concern about the distance between the re-provision block and the extra care block.

#### *Local Residents Groups*

Highgate Society - Have seen the above revised application, which appears to be little changed in substance from the previous application refused. The main changes appear to be

a minimal reduction in the number of flats from 141 to 136, and, as far as they judge, a slight slimming-down of the size of the blocks of flats and alterations to fenestration, though the visual impact is negligible. In terms of scale, massing, design and visual impact, the application is effectively unchanged. The Society are particularly concerned that there is no reduction in height of the tower blocks which the drawing clearly show will be substantially higher than the tree line, and therefore presumably visible on the skyline along the high and visible Hornsey Lane ridge from a considerable distance and from many viewpoints. They are also disappointing that the built massing of the block continues to take its theme from the tower blocks at Hilltop House and Ridgeway Gardens, rather than from the wider, predominantly lower-scale character of Hornsey Lane.

The Society recognises the need for sheltered housing of this type in the Highgate area and does not necessarily wish to see a substantial reduction in the number of units for its own sake. However, as designed, the development will dramatically change the character of Hornsey Lane, setting a precedent for similar developments in the place of the lower-scale development which predominates.

The Society consider that much more discussion and study is needed to ascertain the most appropriate style of building for this site, and whether, indeed, the density and massing proposed is simply excessive for its location. Highgate Society therefore cannot support the revised application.

Friend of Parkland Walk – The closeness of the west wing of the proposed (7m from the Nature Reserve) although designed to be low will be obtrusively visible from the Nature Reserve, therefore affecting ecology. The spring of water that flows onto Parkland Walk plays a role in the ecology of this part of Nature Reserve and therefore it is important that this source of the flow is known and protected.

Hornsey Lane Association (HLA) – Accept the need to redevelop the site but highlight the need for the new development to fit into its environs. The association object strongly to the scale and intensity of the development and believe that Ridgeway Gardens and Princess Court are of a more appropriate scale. The HLA believe that the massive increase of parking on site will adversely affect traffic conditions on Hornsey Lane and point out that if the development were on the other side of the road no parking provision would be permitted.

#### Other Consultation

Development Control Forum – The scheme which comprised the first application was presented at a Development Control Forum meeting on the 6th September 2007. The minutes of this meeting are attached in Appendix 1.

Design Panel - An initial scheme was presented to the Design Panel on 1st August 2007. Overall the Panel felt that the scheme design was well-considered and that the designer had addressed the development of the site in a positive manner. However some concern was expressed about the change of character of the site that is likely to occur as a result of accommodating a significant increase of dwellings on the site. The panel felt that the site's overall greenness and mature planting, along with the low-level nature of present development results in a pleasant, open character that contributes positively to Hornsey Lane. The panel recommended that any development of this site should be sympathetic to this character.

The panel expressed concern about the height/ bulk of the development, especially in the larger front blocks. They felt that the current arrangement is low level and open in character and that the proposed development represents a significant change to the character of the area. The Panel commented that the designer should not use adjacent development as a guide to the height of the proposed scheme given the intensity of the proposed development. The Panel suggested that alternative building forms should be tested to discover arrangements that result in a less tall and bulky development. One suggestion was exploring the idea of excavation of the site to drop the height. Another suggestion was to revisit the

front section and to look at the possibility of bridging between those blocks to transfer some of their volume into a gateway form.

Pre-Application Consultation - A 'Statement of Community Consultation' was submitted with this application and outlines some of the pre-application consultation measures taken by the applicant's – Community Housing Group (CHG). The following meetings have been held by CHG:

- Short-hold tenants informed of the situation and options available; by letter (13/03/06);
- Meeting with all Roden Court; Roden Court common room (RCCR) (5/04/06)
- Meeting assured and secured long-term tenants, RCCR (20/09/06);
- Short-hold tenants offered potential shared house accommodation within Community Housing Group; by letter (6/11/06);
- Short-hold tenants offered surgery times to use facilities in the office at Roden Court to assist their search; by letter (29/03/07);
- Roden Court assured and secured long-term tenants; RCCR (22/05/07);
- Haringey Council members; London Borough of Haringey Town Hall (23/05/07);
- Public drop-in session; Highgate Library (30/05/07);
- 1st Drop-In Session with Roden Court Residents; RCCR (12/09/07)
- Residents visit to other PTEa's development to see similar features actually built, PTEa' office, Islington (19/06/07);
- Lynne Featherstone, Member of Parliament Crouch End and Wood Green; House of Commons (20/07/06);
- Environment Committee, Highgate Society; Highgate Society Headquarters (23/06/07)
- Ridgeway Gardens and Hilltop House residents; Coleridge Primary School (27/06/07);
- Hornsey Lane Association, Dialogue's office (9/07/07);
- Formal presentation of final plans to Roden Court residents; RCCR (11/07/07).

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### National Planning Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing

Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport

Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy

### The London Plan - 2004

Policy 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing

Policy 3A.2 Borough housing targets

Policy 3A.3 Efficient use of stock

Policy 3A.4 Housing choice

Policy 3A.5 Large residential developments

Policy 3A.8 Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes

Policy 3A.10 Special needs and specialist housing

Policy 4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites

Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment

Policy 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 4B.7 Respect local context and communities

Policy 4B.9 Large-scale buildings – design and impact

Policy 4C.8 Sustainable drainage

Policy 4C.21 Design statements

Policy 6A.4 Priorities in planning obligations

Policy 6A.5 Planning obligations

Supplementary Planning Guidance (Mayor of London)

Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2006)  
Housing (November 2005)  
Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (April 2004)

Adopted Unitary Development Plan, 2006

Policy G1 Environment  
Policy G2: Development and Urban Design  
Policy G3 Housing Supply  
Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction  
Policy UD3 General Principles  
Policy UD4 Quality Design  
Policy UD7 Waste Storage  
Policy UD8 Planning Obligations  
Policy UD9 Location for Tall Buildings  
Policy ENV2 Surface Water Runoff  
Policy ENV3 Water Conservation  
Policy ENV5 Works Affecting Water Courses  
Policy ENV6 Noise Pollution  
Policy ENV7 Air, Water and Light Pollution  
Policy ENV9 Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency  
Policy ENV10 Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy  
Policy ENV11 Contaminated Land  
Policy ENV13 Sustainable Waste Management  
Policy HSG1 New Housing Development  
Policy HSG4 Affordable Housing  
Policy HSG5 Hostel Accommodation  
Policy HSG7 Housing for Special Needs  
Policy HSG9 Density Standards  
Policy HSG10 Dwelling Mix  
Policy M2 Public Transport Network  
Policy M3 New Development Location and Accessibility  
Policy M4 Pedestrian and Cyclists  
Policy M5 Protection, Improvement and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes  
Policy M10 Parking for Development  
Policy OS2 Metropolitan Open Land  
Policy OS6 Ecologically valuable sites and their corridors  
Policy OS11 Biodiversity  
Policy OS15 Open space deficiency and development  
Policy OS17 Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a Design Guidance and Design Statements  
SPG3a Density, Dwelling Mix, Floor space Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes  
SPG3b Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight  
SPG3c Backlands Development  
SPG4 Access for All – Mobility Standards  
SPG5 Safety by Design  
SPG7a Parking Standards  
SPG7b Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement  
SPG7b Travel Plans  
SPG7c Travel Assessment  
SPG8a Waste and Recycling  
SPG8b Materials  
SPG8c Environmental Performance



SPG8d Biodiversity, Landscaping and Trees  
SPG8e Light Pollution  
SPG8f Land Contamination  
SPG8g Ecological Impact Assessment  
SPG9 Sustainability Statement  
SPG10a The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations  
SPG10c Education needs generated by new housing

#### Other

CABE/English Heritage document "Guidance on Tall Buildings,"

### **ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

This application follows on from a recent refusal (LPA Ref: HGY/2007/1595) which was for a similar development of 40 extra care units and 99 residential units. The reasons for refusal are summarised below and are addressed within this report.

- The development owing to its bulk and mass would result in an overly dominant building form which would not relate successfully to the size of the site, to adjacent buildings;
- The combination of the height and width of the two blocks at the front of the site, and the proximity of one of the blocks to the eastern boundary of the site, would lead to the development having a cramped appearance within the site;
- The proposed development owing to its proximity to Hilltop House and presence of habitable to habitable facing windows within 10 metres of each other would lead to overlooking/ loss or privacy;
- The height and mass of the rear projecting eastern wing would have an overbearing, dominant impact and would give rise to excessive overlooking/ loss of privacy;
- The architectural quality of the proposed buildings, in particular the treatment and choice of facing materials and the arrangement of fenestration to the front elevations, would be unsympathetic to the material qualities of surrounding area.

The main issues with this application are the same as those considered before, namely, the (1) the principal of extra care/ additional residential use on site, (2) the design, built form and layout of the proposed development, and how it differs from previous scheme, (3) transport implications, including public transport accessibility, traffic generations, levels of car parking/ cycle provision (4) impact on adjoining residential properties, (5) sustainability and environmental issues and (6) planning contributions.

## **1 EXTRA CARE/ ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL USE**

### Extra Care

The proposal is for 40 extra care units (15 one bed and 25 two bed units). This extra care facility will have associated communal facilities. Extra care accommodation promotes independent living while providing a level of support and intermediate health and social care for people who are frail due to old age or who have significant disabilities. It is normal that other health and social care services visit such facilities for consultation and treatments.

In a joint study carried out by the Council's Director of Social Services and Director of Housing it was revealed that 322 units of extra care housing area needed in the Borough to meet current needs and 416 will be needed by 2013. The Borough currently only has 60 such units of extra care housing. The provision of extra care housing has been identified as a priority in the Borough's 'Supporting People Strategy 2005-2010' (agreed in March 2005). The provision of such accommodation is strongly welcomed and accords with Policy HSG1 'New Housing Development' and Policy HSG7 'Housing for Special Needs' of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

### Residential Density

This residential site encompasses an area of 0.88 hectares and the proposed residential scheme will have a habitable room density of 375 habitable rooms per hectares (HRH). The Adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) states that residential development in the borough as a general guideline should be in the density range of 200- 400 habitable rooms per hectares.

In terms of the London Plan (2004), the plan categorises density ranges in terms of location, setting, existing building form and massing. Based on the density matrix within the plan the site is considered to be within an urban area where flats are the predominant housing type a density of 300-450 HRH would therefore be acceptable for this site. The proposed residential density is therefore considered to be acceptable and to be in keeping with both the density standards of the adopted UDP and the London Plan. However, density will not override the other main planning consideration mentioned below.

### Residential Mix

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 SPG3a and requires a dwelling mix of 37% 1 bedroom units, 30% 2 bedroom units, 22% 3 bedroom units and 11% 4 bedroom units. The 43 private units will be provided in the upper floors of the tall blocks to the front of the site.

The residents mix for the private sale units equates to 52% 1 bed, 41% 2 bed and 7% 3 bed. On policy grounds the proposal should have a higher proportion of larger units (3 and 4 bed units). However in this case given the nature of this application (i.e. the larger element of re-provision and the extra care facility), the constraints of the site and difficulty of providing family sizes units in tall blocks, it is accepted that there is limited potential to provide for more larger family units within the private sale units.

The recommended mix for affordable housing development is also set out in SPG3a and requires a mix of: 28% 1 bed, 20% 2 bed, 22% 3 bed flats and 32% 4 bed. The residents mix for the affordable housing units equates to 68% 1 bed, 27% 2 bed, 3% 3 bed and 1% 4 bed units. Given that there is a large element of re-provision on the site and the proposed extra care accommodation the possibility of providing a larger number of affordable family housing units is also considered to be limited. Eight large family apartments will be provided in the lowest two floors of the eastern block. Some of these units will open out onto private gardens while some will have large private balconies.

### Affordable Housing

In line with Planning Policy Guidance Note 3, Government Circular 06/98, policies 3A.7 and 3A.8 of the Adopted London Plan and the Council's UDP policies a proportion of affordable housing is required to be provided on site to meet the borough target of 50%. The London Plan seeks to achieve a range of types of affordable housing and an appropriate balance between social and intermediate housing, to meet a London wide objective of 50% social housing and 50% intermediate housing.

In this case the affordable housing contribution has been calculated on the basis of the number of habitable rooms provided in the scheme. Based on the number of habitable rooms provided policy HSG4 would require 65 habitable rooms to be affordable. The proposed 4 family social rent units will provide 17 habitable rooms of affordable housing. When account is taken of the number of habitable rooms provided in the extra care facility (104) the proposed scheme demonstrates a high level of affordable housing provision. The proposed development does not provide a percentage of intermediate units (shared ownership). However given the high element of affordable housing being provided on site (the re-provision for existing residents, the extra care facility and family units) and the strong need for social rented accommodation in the west of the borough, the proposal is considered to be an acceptable balance and is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of policy HSG4 and SPG 10b 'Affordable Housing'.

## 2 DESIGN, BUILT FORM & LAYOUT

### Siting and Design

The proposed development will consist of two towers to the front of the site with projecting wings to the rear which reduce in height. The block closest to Ridgeway Gardens will be 8 storeys in height (25.5 metres) and will marginally exceed (by 1 metre) the height of Ridgeway Gardens. The other block will be 10 storeys in height and will not be higher than the neighbouring tower block (Hilltop House: a 12 storey block). Policy UD9 of the UDP states that applications for tall buildings will be assessed against the following criteria (a) high design quality; (b) acceptable relationship to surroundings; (c) appropriate site size and setting; (d) wind turbulence and overshadowing; and (e) impact on historic environment. Policies 4B.8 and 4B.9 of the London Plan encourages the principle of the 'compact city' and places particular emphasis on design quality and the location of tall buildings.

The tower blocks will sit slightly forward of the existing buildings on the site and will result in the loss of some mature trees; namely a sycamore tree, a group of Cypresses and a Rowan. The front block closest to Ridgeway Gardens will sit 12 metres away from this flank wall of this neighbouring block. There are no habitable windows on the side elevation of Ridgeway Gardens. The other block closest to Hilltop House, will be 10 metres away from the side of this neighbouring block.

The profile of the two front towers have been changed from the previous scheme to produce more slim line blocks with slimmer front elevations. This change has reduced the bulk and mass of the proposed buildings and will help to ensure adequate opportunities for glimpse views into the site. In terms of maximum height there has been no change in the overall height/ number of floors to the proposed blocks. The top of the towers will have penthouse floors, which will be set back from the front, side and rear elevations of the main bulk of the towers. The design of these floors will help reduce the overall height of these blocks and will give them a distinctive roof profile.

As already pointed out there is a number of high buildings along this side of the Hornsey Road, with tall buildings located to either side of (Hilltop House: a 12 storey block and Ridgeway Gardens: two 6 storey blocks). The western most block will be of comparable height to the nearest block in Ridgeway Gardens, while the eastern block will site below Hilltop House. In terms of height there will be a gradual stepping-up from the existing 6 storeys in Ridgeway Gardens through to the proposed 8 and 10 storeys to the existing 12 storeys of Hilltop House; however bearing in mind existing site levels this transition in height is not very noticeable. Computer-generated images have been prepared and submitted with this application to show the impact of the proposal in its local context (both near and further way).

The front elevation of the front towers are well articulated to break down their overall bulk and to give them a distinctive appearance both in short and long views. Bearing in mind the topography of the site, its context with Hilltop House and Ridgeway Gardens, the set back from the street and the number of mature trees/ screening to the front of the site, it is considered that the proposal will not adversely the streetscale, skyline/ panoramas and character of the area. Overall the quality of the towers design is considered to be acceptable and meets the requirements of policy UD9 and design policy UD4. The effect on the proposed blocks in terms of loss of daylight/ sunlight and overlooking are considered in more detail further on in this report.

The western rear wing will project 92 metres into the site and will be 8 metres away from the rear boundary with Parkland Walk at the closest point. This western block will step down in scale from the front of the site eventually to a single storey at the back with Parklands Walk; in order to address privacy/ overlooking issues with the properties in Ridgeway Gardens. The existing 2 ½ storey family dwellings which are built parallel to the western boundary of the site are elevated approximately one storey in relation to the Roden Court site. In order to maintain appropriate window to window distances the proposed 4<sup>th</sup> storey to this wing will be set in and

will have no habitable windows facing towards Ridgeway Gardens. There will be no balconies of the side of the building facing towards these properties in Ridgeway Gardens.

This projecting western block will accommodate the extra care facility. These units will be accessed via an entrance courtyard located along the western access road (beyond the entrance point to the basement car park). There will be approximately 3 car parking spaces including parking for deliveries provided near the entrance to the extra-care facility.

The eastern block and projecting wing will project 53 metres into the site and will terminate close to an oak tree. The rear section of this block will step down to 4 storeys. The height of this wing has been reduced from the previous scheme of 5 storeys to 4 storeys to address the overlooking/ loss of privacy and overbearing impact, noted in the reason for refusal in the previous scheme.

This part of the development will sit in a similar footprint to an existing three storey blocks of Roden Court. However, the new building will sit closer to the eastern boundary. The outer most point of the front tower will be 4 metres away from the boundary with Hilltop House, in comparison to the existing three storey building which is 8 metres away from the boundary. This eastern block which will sit opposite the western elevation of Hilltop House will have habitable windows which will be within 10 metres of habitable windows along the side of Hilltop House. Although this distance is generally inadequate, it is noted the windows to side of Hilltop House are secondary. The windows on the side elevation of the proposed eastern block will be obscure glazed.

A shared internal courtyard will be created between the proposed western and eastern blocks which will allow for views to the back of the site. The width of the courtyard area will vary because of the curved nature of the eastern and western blocks. At its closest point the gap between the blocks will be 15 metres and at its widest point it will be 20 metres. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) accept that normal privacy standards (i.e. 20 metre for two-storey development, with 10 metres for each additional floor) are only generally applied to buildings on adjoining sites as opposed to the layout of a new high density residential scheme which form part of the same building complex/ community. On balance the distance between these facing blocks is considered to be acceptable.

### Materials

A comprehensive palette of materials, including render panels, timber cladding, blockwork masonry will be used. The front tall blocks will have a masonry base with a combination of metal cladding and glazing at the upper floors. There will be a series of balconies along the front elevation of both front blocks. More glazing and more balconies will be created along the front elevations of the proposed blocks in comparison to the previous scheme. These changes, coupled with the visualisation of the appearance of these blocks through Computer Generated Images (CGIs) as submitted with the application, have addressed the Council concerns about the elevation in respect of the previous scheme; which were seen to be 'heavy and impermeable structures'.

The elevations of the rear projecting section of the proposed development will consist of render panels, divided by windows and balcony slots. The sections of the proposed development located closest to Parkland Walk will incorporate more timber cladding.

The flat roof of the projecting wings will have green roofs, planted with sedum, therefore providing a pleasant aspect for the occupiers of the two front towers and to neighbouring occupiers.

### Internal Layout/ Access

The proposed residential units will comply with Housing Corporation standards and the Council's standards as set out in SPG3a. The extra care scheme will be fully wheelchair accessible, therefore representing an overall provision of 30% wheelchair accessible units on site.

### Amenity Space

All of the private sale apartments and re-provision flats will have balconies. The large family apartment located in the lower ground floor of the eastern block will have private gardens. These private gardens will just meet the minimum amenity space standard of 50 sqm (as set out in SP3a). The extra care units and the 48 re-provision units will have access to the rear garden area (over 1,400 sqm in size) located next to Parkland Walk. All the residents of the new Roden Court will be able to use the central courtyard space.

## **3 TRANSPORT AND PARKING**

In accordance with the requirements of SPG7c a Transport Assessment has been prepared by ADL Traffic Engineering. The Traffic Assessment provides an assessment of the likely traffic generation associated with the proposed development, an assessment of the impact of the development on the local road network and an assessment of the accessibility of the site.

### Public Transport Accessibility

The application site is situated close to the W5 bus route on Hornsey Lane/Stanhope Road which offers some 10 buses per hour (two-way) for bus connections to Archway Road tube station. The site is also within a short walking distance of Archway Road, providing some 56 buses per hour (two-way) for bus connections to Archway Road and East Finchley tube stations. It is therefore considered that a high proportion of residents of this development would use public transport.

### Vehicle Accesses and Parking:

The two existing access points to the site will be retained. The western access will operate as the main access with the eastern access acting as a 'hammerhead' turning facility for refuse trucks. It is proposed to provide 45 basement car parking spaces plus 3 surface car parking spaces for the extra care facility. The basement car park and car parking spaces will be accessed via the access route which runs along the western boundary of the site. This access route is already in existence and provided access for the 24 lock-up garages located to the back of the site.

It is noted that the level of car ownership with the existing resident community is very low. It is also noted that this site is not identified within the current UDP as renowned for car parking pressure. The Council's Transportation Officer is satisfied with the level of car parking provision proposed.

As noted above the Council's Transportation Officer will require the proposed western access junction with Hornsey Lane to be upgraded to include a raised table and some traffic calming measures to be implemented, so as to mitigate against possible dangers to pedestrians/ road users. The applicant's have confirmed that the eastern access will not be used except for refuse and emergency vehicle access only, along with pedestrian and cyclists. This will be achieved by restricting access by way of telescopic bollards which will be operated by the concierge of the building. These bollards will be located 10 metres back from Hornsey Lane, therefore allowing for refuse vehicles to pull up and wait for access to the site. This arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

### Traffic Generation

In terms of traffic generation the Council's Transportation Officer accepts ADL's forecast that a development of this magnitude (9145sq.m gross floor area) will generate some 50 and 51 vehicles (two-way) in the morning and evening peak (0800-0900 and 1700-1800 hours respectively) and that this traffic flow prediction will only amount to an increase of 27 and 17 vehicles (two-way) in the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

It is therefore deemed that with this low level of projected increase in vehicular trips to and from this site, together with the restricted car parking provision the traffic impact of this development proposal on the adjoining roads will not be significant.

#### Walking/ Cycling

There are pedestrian footways on both sides of Hornsey Lane with the northern footway providing pedestrian linkage to this site. There are a number of traffic calming measures along Hornsey Lane to slow vehicles and to safeguard pedestrians and cyclists. As noted by the Council's Transportation Officer the pedestrians would benefit from upgraded improved footways within the vicinity of the site which would encompass the removal of the concrete bollards on the footway abutting south of Hornsey Lane. These improvements would be sought through a Section 106 agreement.

In terms of cycle provision the applicants proposed to provide 45 cycle racks. This is considered to be acceptable however the Council will require that 6 cycle racks be provided near the entrance to the extra care facility. It is envisaged that the proportion of people cycling will increase, in time, with the enhanced cycle provision proposed with this development.

#### **4 IMPACTS ON LOCAL RESIDENTIAL AMENITY/ ADJOINING CONSERVATION AREA**

##### Daylight and Sunlight Issues

A daylight and sunlight study was prepared and submitted with this application to assess the likely impact of the proposed development on the nearest neighbouring residential properties. The report has been carried out in accordance with BRE Report 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight' 1991, the standard identified by Haringey's Unitary Development Plan. This Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF) have been used in this analysis.

The VSC is a measure of the amount of light available to any window and depends upon the amount of unobstructed sky that can be seen from the centre of a window under consideration. The amount of visible sky and consequently the amount of available skylight is assessed by calculating what is called the vertical sky component at the centre of the window. The BRE guide advises that non-habitable rooms need not be analysed for VSC.

The ADF method uses a mathematical formula, involving values for the transparency of the glass, the net glazed area of the window, the total area of room surfaces, their colour reflectance and the angle of visible sky measured from the centre of the window. This is a method that measures the general illumination from skylight and takes into account the size and number of windows and size of rooms.

The study specifically considers the nearest residential properties in Ridgeway Gardens and Hilltop House. In terms of the properties in Ridgeway Gardens these properties are fully compliant with BRE Guidelines meeting both the VSC and ADF criteria.

In terms of Hilltop House the report states that the majority of the windows on the side elevation of this building are dual aspect living rooms and therefore VSC has not been applied. In this case the ADF methodology is considered more appropriate as it gives a value to the quantity of light throughout the room taking into account other windows. Based on this approach the consultants consider that all rooms within this property meet BRE criteria.

A sunlight analysis has been undertaken calculating annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) for the main windows of rooms which face 90 degree of due south. The BRE guidelines propose that the appropriate date for undertaking a sunlight assessment is on 21st March, being the spring equinox. Calculations of both summer and winter availability are made with winter analysis covering the period from 21st September to 21st March. For residential

accommodation, the main requirements for sunlight are in living rooms and are regarded as less important in bedrooms and kitchens.

The BRE states a window may be adversely affected if the APSH received at a point on the window is less than 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours including at least a 5% of the annual probable sunlight hours during the winter months and the percentage reduction of APSH is 20% or more.

The consultants deduct that some of the windows on the western elevation are kitchen windows and therefore that the APSH levels to these rooms is considered to be less important. Overall it can be deducted that the proposed development will still retain good daylighting and sunlighting levels to the surrounding residential properties and that the proposal would be in accordance with the requirement of SPG3b 'Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight'.

#### Overlooking/ Privacy

The distance between the western block and the properties in Ridgeway Gardens is considered to be acceptable given that there is already an existing three storey building in a similar position and given the further stepping in of the fourth floor. As noted above the nearby 2 ½ storey family dwellings in Ridgeway Gardens are elevated approximately one storey in relation to the Roden Court site. The proposed development will meet the appropriate window to window distances with these properties on Ridgeway Gardens therefore ensuring that it will not adversely affect

As noted above the eastern block which will sit opposite the western elevation of Hilltop House will have habitable windows (bedroom/ Kitchen windows) which will be within 10 metres of each other. This distance is generally inadequate but as noted these windows on the side of Hilltop House are secondary. The windows on the side elevation of this eastern block will be obscure glazed.

The height and mass of the rear projecting eastern wing has been reduced by one storey from previous scheme and on balance will not an overbearing, dominant or detrimental impact on the residential amenities to the occupiers of Hilltop House. There is also a high degree of screening along the eastern boundary to minimise/ overlooking to the residents of Hilltop House.

#### Noise

Bearing in mind that there is an existing access road next to the western boundary of the site, which provides access to 24 lock up garages to the rear of the site, as well as the screening along this boundary it is considered that the siting of the access to the basement car park and the associated noise with the entry/ exit of cars will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. The basement car park will sit partly at lower ground level and will therefore be partly externally exposed and as such would not require mechanical ventilation.

#### Impact on adjoining Conservation Area

The proposed development will not impact the setting/ views of the conservation area opposite this site, as the proposed development is well set back from Hornsey Lane and is screened by mature trees. The proposed tall buildings to the front of the site will not interfere with strategic views as identified in policy UD5 of the UDP (views of St Paul's Cathedral and the City from Alexandra Palace).

## 5 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES, SUSTAINABILITY & RENEWABLE ENERGY

### Tree Protection

The site is populated with many trees of various species, which are predominantly located around the boundaries, the most significant of which are subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's). Of particular importance are the trees along the frontage with Hornsey Lane which include Beech and Cedar, and those along the eastern and western boundaries which help to screen the site. Towards the rear of the site is a significant Oak (T21). There are also significant trees located in the adjacent property along the eastern boundary. It is proposed to retain the majority of the trees on site.

The foundations for the eastern block would encroach into the recommended Root Protection Area (RPA) of T21; however this area of encroachment is less than 10% of the total RPA. The Arboricultural implication study has proposed a pile and ground beam design and method of installation (using an Air-spade) to minimise disturbance in the RPA. This Council's Arboricultural Officer recommends that this design and method of installation be confirmed and secured by way of a condition.

It is proposed to install a new roadway turning hammerhead which would encroach into the RPA for T53; a beech tree. In respect of the previous scheme the Council's Arboricultural Officer raised concern in regards to the siting of this turning area and possible encroachment into the RPA. The applicant's Arboriculturalist has confirmed that this will be constructed using a 'no dig' form method. It is noted that T33 may require removal to facilitate the new road layout. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has no objection to this, as the tree is of lesser value and its loss would not have such a detrimental impact on the site as a whole.

A number of trees are specified for removal to facilitate the new buildings; these include a Weeping willow (T31) a Yew (T32), a Sycamore (T56) and a group of Cypresses (T55/55a) as well as a Rowan (T52). The Council's Arboricultural Officer points out that T31 and T32 are barely visible from outside of the site and therefore do not merit the protection of TPO's and that T56 is/has a potentially hazardous structural defects and that T52 & T55 are of little amenity value.

### Ecology/ Impact on Parkland Walk

As pointed out the application site backs on to Parkland Walk, a disused railway line which is classified as Metropolitan Open Land and a Local Nature Reserve. A Phase One Habitat survey (undertaken in October 2006) has been submitted with this application, in line with the requirements of Policy OS6. This report states that no evidence of bats were found during the survey and concludes that the site has a low biodiversity value. The Council's Nature Conservation Officer has assessed this report and has made the following observations:

- highlights the importance of further survey work as recommended in the ecology report, in particular Bats surveys;
- recommends that the garages to the rear are surveyed for bat roosts;
- expresses concern about the light spill onto Parkland Walk, a Local Nature Reserve;
- encourages the extensive use of green roof and highlights the need to make sure this 'green measure' is fully implemented as opposed to being scaled back once under construction;
- encourage the incorporation of swift and bat boxes into the fabric of the new building and would be happy to further advise/ liaise on this;
- recommends further investigation on the small stream which drains from the site into the Local Nature Reserve.

Overall it is accepted that the scheme has been well designed to minimise the loss of habitats, in particular through the retention of a high number of trees on site and the retention of a large rear garden area. It is also acknowledged that the site would provide a degree of ecological enhancement, namely through the creation of green roofs. Subject to the



appropriate landscaping and the careful siting of external lighting it is considered that the proposal will not adversely affect the nature reserve/ecological value of Parkland Walk.

### Sustainability

In accordance with the requirement of SPG9 a 'Sustainability Statement and Checklist' has been submitted with this application. The proposals scores high on the Council's sustainability checklist as the scheme incorporates a number of sustainable measures: namely by:

- Being a brownfield development;
- Accessible by public transport;
- Use of green roof which will reduce heat gains and losses, reduce surface water run off and reduce building maintenance, in addition to providing an ecological habitat;
- Including an energy assessment and use of renewable energy technologies;
- Providing double glazed windows;
- Provides new accommodation of significantly better thermal performance to the existing accommodation.

### Use of Renewable Energy

In accordance with the requirements of the London Plan, an assessment of the potential contribution of renewable energy technologies for this development was undertaken. In line with the London Renewable Toolkit, published by the GLA, A list of potential renewable technologies were considered, namely: wind, photovoltaics, Solar Hot Water Systems, Biomass Heating, Biomass Combined Heat and Power, Ground Sourced Heating and Ground Sourced Cooling.

The use of ground source heating and cooling via heat pump technology has been identified on commercial and technical grounds as the most effective solution for meeting the 10% renewable energy requirement. Ground source heat pumps from bore holes submerged beneath the building during construction will provide heating and cooling for the proposed development. The calculations submitted in the assessment indicates that this technology could satisfy approximately 80% of annual heating demand.

### Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

A screening opinion has been submitted and the LPA has determined that an EIA is not required.

## **6. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/ SECTION 106**

Under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, the terms of Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, and in line with Policy UD8 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 10a 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will seek financial contributions towards a range of associated improvements immediately outside the boundary of the site.

### Highway Improvements

A contribution of £50,000 is being sought for the construction of a raised tables/entry treatment at the site access junction with Hornsey Lane and for other the construction of a raised tables/entry treatment at the site access junction with Hornsey Lane as well as an upgrade to the traffic calming measures on Hornsey Lane to improve the conditions for pedestrians and cyclists at this location.

### Education Contribution

In line with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing', it is appropriate for Local Planning Authorities to seek a financial contribution towards the cost associated with the provision of facilities and services arising from additional demand generated for school places. The education contribution associated with this development (applied only to the new family housing units and private sale residential units) is calculated to amount to £140,000.00).

The Local Planning Authority recognises the high level of affordable housing provided in the overall redevelopment scheme for this site. On a habitable room basis the scheme has a higher provision of affordable housing to that required under current affordable housing policy. As pointed out by the applicants' the provision of a large extra care facility and the reprovision of existing residents' bedsits to one bedroom units requires significant cross funding. Given the extraordinary costs associated with the provision of the Council sponsored Extra Care facility and the reprovision units the Local Planning Authority accept that there should be a degree of flexibility in the calculation of the education contribution.

As noted in SPG10c the requirement for education contributions does not necessarily mean that the Council will seek a contribution for every housing application involving the provision of affordable housing. As also stated in this SPG "each application will be considered on its merits on a case by case basis". The Local Planning Authority therefore accept a contribution of £100,000.00 to be a reasonable compromise.

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The proposed development will involve a comprehensive redevelopment of this site to provide a mixed tenure residential scheme. The proposal will deliver a significant amount of high-quality affordable housing and market housing which will make a positive contribution to the Borough's housing supply. The density of the proposed scheme is compatible with recommended density standards and the principle of two high blocks to the front of the site is considered acceptable as the precedent for tall buildings is well established on this side of Hornsey Lane and the proposal continues this pattern of development. The scheme has been designed sensitively to the sites sloping topography, its relationship with neighbouring properties and in particular to achieve an acceptable relationship with the adjoining Metropolitan Open Land/ Ecological Corridor to the back of the site. The proposal will not give rise to significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers or adversely affect local residential amenities.

It is considered that the applicant have appropriately responded to the concerns raised in respect of the previous scheme. The blocks to the front of the site have been slimmed down and their detailing partly changed. A storey has been removed from the eastern projecting wing.

Having considered the proposal against the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance and taking into account other material considerations, Officers consider the proposed development to be acceptable and that planning permission should be granted subject to an appropriate Section 106 Agreement being entered into and suitable planning conditions being imposed.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT PERMISSION – Subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement

Registered No. HGY/2007/2509

Applicant's drawing No.(s) PL3.01 - PL3.19 incl.

Subject to the following condition(s)

## **RECOMMENDATION 1**

The Sub-Committee is recommended to RESOLVE as follows: (1) That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2007/2509, subject to a pre-condition that the owners of the application site shall first have entered into an Agreement or Agreements with the Council under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) and Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 in order to secure:

- (1.1) A contribution of £100,000.00 towards educational facilities within the Borough (£50,000.00 for primary and £50,000.00 for secondary) according to the formula set out in Policy UD10 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 10c of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan July 2006.
- (1.2) A contribution of £50,000.00 towards a range of highway and public realm improvements within the immediate vicinity.
- (1.3) The identified 3 x 3 bed units and 1 x 4 bed units to be provided as affordable housing; (denoted as accommodation type B: as shown on Drawing No: PL3.02) and retained in perpetuity as social rented affordable housing within the definition contained in the London Plan.
- (1.4) The identified 48 x 1 bed re-provision units (denoted as accommodation type B: as shown on Drawing No: PL3.02). shall in the first instance be provided for returning existing residents and thereafter retained in perpetuity as social rented affordable housing within the definition contained in the London Plan.
- (1.5) Plus recovery costs / administration / monitoring which equates to £7,500.00. This gives a total amount for the contribution of £157,500.00.

## **RECOMMENDATION 2**

That in the absence of the Agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed by 26<sup>th</sup> February 2008, planning application reference number HGY/2007/2509 shall be refused for the following reason:

In the absence of a formal undertaking to secure a Section 106 Agreement for appropriate contribution towards education facilities and contributions towards improvements to the site's access junction with Hornsey Lane and upgrade to the traffic calming measures on Hornsey Lane, the proposal is contrary to Policy UD10 'Planning Obligations' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10a 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' and SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development'.

## **RECOMMENDATION 3**

In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (4) above, the Assistant Director (PEPP) (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:

- (i) there has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and

(ii) the further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director (PEPP) within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and

(iii) the relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4**

That following completion of the Agreement referred to in (1) above, planning permission be GRANTED in accordance with planning application no HGY/2007/2509 and Applicant's drawing PL3.01 - PL3.19 incl.subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

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

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority. These should include details of external treatment to the existing rendered walls on the north-western elevation.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. That details of all levels on the site in relation to the surrounding area be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that any works in conjunction with the permission hereby granted respects the height of adjacent properties through suitable levels on the sit

5. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the front of the application site with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the completion of the development; such landscaping shall be implemented within 6 months of the completion of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory setting for the proposed development and in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

6. Details of a scheme depicting those areas to be treated by means of hard landscaping shall be submitted to, approved in writing by, and implemented in accordance with the approved details. Such a scheme to include a detailed drawing of those areas of the development to be so treated , a schedule of proposed materials and samples to be submitted for written approval on request from the Local Planning

Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development has satisfactory landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

7. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied the parking spaces shown on Plan No PL3.03 shall be provided and shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles in connection with this approved residential development.

Reason: To ensure that parking is provided in accordance with the Council's standards, in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, the free flow of traffic and in order to protect the amenities of the area.

8. A pre-commencement site meeting must take place with the Architect, the consulting Arboriculturist, the Local Authority Arboriculturist, the Planning Officer to confirm tree protective measures to be implemented. All protective measures must be installed prior to the commencement of works on site and remain until works are complete.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

9. The species, size and siting of the replacement trees shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the trees shall be planted within 6 months (or as otherwise agreed in writing) of the commencement of the approved treatment (either wholly or in part). The replacement trees shall be maintained and/or replaced as necessary until they are established in growth.

Reason: To maintain the visual amenities of the area.

11. An Arboricultural Method Statement, including a tree protection plan, shall be prepared in accordance with BS.5837:2005 'Trees in relation to Construction' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

12. Details including the type, specification and location of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the residential units are occupied and thereafter carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent adverse light pollution to neighbouring properties and Parkland Walk.

13. Notwithstanding the Provisions of Article 4 (1) and part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no satellite antenna shall be erected or installed on any building hereby approved. The proposed development shall have a central dish or aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for the residential units created: details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property, and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to prevent the proliferation of satellite dishes on the development

14. The 'extra care' residential accommodation hereby approved shall be for the provision of extra care accommodation only for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).

Reason: To ensure the provision of an extra care facility and to enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain strict control over the nature of the use.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a construction method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall include:
- (i) Sequence of construction activity throughout each phase;
  - (ii) Location and specification of acoustic barriers;
  - (iii) Details showing how all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway;
  - (iv) Details of construction lighting and parking;
  - (v) The methods to be used and the measures to be undertaken to control the emission of dust, noise and vibration arising from construction works;
  - (vi) Details of boundary hoardings and measures to ensure they are maintained in a secure and tidy condition.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable impacts, upon neighbouring residential amenity and does not have an adverse impact upon Parkland Walk: a Local Nature Reserve.

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 1300 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.

17. No development hereby approved shall commence until details of surface water drainage works and source of control measures have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure water discharge from the site shall not be prejudicial the amenities of the area.

18. No development hereby permitted shall commence until a Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include a methodology for demolition, mitigation for impacts arising from demolition (including dust and noise) and the named contractor(s). Thereafter, all demolition shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact of the works on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

19. No development shall take place until a survey for the presence of bats on site has been carried out and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should the presence of bats be found, then no development shall take place until full details of measures for bat migration and conservation have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the presence and population of a protected species in line with UK and European Law.

20. A supporting statement shall be submitted demonstrating consistency with the submitted Energy Assessment, along with details of the ground heat pump system and bore holes to be submerged, and approved in writing with the Local Planning

Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with any written approval given by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development incorporates energy efficiency measures including on-site renewable energy generation, in order to contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

## REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The scheme has been designed sensitively to the sites sloping topography, its relationship with neighbouring properties and in particular to achieve an acceptable relationship with the adjoining Metropolitan Open Land/ Ecological Corridor to the back of the site. The architectural quality of the proposed buildings including their scale, form, massing, proportion and silhouette, facing materials and relationship to other structures is now considered acceptable. The proposal will deliver a significant amount of high-quality affordable housing and will make a positive contribution to the Borough's housing supply. The proposal will not give rise to significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers or adversely affect local residential amenities.

As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies G2 'Development and Urban Design', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage', UD9 'Location for Tall Buildings', ENV9 'Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency', ENV10 'Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy', HSG1 'New Housing Development', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG7 'Housing for Special Needs', HSG9 'Density Standards', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix', M10 'Parking for Development', OS2 'Metropolitan Open Lane', OS5 'Development adjacent to Open Space', OS6 'Ecologically Valuable Sites', OS16 'Green Chains' and OS17 'Tree Protection' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan and with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 'Design Guidance and Design Statements', SPG3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floor Space Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes', SPG3b 'Privacy / Overlooking, Aspect / Outlook and Daylight / Sunlight', SPG8a 'Waste and Recycling', SPG10 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' and SPG 12 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development'.

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

INFORMATIVE: Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contact on 0845 850 2777.

Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.