

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2007/2583

Ward: Tottenham Hale

Date received: 11/12/2007

Last amended date: N / A

Drawing number of plans: 0557(PL)001, 002, 009A, 010A, 011A, 012A, 110A, 111A, 112A, 113A, 114A, 115A, 116A, 200A, 300A, 301A, 302A, 303A, 304A, 305A, 306A, 400, 401 & 402.

Address: 596 - 606 High Road N17

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of part 3 / part 4 storey buildings to provide 186 sqm of A1 / A2 / A3 floorspace and 48 residential units together with formation of new vehicle access to Tottenham High Road.

Existing Use: Vacant

Proposed Use: Mixed Use

Applicant: Rock One

Ownership: Private

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Archeological Importance
Conservation Area
Road Network: Classified Road

Officer Contact: Stuart Cooke

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on the east side of Tottenham High Road just south of Scotland Green. It comprises the former CIU Club building and surrounding land and the sites and buildings of Nos 596-602 Tottenham High Road.

The site falls within the Bruce Grove conservation area and is within an area of archaeological importance as identified in the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

It is also directly adjacent to the Tottenham/Bruce Grove District Centre and primary shopping area.

The site generally fronts onto Tottenham High Road which is characterised by mixed use commercial and residential development. Directly to the north of the site are Nos. 608-610 High Road which are part 2, part three storey Victorian buildings in mixed use, with A3 use on the ground floor and residential above. Adjacent to these buildings is the Prince of Wales PH, (No. 612), on the corner of Tottenham High Road and Scotland Green. This is a substantial 3-storey Victorian building which is currently undergoing refurbishment. Directly to the south of the site is Nos. 600-602 High Road, a modern 2-storey building, currently vacant and formerly a Betting Office. Adjacent to this are Nos 596 and 598 High Road, both locally listed buildings. No. 598 was demolished without consent approximately 2 years ago. No. 596 remains and is currently vacant. Adjacent to these buildings is No. 504, the Friends Meeting House, another 2-storey, relatively modern building forming the end of this group of buildings to which the application site is central.

The site is bounded to the north by the terrace of modest, generally 2-storey, mixed use, mid-Victorian buildings in Scotland Green. To the north of this terrace fronting Tottenham High Road is the former Blue School building, currently undergoing refurbishment.

To the east of the site are the rear gardens of the 2-storey semi-detached houses in Parkhurst Road and the buildings and playgrounds of Parkhurst Infants and Junior Schools and the Mulberry Nursery.

Tottenham High Road itself is a busy north-south route through the borough served by a number of bus routes, with Bruce Grove and White Hart Lane rail stations within half a mile of the application site and Seven Sisters underground station within one mile.

PLANNING HISTORY

Various planning applications have been submitted in the past for changes of use or extensions to the existing buildings.

In 2005, retrospective conservation area consent was granted. (HGY2005/1428), to demolish No. 598 Tottenham High Road which had been demolished without consent, based on a satisfactory replacement scheme having been submitted and approved, (HGY2005/1426).

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The scheme involves the demolition of the buildings on the site and the redevelopment of the site for a mixed residential/commercial scheme. The development comprises four main blocks between 3 and 4 storey in height.. Block A fronting Tottenham High Road is 3 storeys high comprising four commercial units at ground floor level with residential above. Block B is 3 and 4 storeys of residential, Block C is 3 and 4 storeys of residential and block D is 3 storey residential. In total, the scheme comprises 48 residential units, 23 x 1-bed, 12 x 2-bed, 9 x 3-bed flats and 4 x 4-bed houses, of which 21 are affordable.

Although the development is submitted as car free, access for emergency and service vehicles, including refuse vehicles, is from Tottenham High Road. The access way winds between the blocks to the rear of the site. Two refuse/recycling areas are proposed, one against the south boundary opposite Block B and the second in the area of the site behind Collins Yard and Scotland Green.

In terms of amenity space, private gardens are provided to the ground floor units of Block C and the houses in Block D. A small communal courtyard is provided between Blocks A and B. Otherwise, the main access area between Blocks C and D is identified as a "Home Zone", described as space which doubles as both vehicle access and turning space and amenity space. This area is largely hard surfaced with two rows of trees shown as planted in it.

CONSULTATION

Ward Councillors

Transportation
Cleansing
Building Control
Policy
Conservation

Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee
English Heritage

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Metropolitan Police
Environment Agency

570-614 High Road N17
581-599 High Road N17
2-56 Scotland Green
23-31 Parkhurst Road
Units 1-7 Reform Row
Parkhurst Infants School

RESPONSES

Ward Councillors – no responses received.

Transportation – "no objection in principle. However, the following concerns are raised.

- 1. cycle parking provision to be raised to 48 spaces.*
- 2. The vehicle access arrangement which sets back the automatic bollards into the site, in order to create a storage/delivery area to the front of the site and abutting the High Road, is unacceptable. We will require the*

applicant to construct a remote-controlled, automatic sliding gate or retractable bollards, which shall only be activated by refuse/emergency vehicles and enable them to enter and leave the site promptly, without impeding bus movements on the adjacent bus lane. We will expect the applicant to seek other means of delivering to the commercial/residential premises.

3. It is unclear how construction traffic associated with implementing this scheme will be managed. We will therefore ask the applicant to demonstrate how these vehicles will service the site with minimal disruption to the adjoining roads, especially the High Road.

Cleansing -

“There are 2 bin storage areas shown in the drawings provided and Block D is shown as 4 separate units each with its own wheelie bin storage area. Whilst provision has been made for a refuse collection vehicle to enter the site and turn around the vehicle only has access as far as the end of Block C. This will mean that the furthest wheelie bin will be beyond the maximum distance of 25 metres.

“To overcome this problem I would suggest that a bin storage area be created opposite the last 2 units in Block C to accommodate 2x100 litre refuse bins and 1x1100 litre recycling bin.

“Overall the development will require 10x1100 litre refuse bins and 3x1100 litre recycling bins.”

Building Control – *“as the ‘dead-end’ access route is in excess of 20 metres deep, suitable turning facilities should be provided within the site for fire brigade vehicles. Access for fire appliances must be to within 45 metres of any point within the new buildings.*

“Means of escape will be dealt with on submission of a formal Building Regulation application.”

Policy -

no response

Conservation –

“In design and conservation terms there is potential for a replacement form of development on Nos 598 – 606 High Road. Any proposal should be in scale with the established 2/3 storey height of this urban block, and harmonise with its established urban grain.

“The historic pattern of development is a continuously built up form along this eastern part of the High Road. It is important that the continuity of the street be reinstated. No. 598, the gap site, needs a replacement building. Furthermore the

principle of forming an access road through a gap site formed by illegally demolishing a locally listed building is unacceptable.

“Any significant residential development within this landlocked site will need construction / emergency / refuse / service access to it. Unless an acceptable alternative access route is identified the principle of any development on this backland site cannot be established.

“Proposals should be in compliance with the Council’s SPG Policies and SPG3c Guidance ; Backland Development, and should be subordinate to the established scale of the street frontage and ‘limited to one or two storeys’.

“Any proposed new development should complement the existing pattern of development in Scotland Green and not adversely affect the quality of amenity of local residents in compliance with Policies UD3 & UD4, and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in compliance with Policy CSV1.”

Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee – *“Object. on the grounds that the locally listed building at 598 High Road should be re-instated. “We are aware that this building was illegally demolished in 2005 and that the then owner got planning permission to build a two-storey replacement building. This was accepted by the Conservation Department as it “reinstates the locally listed building that existed on the site.” However the owner never went ahead to build this replacement but apparently sold the site.*

“598 has historic importance as the home of the famous Quaker Thomas Shillitoe. If the Council accepts the loss of this building it sets a very poor precedent which could influence other landowners in the area. There is not a lot left in this mid section of the High Road and the Council needs to keep this. The CAAC considers that there is not much point in making the whole High Road into conservation areas and lots of Heritage scheme money being poured in if it’s blatantly ignored.

“Discussion at the Development Control Forum focused on the awkward size and shape of the development site and the lack of access. If this section of the High Road is to be properly developed it should include the Prince of Wales pub and Titanic Cafe to the north.”

English Heritage – *“concern is raised by the scale of development in proximity and visibility of the High Road and Scotland Green, and the overall quality and grain of the development. The decision to provide access through an illegally demolished building must*

also raise questions of propriety....we would therefore advise that if the land is to be developed that an alternative access is found and the street frontage re-instated in an appropriate manner.

“The quality of the scheme is also questioned....the relationship with Block B appears to be badly handled, creating a north facing courtyard with no access at the rear. The greater height and stepping forward from behind Block A would also draw attention to what is a utilitarian and insensitive scheme....as such the development makes no reference to the general pattern of development within the Scotland Green and Tottenham High Road conservation areas.

“In the event of an appropriate access being identified then a less intensive scheme with greater consideration of outside space, orientation, and landscaping could enhance the area and the general environment.”

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – no objections

Metropolitan Police - *“I have concerns that the development has insufficient measures to “design out” crime. Although the rising bollards at the entrance will prevent vehicle intrusion, I am unconvinced on the creation of a “Home Zone” and question whether the design of the site off the High Road will be sufficient to deter casual intrusion. It is vital that there is clear and robust demarcation between public and private space within the development and that this “defensible space” is created and maintained for the good of the future residents and others. I am unconvinced that the line of shrubs around Blocks B & C will be sufficient to create any form of defensible space. I am much more encouraged by the formal treatments of the houses at Block D, with treatments that create and enhance the defensible space for the homes. The use of public amenity space adjoining residential blocks needs careful design and management if it is not to fail and create problems for the future. If such areas are fully public, they automatically fall outside the control of residents and can easily become crime generators. (Safer Places 2004, p.30 “Ownership”) The proposed boundary treatments should be higher in order to provide sufficient security for the existing homes that back onto the site, In addition to the proposed 1.8m wall or fence, I would recommend a minimum 300mm trellis topping to raise the height in an aesthetically pleasing way. Regardless of the Secured by Design scheme, it is crucial that the communal door entry systems are of a high security standard. Poor quality door systems lead to crime and high*

maintenance costs for the owner and are not in any way part of a sustainable development. In addition the lighting scheme for the site should meet Secured by Design standards. “The positive effect that lighting can have on the quality of the public realm makes places more attractive as well as safer.” (Safer Places p. 28)

*The homes would benefit from the enhanced security standards detailed in the “Secured by Design Scheme” (www.securedbydesign.com). **However, in my opinion, the layout of the estate is flawed and in its current form would not comply with the conditions of a Secured by Design development. I would require additional security measures to enhance the private nature of the development, create defensible space and prevent casual intrusion and congregation.***

Environment Agency – Object. *“The site lies on a minor aquifer and the Moselle Brook is indicated as running close to the site, though possibly culverted here. The site lies within an Outer Source Protection Zone (SPZ2) relating to the chalk groundwater that is naturally protected by the London Clay above. We note the ground source heat pumps are proposed. These would need to penetrate through the London Clay. The drilling of these and their long term presence could create a pathway between any surface contamination and the chalk aquifer. No assessment of the risk of pollution to controlled waters has been submitted and therefore the pollution risks have not been adequately addressed. The applicant must submit a risk assessment, which complies with the requirements of PPG23’ Pollution and Planning Control’.*

“The Environment Agency recommends that developers should follow the risk management framework provide in CLR11 ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination’, and refer to the Environment Agency guidance on requirements for Land Contamination reports.”

The Mulberry Primary School – *“we would wish to bring to your attention that after observation of the proposed plans, it would seem that Blocks C and D (in particular Block D), may have, depending on their height, visual access to English Heritage school site. This could, if not sympathetically dealt with by the architect, lead to possible child protection issues.”*

15 Jansons Road N15 – *“Object. The proposed development makes no provision for the restoration of the illegally demolished building 598 High Road, as already agreed to by the Council under*

planning application ref. HGY2005/1426. Not to insist on its restoration would set a bad precedent for other would-be developers and in direct conflict with the establishment of the High Road as a conservation area.”

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing
Planning Policy Guidance 13 – Transport
Planning Support Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk

The London Plan

Policy 3A.1 – Increasing London’s Supply of Housing
Policy 3A.21 – Education Facilities
Policy 4B.3 – Maximising the Potential of Sites

Unitary Development Plan 2006

G2 – Development and Urban Design
AC3 - Tottenham High Road regeneration corridor
CSV1 - Development in Conservation Areas
CSV7 – Demolition in Conservation Areas
UD2 – Sustainable Design and Construction
UD3 – General Principles
UD4 – Quality Design
UD6 – Mixed Use Development
UD7 – Waste Storage
UD8 – Planning Obligations
HSG1 – New Housing Developments
HSG2 – Change of Use to Residential
HSG9 – Density Standards
HSG10 – Dwelling Mix
M9 – Car Free developments
M10 – Parking for Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a – Design Guidance
SPG3a – Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes
SPG3b – Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook, Daylight/Sunlight
SPG3c – Backland Development
SPG7a – Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement
SPG8a – Waste and Recycling

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

The main issues to be considered in terms of this application area:

1. the principle of the uses proposed
2. density/mix of the residential element
3. layout/bulk/mass/design
4. effect on the conservation area
5. access/parking
6. amenity space
7. sustainability
8. waste/recycling

1. The principle of the uses proposed

The site is located directly adjacent to the Tottenham/Bruce Grove District centre and is currently occupied by the vacant nightclub building, vacant bookmakers, the site of No. 598, (demolished) and No. 596 Tottenham High Road. Policy AC3 'Tottenham High Road regeneration corridor sets out the Councils position for development along the High Road. It states in para. 1.12:

“The Tottenham High Road Regeneration Strategy (2002) encompasses the entire length of the High Road. It links the borough boundary with Enfield to the north and Hackney to the south, and incorporates Northumberland Park, Bruce Grove and Seven Sisters. The Strategy area is shown on Map 1.1. Tottenham High Road and the buildings, shopping centres and open spaces along it will be improved as an historic North/South corridor.”

It seeks to promote regeneration of this area through encouraging development which will:

- a) *Be sustainable and positively contribute to the regeneration of the High Road.*
- b) *involve no significant adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity, and provides a safe and secure environment that combats crime and the fear of crime.*
- c) *result in any loss of public open space.*
- d) *significantly increase the vehicular traffic flow on the High Road.*
- e) *not detract from the vitality and viability of the town centres, which should be the focal point for new travel intensive uses,*
- f) *that new housing should promote a more balanced, mixed, sustainable and less transient community, and the proportion of affordable housing should not exceed 50 per cent, the majority of which should be for intermediate forms of housing (shared ownership, key worker and sub market schemes); and*
- g) *change of use to residential will be encouraged outside the defined retail centres, subject to other policies in this plan.*

It is considered that, in terms of the mix of uses proposed by this development, these uses meet the criteria set out in the policy. The proposed commercial

floorspace is considered to be of a level that will provide a significant number of new jobs without significantly affecting the vitality and viability of the District Centre to the south. Paragraph g. encourages change of use to residential as long as the change of use complies with the other relevant policies in the plan.

Policies HSG1 New residential Development and HSG2 Change of Use to Residential seek to ensure that new residential development is located in preferred locations within the borough, is of appropriate density levels and mix, and will not result in the loss of employment opportunities. In this case, the site is a brownfield site with good access to public transport and local services and facilities.

Policy UD6 considers mixed use developments specifically and requires that such developments should be located in Town Centres, areas of high public transport accessibility and within major new developments. It is considered that this scheme meets these requirements and is therefore appropriate in this respect.

It is considered therefore that the principle of the uses proposed is acceptable and meets the requirements of policies AC3, UD6, HSG1 and HSG2 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

2. Density/mix of the residential element

Policies HSG 9 and HSG10 set out the Councils policies for residential density standards and dwelling mix. These are in line with the advice in the London Plan. In terms of density, the borough seeks to achieve a density of residential development in the range of 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare. This is qualified further in para. 4.33 and 4.34 which state:

“The density ranges will be applied flexibly in light of local circumstances. Therefore, the Council will adopt a ‘design-led’ approach to density and will consider the following factors:

- a) the character of the surrounding area, in terms of existing building form, massing and building heights;*
- b) historic heritage context, including listed buildings and conservation areas;*
- c) the characteristics of the site;*
- d) the quality of the design;*
- e) the range and mix of housing types;*
- f) the level of service provision and public spaces; and*
- g) car parking provision.*

4.34 *As such, proposals should conform with other policies of the Plan, notably Policies UD3 (General Principles), UD4 (Quality Design) and UD9 (Tall Buildings).”*

It goes on to state in para. 4.35:

“New development should be compatible with the existing pattern of development and character of an area...and be in line with the guidance in para. 4.47 of the London Plan.”

It is clear from the criteria set out above that, in this case, development should be toward the lower end of the density range to reflect the historic character and the general characteristics of the site and surroundings.

SPG3a adopted in July 2006, gives guidance on density calculation of sites proposed for mixed use development. Para. 2.A7 states:

“For mixed use developments the residential site area should be calculated using total net site area apportioned between the various uses. Half width of the road should also be calculated on a proportional basis. “

Whilst in this case, the non-residential element of the scheme is relatively small, it should be recognised that calculating the residential density based on the whole site area would be inappropriate and some adjustment is required to reflect the mixed use nature of the development. In this case, the whole site area is 0.381 hectares as stated in the application. The total number of habitable rooms is 150. This results in a net residential density of 394 habitable rooms per hectare. Allowing for an adjustment to take account of the mixed use nature of the development, a residential density of between 410 and 430 habitable rooms per hectare is likely.

Taking into account the guidance in Table 4B.1 of the London Plan, a residential density of up to 450 habitable rooms per hectare is considered to be appropriate for this site. The resulting density is towards the top end of this range. As referred to above, policy HSG9 sets out a number of criteria against which density should be judge within the specified range, in particular the characteristics of the area and the historic heritage context of the site. When the scheme is considered in this context as required by the London Plan and the Unitary Development Plan, it would indicate that the density of the proposed scheme is relatively high for the site. However, in itself, the density is not considered to be so excessive as to be a reason for refusal, however, it does indicate that the proposal is likely to relate adversely to the surrounding conservation area. The specific issues raised in relation to the conservation area are discussed in the section 4 below.

In terms of the mix, the scheme proposes:

- 1-bed – 21%
- 2-bed – 16%
- 3-bed – 32%
- 4-bed – 31%

This mix largely accords with the mix set out in SPG3a and is therefore considered acceptable.

3. Layout/bulk/mass/design

Policies G2 'Development and Urban Design, UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' set out the Council's policies regarding new development. This scheme comprises four separate blocks of between 3 and 4 storeys in height. Block A fronts Tottenham High Road and lines through with the general building line in the High Road and the height of this block is considered appropriate.

Blocks B, C and D are located at various positions throughout the site which are regarded as relating poorly to the surrounding pattern of development. The residential area to the north of the site is characterised by the modest, 2-storey terraced properties of Scotland Green and it is considered the residential element of this scheme should reflect that general layout. This is particularly important given the bulk of the site falls within the Bruce Grove conservation area, and so any development of this site should respect and relate appropriately to that conservation area. The impact of the development on the conservation area is considered in more detail in section 4 below.

However, it is considered the development fails to meet the requirements of policy UD4 of the Unitary Development Plan, in particular that it fails to complement the character of the surrounding conservation area and is of a scale that is not sensitive to the surrounding area, results in poor movement within the site, and fails to respect the existing urban grain and historic heritage context of the surrounding area. In addition, the Crime Prevention Design Advisor raises a number of concerns relating to the layout of the scheme in terms of Designing Out Crime which the scheme fails to address.

4. The effect on the conservation area

During the pre-application discussions the agent was advised that in conservation terms the principle of infill development in the site of No 598 (the demolished building) was essential to the High Street frontage, and that a vehicular cross over at this point was objectionable.

The historic pattern of development is a continuously built up form along this eastern part of the High Road. It is important that the continuity of the street be reinstated. No. 598, the gap site, needs a replacement building. In conservation and urban design terms the principle of re-establishing the enclosure to the street is essential, and forming an access road through a gap site formed by illegally demolishing a locally listed building is unacceptable.

In design and conservation terms there is potential for a replacement form of development on Nos 598 – 606 High Road. Any proposal should be in scale with the established 2/3 storey height of this urban block, and harmonise with its established urban grain.

In addition to the harm caused by not re-instating the street frontage the proposed vehicle access is approx. 18 m from the vehicular cross over to the Friends Meeting House and that the vehicular cross over to the Aldi car park is immediately adjacent. This is too close - another vehicular cross over for an

access road in this location fragments the High Road street frontage and has a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area

The Council's Principal Transportation Planner objects to the proposed this proposed access for anything other than emergency vehicle access & refuse collection vehicle access - service access is not acceptable. Full service vehicle access would generate significant traffic. The commercial unit would need servicing and deliveries, and the 48 dwellings is likely to generate a wide variety of vehicular traffic journeys, removal vans, delivery vans, gas, water, electricity and all sorts of specialist contractor vans, taxis.

The prospect of a 10m long waiting area in front of bollards would result in vehicles waiting to enter the site just within the site boundary, standing on the footprint of the illegally demolished No 598, would be visually detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Design proposals should be in compliance with the Council's Policy UD4 ; Quality Design and SPG Guidance 1a, which requires that the spatial and visual character of the development site and the surrounding area should be taken into account and that new development should respect the form, structure, and urban grain of the locality, taking into account its local distinctiveness (including materials and features).

The cul-de-sac layout featuring a development of 4 blocks on an access road with three right angle turns leading to the rear of the site is convoluted, difficult to access, and bears no relation to the established historic pattern of development or urban form along the High Road.

This specific context is formed by individual historic buildings, two and three stories high, in a terrace layout grouped around the site. Most characteristically these are narrow frontage houses which have a fine urban grain. In this sensitive context I consider the proposed Blocks A, B, C & D, are substantially longer, wider and deeper, have a much coarser urban grain, and are out of scale and out of character. Moreover the height, mass and bulk of the four storey Blocks B and C would be visually prominent, obtrusive, and out of character in this sensitive context.

Block A's fenestration treatment fronting the High Road is asymmetrical and irregular, its 17m long façade does not articulate the layout or scale of the residential layout behind, and there is no reference to the fine urban grain which is characteristic of the urban block. The front elevation facing the High Road deserves better, this bland appearance is more like a rear elevation facing a service yard.

Views from the High Road through the gap show the 4 storey 25.5m long Blocks B elevation abutting Block A, and Block C which will appear over dominant and overscaled relative to the street frontage. The architectural treatment of their elevations, in particular the aluminium and fibre cement clad panelled elevations, do not express the use, the layout, the scale, or the character of the residential layout behind. The overall appearance is more like an anonymous office buildings

of the 1970's, and it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

I have serious concerns regarding the siting of the 4 storey Block C right on the joint boundary wall with the historic Friends Burial Ground. There is no set back from the boundary wall to allow for pedestrian access around the end of the building – indeed it is apparent that to construct Block C access and scaffolding would need to be made available from the Friends Burial Ground itself. The blank flank wall of Block C, approx 11m wide x 12 m high, would appear overdominant and detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Within a Conservation Area any development must follow the imperative of preserving or enhancing its character and appearance in compliance with Policy CSV1. The proposed development conflicts with this policy as it ;

- Leaves the gap (No 598) in the High Road and fails to reinstate an acceptable replacement street frontage.
- Block A, B, C & D are not visually compatible with the established scale, mass, height, bulk of the street frontage, and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- It has an adverse effect on views into, across and within the site.
- The layout of the development fails to respect the established pattern of development in the conservation area.

5. Access and Parking

Policy M9 allows for car free development where:

- a) there are alternative and accessible means of transport available;*
- b) public accessibility is good; and*
- c) a controlled parking zone exists or will be provided prior to occupation of the development.*

The application site is located in an area with a PTAL rating of 3 – 4 as shown on Map 7.1 of the Unitary Development Plan. This is considered reasonable and a CPZ operates in the surrounding area. Therefore a car free development is regarded as appropriate here.

The Transportation Group have commented that the servicing/delivery arrangements of the scheme are unsatisfactory in that no dedicated space is provided for servicing and delivering to the commercial premises fronting Tottenham High Road. Outside the site is a bus lane and parking restrictions are in operation. Therefore on-street servicing is not acceptable here. Transportation states:

“The vehicle access arrangement which sets back the automatic bollards into the site, in order to create a storage/delivery area to the front of the

site and abutting the High Road, is unacceptable..... We will expect the applicant to seek other means of delivering to the commercial/residential premises.”

As such, the scheme is considered to fail to meet the requirements of policy M10 'Parking for Development' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006 and draft SPG7a 'Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement'

Much of the vehicle access space serves a dual function as amenity space within the development identified as a “home zone” between blocks B and C. It is considered that such a dual use of space is unlikely to operate satisfactorily and will not provide either practical vehicle access or usable and safe amenity space. No indication has been provided in the application as to how this space will be laid out and managed to satisfactorily achieve both these functions.

The scheme however relies on an access from Tottenham High Road via the space resulting from the demolition of No.598 High Road. As described earlier, this building was a locally listed building within a conservation area which was demolished without consent. It is the Council's view that this building should be re-instated and a planning permission exists to re-instate the building. Such a re-instatement would of course mean this scheme would become unrealistic. The case for the re-instatement of No.598 is set out in paragraph 4 above.

6. Amenity Space

The ground floor units of Blocks C and D have private amenity space in terms of rear gardens. However, most of these are below the Council's standard of 50 square metres set out in section C of SPG3a. A separate amenity area approximately 6m x 6.5m is provided behind Block A. This is almost entirely surrounded by 3 and 4-storey buildings and is likely therefore to receive very little sunlight and daylight and its value as amenity is regarded as significantly compromised by its position. The remainder of the units above ground have to use the shared vehicle access/amenity space between blocks B and C, identified as a “home zone” in the application. As set out in paragraph 5 above, it is considered that such a dual use of space is unlikely to operate satisfactorily and will not provide either practical vehicle access or usable and safe amenity space.

As such, the scheme is considered to fail to provide adequate amenity space within the development contrary to the requirements of policy UD3 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG3a.

7. Sustainability

The applicant has submitted an energy statement prepared by Eco-Consulting which sets out how the development will achieve a 20% on-site renewable energy target. This report considers various options and concludes that a 20% reduction can be achieved through a combination of the renewable technologies considered.

8. Waste/recycling

Policy UD7 states;

“In new developments the provision of enough space to store waste until it can be collected is important to avoid the storage of waste on street/pavements. Therefore all planning applications should show on the proposed plans dedicated areas adequate for waste storage within the site, excluding any part of the pavement that is part of the site. This applies to conversions and changes of use as well. SPG8a Waste and Recycling provides more guidance on space and location for waste storage and also on the form and content of waste management plans for large developments.”

This scheme has two waste storage areas, one to the north side and one to the south. Waste management have identified that part of the development exceeds the maximum distance from these storage areas and will have to be amended. They state the entire development will require 10 x 1100 waste bins and 3 x 1100 recycling bins. 9 x 1100 waste bins and 4 x 1100 recycling bins are provided. The houses in Block D are indicated as having bin enclosures in their front gardens, but these are considered outside the recommended collecting distance by Waste Management.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The application site is located on the east side of Tottenham High Road just south of Scotland Green. It comprises the former CIU Club building and surrounding land and the sites and buildings of Nos 596-602 Tottenham High Road. The site falls within the Bruce Grove conservation area and is within an area of archaeological importance as identified in the Unitary Development Plan 2006. It is also directly adjacent to the Tottenham/Bruce Grove District Centre and primary shopping area.

The scheme involves the demolition of the buildings on the site and the redevelopment of the site for a mixed residential/commercial scheme. The development comprises four main blocks between 3 and 4 storey in height.

It is considered that the principle of the uses proposed is acceptable and meets the requirements of policies AC3, UD6, HSG1 and HSG2 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

A residential density of up to 450 habitable rooms per hectare is considered to be appropriate for this site. The resulting density of this scheme is towards the higher end of this range. The density is not however considered to be so excessive as to be a reason for refusal, however, it does indicate that the proposal is likely to relate adversely to the surrounding conservation area. The dwelling mix largely accords with the mix set out in SPG3a and is therefore considered acceptable.

The scheme is however considered to fail to meet the requirements of policy CSV1: 'Development in conservation areas' as the development fails to respect and relate appropriately to the Bruce Grove conservation area.

It is considered the development fails meet the requirements of policy UD4 of the Unitary Development Plan, in particular that it fails to respect and complement the character and historic heritage context of the surrounding conservation area and is of a scale that is not sensitive to the surrounding area, results in poor movement within the site, and fails to respect the existing urban grain of the surrounding area. In terms of the provision of amenity space, the scheme is considered to fail to provide adequate amenity space within the development in line with the guidance in SPG3a.

The scheme will also result in the permanent loss of No. 598 Tottenham High Road, a locally listed building demolished without consent, the loss of which will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Bruce Grove conservation area contrary to policy CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2007/2583

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 0557(PL)001, 002, 009A, 010A, 011A, 012A, 110A, 111A, 112A, 113A, 114A, 115A, 116A, 200A, 300A, 301A, 302A, 303A, 304A, 305A, 306A, 400, 401 & 402.

For the following reasons:

1. The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within the Bruce Grove Conservation Area. The proposal, if approved, would seriously detract from the important character to the detriment of the vicinity contrary to Policy CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.
2. The proposal fails to relate to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in terms of urban grain and layout, the historic heritage context, designing out crime and makes inadequate provision for amenity space for the benefit of future occupiers of the development contrary to Policy UD4 'Quality Design' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
3. The proposal will result in the permanent loss of No. 598 High Road, a locally listed building demolished without consent, resulting in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Bruce Grove Conservation Area contrary to Policy CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

4. That the vehicle servicing and delivery arrangements are unsatisfactory and will prejudice the free flow of pedestrians and vehicles in Tottenham High Road contrary to Policy M10 'Parking for Development' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.