

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/1573

Ward: Harringay

Address: Railway Approach Hampden Road N8 0HG

Proposal: Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide two buildings of between 4 and 14 storeys in height comprising 174 residential units (Use Class C3) and 294 sqm flexible B1 floorspace, including the provision of private and communal amenity areas, child play space, secure cycle parking, car parking, refuse and recycling storage areas and other associated development

Applicant: Mr Luke Cadman Fairview New Homes (Developments) Limited

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Valerie Okeiyi

Site Visit Date: 07/06/2016

Date received: 16/05/2016 **Last amended date:** 23/08/2016

Drawing number of plans: 6538-D1000, 6538-D1100, 6538-D1101, 6538-D1102, 6538-D1700, 6538-D1701, 6538-D1702, 6538-D9200, 6538-D9201, 6538-D9202, 6538-D9203, 6538-D9204, 6538-D9205, 6538-D9206, 6538-D9207, 6538-D9208, 6538-D9209, 6538-D9210, 6538-D9211, 6538-D9212, 6538-D9213, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9800, 6538-D9801, 6538-D9802, 6538-D9803, 6538-D9707, 6538-D9708, 6538-D9720, 6538-D9500, 6538-D9501, 6538-D9502

- Air Quality Assessment prepared by MLM Environmental dated April 2016
- Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by Ian Keen Limited
- Archeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs Consulting
- Geoenvironmental interpretative report prepared by CGL Providing Ground Solutions
- Cover letter prepared by Fairview New Homes Ltd dated April 2016
- Crime Impact Statement prepared by Formation Architects dated April 2016
- Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by CHP Surveyors Ltd dated April 2016
- Design and Access Statement prepared by Formation Architects dated April 2016
- Addendum to the Design and Access Statement dated August 2016
- Surface Water/SUDs Strategy prepared by Infrastructure Design Limited

- Ecology Assessment prepared by Ecology Solutions dated April 2016
- Employment Land report prepared by JLL dated April 2016
- Energy Statement prepared by Low Energy Consultancy Ltd dated May 2016
- Foul Sewerage and Utilities Assessment dated April 2016
- Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal prepared by NLP dated April 2016
- Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Grant Acoustics dated May 2016
- Planning Statement prepared by JLL dated April 2016
- Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Curtain & Co dated April 2016
- Sustainable Design and Construction Statement prepared by Low Energy C Ltd dated May 2016
- Transport Assessment prepared by AECOM consultancy dated April 2016
- Residential Travel Plan prepared by AECOM dated April 2016
- Aboricultural Report prepared by Ian Keen Ltd
- Waste Management Statement dated April 2016

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee as it is a major planning application and is required to be reported to committee under the constitution.

1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development optimises the potential of the site for a high quality mixed use development taking account of the character of the surrounding area, providing significant regeneration benefits.
- The loss of the existing Steel Stockholders land and Wilmott House will be replaced by good quality residential accommodation, whilst contributing to the Borough's housing targets. The flexible B1 commercial floorspace would add to the vitality and vibrancy of this section of Hampden Road.
- The employment opportunities are considered to support the objectives within the Corporate Plan and Local Plan and will have a positive economic impact in the locality. Local labour and training obligations will contribute positively to the regeneration objectives for the area.
- The visual and townscape assessments accompanying the application demonstrate that the overall bulk and massing of the tallest element of the development, which is most likely to be visible in the views, is animated to a

degree so as to add interest to it. As such the less than substantial harm would be outweighed by public benefit associated by the development.

- The design is considered to be high quality which justifies a higher density than recommended in the London Plan guidance.
- There would be 37.6% affordable units based on habitable rooms which an independent viability assessment has shown to be maximum level of affordable housing that the site can viably support. This will be subject to a review mechanism, for re-appraisal to maximum cap of the policy requirement (40%)
- The proposed mix of units is considered appropriate for a high density scheme at an accessible location with a larger number of smaller units but also some larger family units.
- The proposed residential accommodation would be high quality and meet all the required London Plan Standards and meet the requirements for child playspace.
- 10% of the residential units will be fully wheelchair accessible.
- In terms of impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties the proposal would not cause unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy or sense of enclosure or affect daylight/ sunlight.
- The scheme subject to appropriate mitigation for the development proposal will have no adverse impact on the surrounding highway network or on car parking conditions in the area.
- The level of carbon reduction proposed is considered acceptable in this instance and carbon offsetting is required through the S106 to reach the London Plan target. The building has been designed such that demand for cooling will be minimised. The proposal will provide sustainable drainage and will not increase flood risk and as such is considered to be a sustainable design.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 2.2 That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 31/10/2016 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- 2.3 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions below.
- 2.4 That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director / Director or the Head of Development Management to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Precise details of materials
- 4) Boundary treatment
- 5) Details of levels
- 6) Landscape details and implementation
- 7) BREEAM UK New Construction 2014
- 8) Sustainability
- 9) Energy
- 10) Living roof/green roof
- 11) Air Quality Assessment
- 12) Combustion and Energy Plant
- 13) Contaminated Land
- 14) Management and Control of Dust
- 15) A pre-commencement site meeting
- 16) Robust protective fencing / ground protection
- 17) Tree protective measures
- 18) Construction works within root protection areas
- 19) Drainage maintenance and management
- 20) Drainage compliance

- 21) Contamination
- 22) Verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy
- 23) Surface water drainage
- 24) Piling impact method statement
- 25) Underground storage tanks
- 26) Water supply infrastructure
- 27) Groundwater
- 28) Details of cycle parking and streetscape arrangements to Hampden Road
- 29) Delivery and Servicing Plan
- 30) Construction Logistics Plan
- 31) Excavations/Earthworks
- 32) Vibro-impact Machinery
- 33) Lighting
- 34) Boundary fencing
- 35) Method Statements/Fail Safe/Possessions
- 36) OPE
- 37) Noise/Soundproofing
- 38) Detailed playspace design
- 39) Secured by design
- 40) Communal aerial
- 41) Building lighting

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Surface water drainage
- 8) Water pressure
- 9) Asbestos survey
- 10) Former BR Land Smaller Land Issues
- 11) Fail Safe Use of Crane and Plant
- 12) Security of Mutual Boundary
- 13) Fencing
- 14) Demolition
- 15) Vibro-impact Machinery
- 16) Scaffolding
- 17) Abnormal Loads

- 18) Cranes
- 19) Encroachment
- 20) Trees, shrubs and landscaping
- 21) Access to railway

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

- 1) Affordable Housing 37.6% (32 x Affordable Rented units and 23 x Shared Ownership units)
- 2) Improving the pedestrian routes to and from the site £20,000
- 3) £9,000 to investigate potential measures to mitigate issues with parking stress arising from the development.
- 4) The site is to be permit/car free with respect to CPZ permits.
- 5) Monitoring per travel plan contribution of £3000
- 6) Car Club membership (two years membership and £50 credit)
- 7) Carbon off set contribution if required
- 8) Contribution towards improving the highway environment and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists as there will be an uplift in car/vehicle movements generated from the site, as well as pedestrians and cyclists £30,000
- 9) Local labour and training during construction

2.4 In the event that member choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

2.5 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposed development in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of on-site affordable housing would have a detrimental impact on the provision of much required affordable housing stock within the Borough and would set an undesirable precedent for future similar planning applications. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy SP2 'Housing' of the Council's Local Plan March 2013 and Policy 3.12 (Negotiating Affordable Housing on Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Schemes) of the London Plan.
- (ii) In the absence of an agreement to work with the Haringey Employment Delivery Partnership the proposal would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population contrary to Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9.

- (iii) In the absence of planning obligations to secure a permit/car free with respect to CPZ permits, financial contribution towards highways works, mitigation of highway environment and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and motorist impacts, travel plan monitoring and car club funding, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the highway and fail to provide a sustainable mode of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan policy SP7, saved UDP policy UD3 and London Plan policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13.

- (iv) In the absence of the provision of a financial contribution towards carbon offsetting the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2. and Local Plan Policy SP4.

2.6 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.5) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-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 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.

CONTENTS

- 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
- 4.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE
- 5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
- 6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
- 7.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPENDICES:

- Appendix 1: Consultation Responses
- Appendix 2: Plans and images
- Appendix 3: Quality Review Panel Notes
- Appendix 4: DM Forum Notes

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

- 3.1 This is an application for demolition of the existing buildings on land between the New River and Hampden Road (Steel Stockholders Yard and Wilmot House) and redevelopment of the site to provide two parallel buildings ranging in height between 4 and 14 storeys comprising 174 residential units and commercial floorspace on the ground floor.
- 3.2 The tallest building of 14 storeys fronting Hampden Road is on the western side facing the railway and the lower building of 11 storeys fronting Hampden Road is on the eastern side. Both buildings have a stepping form from south to north towards to the New River and includes slight variations in articulation along the full length of the blocks. Each building fronting Hampden Road will have a two storey base at ground and first floor level and three storey base at the top floors. The primary material proposed throughout the development is brick using three different shades, where the stair cores would use a contrasting brick and the base would be treated differently. The brick facade is to be articulated with the addition of panelled elements and balconies that would be either recessed or projecting with steel balustrades. The windows are to be constructed using grey UPVC and the doors are to be in steel.
- 3.3 The proposal also includes the CHP at basement level and 294 sqm of commercial floorspace at ground floor level for both buildings fronting Hampden Road. 52 car parking spaces as well as 287 cycle parking spaces are proposed either within the central courtyard or located in the undercroft of both buildings. The commercial units have their own separate entrance and refuse stores. The western block has three residential cores where two of the residential flats are at ground floor level with private courtyards and the eastern block has two residential cores where two of the residential flats are at ground floor level with private courtyards. Each core other than core A & B would have their own separate refuse store. The proposal would also comprise of hard and soft landscaping surrounding the site and would include a child play space located at the east of the site, which is connected to the central courtyard and a pocket park is proposed towards the southern boundary located in front of the commercial unit, as well as other associated works.
- 3.4 The application has been amended since initially submitted and includes the following changes:
 - Additional commercial unit on ground floor of western block;
 - New basement to accommodate CHP;
 - Slight amendment of parking layout (no change in number of spaces);
 - Update to refuse store layouts to show compliant number of bins;

- Elevations amended to include additional windows to cores, extension of rustication to parts of the first floor, different treatment of top floors, articulation of taller facades.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.8 The site location is in the centre of the borough, to the south of Wood Green, east of Hornsey and west of Green Lanes. It is part of the Wood Green and Haringey Heartlands designated Growth Area, in the London Plan (2015) and Haringey's adopted (2013) and emerging revised (pre-submission 2016) Local Plan Strategic Policies. It is also a designated site in the council's emerging Site Allocations DPD (pre-submission 2016), as SA17.
- 3.9 The site is a triangular plot, with its street frontage to its south onto Station Approach, the continuation of Hampden Road; this road is one of the series of distinctive streets of the "Haringey Ladder; pleasant east-west residential streets generally lined with consistent 2 or 3 storey Edwardian terraced houses between Green Lanes and Wightman Road, the North-South streets that form the eastern and western "uprights" of the "ladder". Hampden Road almost uniquely in 'The Ladder' continues west of Wightman Road, where it changes in character to a more commercial and institutional street from the mosque and shop on the corner, before crossing the 'New River' and becoming 'Station Approach'. This is where the railway becomes the dominant presence, with vehicle and workers' entrances to the two depots to the south and west as well as the stairs to the pedestrian footbridge that closes the western dead end. It provides access to Hornsey station and over to the streets of the western side of the railway.
- 3.10 On the other sides of the site, the western boundary is onto the railway; and the access road to the Coronation Sidings depot before the tracks proper, and is about half a level above ground level. The longest boundary though is the hypotenuse of the triangle, to the north-east; onto the 'New River'; this originally 17th century aqueduct is now a tree lined water channel with grass banks to both sides. It does not currently form a right of way at this point but there are ambitions to make a public footpath alongside, it does currently form a wildlife corridor. The other side of the 'New River' is a housing estate, Denmark Road, of 20-30 year old 3 storey houses and 4 storey blocks. The 'New River' is about half a level below the site, with the estate beyond another half a level below. A short distance to the north of Turnpike Lane is the Haringey Heartlands Area of Regeneration, which is subject to the Haringey Heartlands Regeneration Framework SPD.
- 3.11 As well as the Growth Area and Site Allocation, it forms part of or is close enough to be affected by other policy designations:

- a) It is beside the East Coast Main Line railway and forms part of the designated Ecological Corridor covering the tracks, sidings, cuttings, embankments and other associated land, although it is not currently in railway related use.
- b) However, it is not a designated Employment Site, although it is currently in employment use; about three quarters of the site is currently in use as a steel stockholders site, "Stewarts Steelyards", a storage use designated B8, the other quarter is an office, B1.
- c) The neighbouring New River aqueduct is designated a Proposed Green Chain and part of the Blue Ribbon Network.
- d) A short distance to the North West is the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area.
- e) The development is potentially visible from this and a number of other Conservation Areas as well as from close to Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, various parks particularly the viewing terrace in front of Alexandra Palace and various public footpaths and pedestrian friendly streets nearby; however it is not affected by any designated Strategic View Corridors and just misses the corridors of a couple of emerging Locally Significant Views (in the pre-submission draft Development Management DPD).
- f) The nearest designated retail use is the Local Shopping Centre on Turnpike Lane a short distance to its north, with the Metropolitan Town Centre of Wood Green a fairly short distance further north.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- 3.12 Planning permission was GRANTED under planning reference HGY/2007/0089 on 06 March 2007 for Change of use from storage (B8) to practical training centre (D1) and alterations to the front elevation of the building – Wilmot House.
- 3.13 Planning permission was GRANTED under planning reference HGY/2010/1561 on 29 October 2010 for Change of use of existing property from B1 to D1 - Wilmott House.
- 3.14 Planning permission was REFUSED under planning reference HGY/2013/0470 on 17 May 2013 for change of use from steel yard to residential and construction of a new building to create 80 new private and affordable apartments and two commercial units.
- 3.15 An Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion has been provided under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 reference HGY/2016/1085 – The result from the screening is that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

- 3.2 This application is subject to a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) and a number of pre-application meetings have been held.
- 3.3 This planning application was submitted following a previous planning application that was refused planning permission in 2013 under planning reference HGY/2013/0470 for the change of use from steel yard to residential and construction of a new building to create 80 new private and affordable apartments and two commercial units.
- 3.3.1 Planning application reference HGY/2013/0470 was refused for the following reasons;
1. *The proposed development, by reason of its inadequate parking provision, is contrary to Saved UDP Policies UD3 'General Principles', M10 'Parking, Local Plan Policy SP7 'Transport' and Policy 6.13'Parking' of the London Plan would result in an unacceptable increase in on street parking and prejudice the free-flow of traffic along the adjoining highways network.*
 2. *The proposed layout of the development and its ability to provide safe access and egress for pedestrians, cyclist and facilitate servicing by large vehicles in particular refuse and large rigid vehicles would be adversely affected contrary to Policies Saved UDP Policy UD3'General Principles' and Local Plan Policy SP7 'Transport'*
 3. *The proposal constitutes a development of 760 habitable room per hectare resulting in a density of accommodation which is excessive for the site and locality, contrary to Policy SP2 'Housing' of the Haringey Local Plan (2013) the Housing SPD and Policy 3.5 'Quality and Design of Housing Developments' of The London Plan.*
 4. *The proposed development does not meet the standards set out in the London Housing Design Guide and will therefore provide substandard residential accommodation by virtue of overshadowing to the communal area, inadequate unit sizes and insufficient playspace provision contrary to Policy 3.5 'Quality and design of housing developments' of the London Plan 2011.*
 5. *The site of the proposed development lies within an area designated as an Ecological Corridor' The benefits of the proposal would fail to outweigh the nature conservation value of the site and is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy SP13 'Open Space and Biodiversity' and London Plan Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature and Policy 2.18 Green Infrastructure: The Network of Open and Green Spaces*

6. *The proposed development, due to its bulk, massing, detailing and materials, would be overbearing and out of keeping with the scale, form and character of the area contrary to London Plan Policies 3.5 'Quality and Design of Housing Developments', 3.8 'Housing Choice', 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' as well as Haringey Local Plan Policy 7.6.*

3.3.2 This current planning application - reference (HGY/2016/1573) seeks to redevelop the site at the Steel Yard and the adjacent Wilmott House comprehensively. The previous planning application (HGY/2013/0470) was to develop the Steel Stockholders Yard site only. This application also seeks to address the above reasons for refusal for the previous planning application (HGY/2013/0470).

3.7 The proposal, the subject of this planning application has made the following revisions in order to address each reason for refusal as follows:

- *Off-street parking provision has been provided by creating 52 car parking spaces, which addresses reason for refusal number 1*
- *The proposed layout of the development and its ability to provide safe access and egress for pedestrians, cyclist and facilitate servicing by large vehicles is now acceptable, which addresses reason for refusal no. 2*
- *The proposal constitutes a development of 238 units per hectare and 715 habitable room per hectare. This is lower than the previous density and marginally exceeds the guidance in the London Plan density matrix which is 200-700 hr/ha. Given the sites location close to public transport and the town centre a higher density could be considered subject to a high quality design, which addresses reason for refusal 3*
- *The proposal provides good quality accommodation where the level of sunlight to the communal area is well in excess of that recommended within the BRE Guidelines, all the unit sizes meet the mayors standards as set out in policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2015) and the playspace provision is adequate, which addresses reason for refusal 4.*
- *The benefits of the proposal would outweigh the nature conservation value of the site, which addresses reason for refusal 5.*

- *The bulk, massing, detailing and materials as amended creates a form that would add visual interest to the area and at the same relates positively to the surrounding area, which addresses reason for refusal 6.*

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 Haringey Quality Review Panel has considered the proposal on 16th March and 17th August 2016.

4.1.1 The minutes of the meeting dated 16th March 2016 are set out in appendix 3 and summarised as follows:

- *The Quality Review Panel broadly supports the proposals, and acknowledges that whilst the scheme is high density, it has a good public transport accessibility level (PTAL), and represents a terrific opportunity for development. However, the panel feels that if such density is to be permitted, further refinements are required. There is scope to improve the architectural expression in addition to the massing of the development to the north of the site. The panel suggested additional local view studies to help shape the refinements to the design, and improve the visual impact upon neighbouring communities. Cross-sections through the development would help to test how the development should step down, and in relation to surrounding buildings and topography. Scope also remains to significantly improve the elegance of the 12-storey block. At a detailed level, the panel would encourage further consideration of the landscape design, with particular reference to the interface with the New River. More detailed comments are provided below:-*

4.1.2 The minutes of the meeting dated 17th August 2016 are set out in appendix 3 and summarised as follows:

- *The Quality Review Panel warmly welcomes the way that the design of the development has responded to the feedback from the previous QRP meeting in March, and expresses support for the scheme. They identified three main design interventions that have significantly improved the scheme. Adjustments in storey heights of the development, now ranging from 4 storeys to 14 storeys, achieve a more neighbourly relationship with properties to the north of the site. The elevational treatment of the tallest elements of the scheme, creates a 'break' in the parapet at roof level, and visually increases the slenderness of the tower. In addition, the façade design to create a distinct 'base' to the buildings is also welcomed. The panel notes that whilst they welcome the additional route to the*

play area through the undercroft car park, it will need to be very carefully designed and managed. They welcome the additional commercial unit at ground floor level.

4.2 Planning Committee Pre-application: the proposal was presented to the 16 March 2016 pre-application briefing meeting of the planning committee. The following issues were discussed;

- *Loss of employment*
- *Noise from the railway line to the west facing block. What type of glazing in terms of acoustic situations is proposed*
- *Car parking*
- *Query raised on design as well as step down*
- *Query on the step down design*
- *Views assessment due to the height*
- *Height*
- *Public consultation*
- *Is the natural surveillance adequate*
- *Interaction with the new depot site to the south*

4.3 Haringey Development Management Forum was held on 10 March 2016 the comments raised were as follows;

- It is important the development is comprehensive*
- Querying whether there has been consultation with the Green Lane Partnership*

4.4 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal

- 1) LBH Head Of Carbon Management
- 2) LBH Design Officer
- 3) LBH Planning Enforcement
- 4) LBH Housing Design & Major Projects
- 5) LBH Arboricultural Officer
- 6) LBH EHS - Noise Derek Pearce
- 7) LBH Flood and Surface Water
- 8) LBH Economic Regeneration
- 9) LBH Cleansing
- 10) LBH Nature Conservation
- 11) LBH Parks
- 12) LBH Conservation Officer
- 13) LBH Homes For Haringey

- 14)LBH Emergency Planning and Business Continuity
- 15)LBH Building Control
- 16)LBH EHS - Pollution Air Quality Contaminated Land
- 17)LBH Transportation Team

External

- 18)Greater London Authority
- 19)London Fire Brigade
- 20)Catherine West MP
- 21)The Inland Waterways Association
- 22)Designing Out Crime Officer
- 23)The Hornsey Society (The Secretary)
- 24)Arriva London
- 25)Alexandra Park & Palace Statutory Advisory Comm.
- 26)National Rivers Authority

The responses are set out in full in Appendix One and are summarised as follows:

Internal:

- 1) Pollution: Officers raise no objection and recommends the following conditions/informative;
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Combustion and Energy Plant
 - Contaminated Land
 - Management and Control of Dust
 - Informative regarding asbestos

- 2) The Carbon Management Team following the updated energy statement, sustainable design and construction statement and overheating assessment would not object to this application subject to the imposition of the following conditions;
 - BREEAM UK New Construction 2014
 - Sustainability Measures
 - Energy Measures
 - Living roof/green roof

- 3) The House Enabling Officer Housing Commissioning, Investment and Sites team

has made the following comments;

- The SP2, local plan (due for adoption) London plan Policy.11A requires sites yielding 10 units and above to provide to meet the affordable housing target of 40% the London Plan stipulates that the provision on sites need to be maximised in order meet the target. The tenure split required as per policy is 60 :40 in favour of affordable rent tenure and remainder will provide intermediate tenure;
- 10% of the units will need to be fully wheel chair adapted with nearby parking space;
- The dwelling mix will need to be in accordance with planning policy DM 11 A-C and DM13. This development has pre dominance of 1 and 2 bed units and an under supply of 3 bed plus family sized units. In the west of the borough there is a shortage of family size units relative to supply;
- The bedroom mix needs to be reviewed in accordance with the Housing Strategy requirements;
- Careful consideration should be given to the layout and pepper potting of the tenures to avoid where possible mono tenure blocks/areas, but to achieve integration tenure blind objectives. Due to the size of the development it is advised some attention to given towards management scheme being put in place for the benefit of the residents.

4) The Tree/Nature Conservation Officer raises no objection to this application subject to the following conditions;

- A pre-commencement site meeting
- Robust protective fencing / ground protection
- Tree protective measures
- Construction works within root protection areas

5) Flood and Surface Water: Agreed in principle to the concept proposed and required conditions for further details

6) Economic Regeneration: Officers raise the following comments from an economic development perspective;

- The Council places great importance on retention/creation of workspace provision;
- Officers acknowledge that the site has outdated commercial buildings and would require significant investment to bring them to modern standards;
- Officers welcome the fact that the developers have increased the commercial floorspace provision to 294 sqm from the original 160 sqm but note that the Pre-

Submission Version of the Site Allocations DPD (SA: 17) proposes an Indicative Development Employment Capacity of 980sqm;

- Officers endorse the target market for this floorspace (identified in the JLL's Employment Land Report) anticipated to be a combination of local start-up businesses, co-working operators and TMT (Technology, Media & Telecommunications) companies re-locating from more Central areas.

7) Transportation team: Officers raise no objection and have made the following comments;

- Overall, the proposal is well placed for access to public transport services, and is located in areas of formal parking control. However a number of potential impacts can arise and suitable mitigation will be necessary to manage these to make the development acceptable in Transportation terms.
- The highway and transportation authority would not object to this application subject to the imposition of the following;
S.106 towards investigating potential measures to mitigate parking stress in the locality of the site, to improve pedestrian routes to and from the site, site to be permit free/car free with respect to CPZ permits, Travel Plan monitoring, operation of car club scheme and mitigation of highway environment and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and motorist impacts
- Planning conditions for details of cycle parking and streetscape arrangements to Hampden Road, Delivery and Servicing Plan, Construction Logistics Plan.

8) Waste Management Team: No objection to the revised waste strategy

9) Design Officer: Officers raise no objection and has made the following comments;

- The necessary design quality has been achieved to permit the exceptional height and visibility in this sensitive location. The quality of residential accommodation will be high, and that the relationship of the proposed development to the street and context will be positive

10) Conservation Officer: The Officer raises no objection and has made the following comments;

- The site lies outside the Hornsey village conservation area. Given the height of the proposal, the development would be visible from various view points within and outside of the conservation area. Additionally the site would also be visible in long distance views from Alexandra Palace (Grade II listed), Alexandra Palace

Park Conservation area and Registered Historic Park and Hillfield Conservation Area. As such its impact would be on the townscape and setting of the heritage assets and given the limited visibility of the site, would be considered as less than substantial harm.

As part of the pre-application discussion, various views were suggested and the applicant has demonstrated these to a satisfactory detail. Discussions have also been undertaken to ensure that the overall bulk and massing of the tallest element of the development, which is most likely to be visible in the views, is animated to a degree so as to add interest to it. This has been achieved to a high enough quality so that the views to and from the heritage assets and their setting are enhanced. As such the 'less than substantial harm' would be outweighed by the enhancement to the heritage assets and their setting. The development is therefore acceptable from a conservation point of view. All materials should be conditioned.

External:

- 11) Natural England raise no comments
- 12) Crime Prevention Officer – No objection
- 13) Network Rail raise no objection and recommends the following conditions/informative;
 - Excavations/Earthworks
 - Vibro-impact Machinery
 - Lighting
 - boundary fencing
 - Method Statements/Fail Safe/Possessions
 - OPE
 - Noise/Soundproofing
 - Informative regarding Former BR Land Smaller Land Issues
 - Informative regarding Fail Safe Use of Crane and Plant
 - Informative regarding Security of Mutual Boundary
 - Informative regarding fencing
 - Informative regarding demolition
 - Informative regarding Vibro-impact Machinery
 - Informative regarding Scaffolding
 - Informative regarding Abnormal Loads
 - Informative regarding Cranes
 - Informative regarding encroachment
 - Informative regarding trees, shrubs and landscaping
 - Informative regarding access to railway

14) The Environment Agency raises no objection to this application subject to the following conditions;

- Contamination
- Verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy
- Surface water drainage
- Piling
- Underground storage tanks
- Informative regarding water course

15) Thames Water - No objection and has made the following comments

- With regards to surface water drainage where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required;
- With regards to sewerage infrastructure Thames Water has no objection;
- Thames Water would not object to this application subject to the imposition of the following condition/informative:
 - Piling
 - Water supply infrastructure
 - Groundwater
 - Informative regarding groundwater risk management
 - Informative regarding foundation design
- GLA (Stage 1 response)

On balance, the application does not yet comply with the London Plan and further information should be provided with regard to housing, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive access, flood risk and climate change to address these deficiencies. Changes have been made to scheme in response to these comments together with justifications where changes have not been made. These are dealt with in the body of the report below.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following were consulted:

2,019 Neighbouring properties

8 Residents Associations

7 site notices were erected close to the site

5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 96

Objecting: 70 (including a petition with 32 pages of signatures)

Supporting: 23

Others: 2

5.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Friends of the Earth
- Alexandra Park & Palace CAAC
- Ladder Community Safety Partnership

5.4 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

- Objections to the design and appearance
 - Inappropriate scale, height and massing
 - Impact on the skyline and townscape
 - Out of keeping with the area
 - Impact on the conservation area
 - Impact on Alexandra Palace and Alexandra Park
 - The scheme should be re-designed
 - The public realm should be given attention on this part of Hampden Road
 - Previously a 9 storey development was rejected and therefore this development should not be supported
 - The design should include PV and living roofs combined across all roofs
 - Poor architecture
 - Too many materials used for the development
 - Too many dead frontages on the ground floor resulting in the potential for anti-social behaviour
 - There is no precedent for a 14 storey development in the location
 - The site is too small to accommodate the development
 - Grim environment
 - The scheme would create a concrete jungle
- Concerns with the quality of the development
 - Poor outlook to the west and over the railway depot and tracks
 - Noise and vibration disturbance to residents facing west
 - Overshadowing to the communal areas of the development
 - Inadequate unit sizes
 - Insufficient play space provision
- Density too high above the mayors standards
- Visual intrusion
- Impact on biodiversity

- Over-intensification
- The site lies within an Ecological Corridor and environmental and ecological importance has not been taken into account
- Housing mix should include more family units as 1-2 beds increase a transient population that would diminish the local community
- Proportion of affordable housing too low
- Landscape design is poor
- The scheme will dwarf the railway line and aspect from the train
- The scheme fails to create sense of community
- Too many residential units proposed
- Lack of employment floorspace
- Loss of employment
- Concerns local businesses will benefit significantly from increased footfall
- The site was originally a commercial area
- Waste Pollution
- Lack of green space
- The proposal does not make the best use of a brownfield site
- The area is already quite busy as there is the Mosque, a Church, a community centre and the Greek Church all operating in the area and whose community congregate on different days which makes the area quite busy
- Excavation will result in further damage to nearby homes
- Concerns around regeneration and impact on the area

- Impact on neighbours and the surrounding area
 - Loss of privacy
 - Overshadowing and loss of light
 - No evidence of a wind study
 - Noise and disturbance during construction
 - Noise pollution
 - Overbearing
 - Over dominant

- Impact on local services and the community

- Transportation concerns,
 - increased parking
 - Increased traffic levels
 - Pedestrian conflicts
 - Road safety
 - Parking provision is too high
 - Impact on Hornsey Rail Station
 - The scheme should be car free
 - Ownership and maintenance of access road
 - Additional services in an already over congested traffic hub

- Parking provision is insufficient
 - There are heavy good vehicles using this road at all times. In addition Wightman Road is a very busy road with cars travelling at great speed
- Support for more housing
 - Support as the location is sustainable with good transport links
 - Support for reasonable priced accommodation
 - Support of the height
 - Support as the proposal will help local businesses
 - Support as the scheme would result in efficient use of the site
 - The current use on site at the steel yard proposes to move to a more suitable location where there is a higher demand for customers

5.5 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Loss of a private view (Officer Comment: This is a private matter and therefore not a material planning consideration)
- Impact on property values (Officer Comment: (This is a private matter and therefore not a material planning consideration)

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of demolition
2. Principle of the development
3. Impact on the Ecological Corridor
4. Density
5. Design
6. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the adjoining Conservation Area
7. Affordable Housing, Mix, Quality, layout and Child playspace
8. Inclusive Access
9. Transport
10. Daylight, Sunlight/Impact on neighbouring amenity
11. Trees
12. Flooding and drainage
13. Energy/Sustainability
14. Waste storage
15. Contaminated land and air quality
16. Conclusion

Principle of demolition

- 6.1.1 The scheme proposes the redevelopment of the site, including the demolition of the existing buildings. The existing buildings that occupy the site have no architectural merit and detract from the appearance of the area. This can be supported by Policy (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 where no building is sought to be retained.
- 6.1.2 As such the principle of demolition is considered to be acceptable subject to an appropriate replacement scheme.

Principle of the development

Residential Use

- 6.1.3 The proposal provides 174 residential units. The principle of housing is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 chapter 6 Delivering a wide choice of quality homes, London Plan 2015 Policies 3.3 'Increasing Housing Supply' and 3.4 'Optimising Housing Potential'. It is also supported by Haringey Local Plan Policy SP2 'Housing'. The Haringey Local Plan 2013 sets out a target of 8,200 dwellings between 2011 and 2021 (820 per year). Under the new draft plan figure alterations to the London plan (FALP), the 2015 target is increased to 15,019 (1,502 per year). The site is identified as (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 which supports residential development. In addition the site is surrounded by residential uses and is within a broader residential context.
- 6.1.4 The proposed number of residential units on the site would therefore contribute to providing housing to assist in meeting this housing target.

Loss of Steel Stockholders land/Wilmott House

- 6.1.5 The loss of the existing *B Class uses* floorspace is a fundamental planning consideration and Local Plan Policy SP8 makes it clear that there is a presumption to support local employment and small sized businesses that require employment land and space. It is also important to note that draft DPD Policy DM40 (B) states that the Council will only consider the loss of employment land or floorspace is acceptable, subject to the new development proposal providing the maximum amount of replacement employment floorspace possible, as determined having regard to viability. Although only limited weight can be afforded to draft DPD DM policies given its current status which is early in the adoption process.

- 6.1.6 The site is identified as (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 which states that new employment space should be provided. This should be the maximum quantity of new flexible workspace feasible on this site. This draft document makes reference to an indicative development capacity of 930 sqm of new employment floorspace. This document has not yet been formally adopted and therefore has limited weight but is still a materially relevant document in assessing such a scheme.
- 6.1.7 Furthermore saved UDP Policy EMP4 encourages the redevelopment of unallocated employment sites providing that: the land or building is no longer suitable for business or industry use on environmental, amenity and transport grounds in the short, medium and long term; and the redevelopment or re-use of all employment generating land and premises would retain or increase the number of jobs permanently provided on the site, and result in wider regeneration benefits.
- 6.1.8 The site is formed from two land parcels. The Steel Stockholders land parcel to the west extends to approximately 0.4 ha (1 acre) and comprises a steel yard with hardstanding open storage (Use Class B2). There are four separate single storey buildings on site and these provide a total floorspace of approximately 490 sqm (5,350 sq ft). The Wilmott House land parcel to the east extends to approximately 0.3ha (0.7 acres) and comprises two buildings and an open yard area that are understood to have previously been in Class B use. These buildings provide a total floorspace of approximately 2,020 sqm (21,800 sq ft).
- 6.1.9 With regards to Saved UDP Policy EMP4, the site benefits from no strategic or local employment designations. The accompanying Employment Land Report dated April 2016 submitted with the planning application confirms that the extensive marketing for Wilmott House since 2008 has not identified any medium or long term interest from commercial occupiers but Wilmott House have been able to secure full occupancy for most of the period during our involvement by short term lettings reflected by discounted rents. With regards to the Steel Yard which currently employs 7 full time staff, LR Stewart and Sons have operated a successful business from Hampden Road site for many years. However due to the changing nature of the steel industry, owing to competing markets and a significant decrease in profitability in recent times, the director has been exploring the possibility of moving the business to a more strategically located site to fit the current demands for its customers. Notwithstanding this, the existing buildings on the site are in a poor condition and the existing occupier of the

bespoke buildings for the Steel Yard considering the site no longer fit for purpose in an industrial use.

- 6.1.10 The site is not a key site for new employment uses. It is a relatively small employment site that is located within a predominately residential area (with residential uses to the north and east beyond the New River to the west beyond the railway) and it is accessed from residential grade roads.
- 6.1.11 The Employment Land Report confirms that there are no reasonable prospects for continued use and operation of the existing buildings beyond a short term future, with retention of the existing facility not pragmatic. The NPPF seeks to avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. The managed release of surplus land that does not meet the anticipated future needs of industrial and related uses is supported at both a national and regional level so that this land can contribute to strategic and local planning objectives, especially those to provide more housing.
- 6.1.12 Notwithstanding the above, Officers are satisfied that the loss of the employment generating floorspace has been robustly justified in land use planning policy terms and is in accordance with the above policies subject to satisfactory employment floorspace re-provision.

Employment Floorspace Re-provision

- 6.1.13 The existing 2,510 sqm of B8/B2 commercial floorspace will be replaced by 294sqm of flexible B1 commercial floorspace, Officers endorse the target market for this floorspace (identified in the JLL's Employment Land Report) anticipated to be a combination of local start-up businesses, co-working operators and TMT (Technology, Media & Telecommunications) companies re-locating from more Central areas, whilst this would be a significant net loss of 2,216 sqm of commercial floorspace, the proposal would provide significant regeneration benefits and is supported by the emerging draft site allocations DPD (SA21) which does not require re-provision of the existing employment floorspace, given also the proposed development would provide an increased employment opportunity for new, high quality jobs through the provision of 294sqm flexible commercial B1 floorspace. This has been calculated that based upon general office employment densities this would provide up to 24 (24.5) full time equivalent (FTE) jobs.

6.1.14 Therefore, in consideration of the above, and supported by the conclusions within the submitted Employment Land Report, the loss of the existing employment floorspace is considered acceptable in this instance as the replacement floorspace will provide a valuable contribution to the employment floorspace stock in the borough, where there is identifiable demand from smaller B1 users for this type of space proposed in this location in accordance with Local Plan Policy SP8. The reduction in employment floorspace afforded to the existing B2/B8 uses to facilitate a new flexible commercial B1 floor space would therefore be supported by Officers as it is considered a better quality of employment space which at the same time provides an active frontage at ground floor level fronting Hampden Road. A financial contribution for the loss of the existing employment floorspace is not considered necessary given the site allocation and the level of affordable housing provided, however a contribution towards local labour and training would be secured.

6.1.15 Therefore the principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to other detailed considerations.

Impact on the Ecological Corridor

6.1.16 In terms of land designation the site in question is designated as an Ecological Corridor within the Local Plan Proposal Map (2013). London Plan Policy 7.19 seeks to ensure that development proposals make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity. The site is identified as (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 which seeks to ensure that developments enhance the currently poor quality ecological corridor on this site.

6.1.17 Local Plan Policy SP13 seeks to protect and improve the boroughs open spaces of nature conservation value.

6.1.18 Furthermore, Draft DPD Policy DM19 notes that development proposals on sites which are, or are adjacent to, internationally designated sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or Ecological Corridors, should protect and enhance the nature conservation value of the site. Development that has a direct or indirect adverse impact upon important ecological assets, either individually or in combination with other development, will only be permitted where:

a The harm cannot be reasonably avoided; and

b It has been suitably demonstrated that appropriate mitigation can address the harm caused.

6.1.19 Objections have been received from local residents that the proposed development has not taken into account the environmental and ecological importance of the site. In this instance, a report prepared by Ecological Solutions undertook surveys of the existing site and buildings. The surveys were commissioned to assess any potential ecological constraints to the proposed works at the site and provide recommendations for further survey, avoidance, mitigation and enhancement where appropriate. The surveys have confirmed that there are no significant ecological issues at the site.

6.1.19 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable as it would increase biodiversity on the site and would result in a higher ecological value in comparison to the existing land uses. The existing site comprises industrial uses and hardstanding with little or no positive effects on the Ecological Corridor designation of the site. The proposed development would significantly enhance the existing situation with living green roofs, additional planting, bird/bat boxes and significant 'greening' of the site.

6.1.20 Overall, the proposed ecological measures are considered to be a significant improvement over the existing situation to respect the designations of the site, as such, Officers are satisfied that reason 5 of the previously refused planning permission (HGY/2016/0470) has been satisfactorily addressed in that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the nature conservation value of the site in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.19, Local Plan Policy SP13 and Draft DPD Policy DM19.

Density

6.1.21 Objections have been received from local residents that the proposed development would represent excessive density on the site. The density proposed is 238 units per hectare and 715 habitable rooms per hectare which exceeds the 200–700 hr/ha set out in the London Plan. This marginally exceeds the guidance in the London Plan density matrix, however exceeding the density matrix does not mean that the development is automatically inappropriate for the site. In this instance the proposal is located in a highly accessible location, close to public transport i.e. immediately adjacent to Hornsey Rail Station and close to the town centre. The scheme as amended would result in a high quality design, architecture and approach to the public realm. Therefore, it is considered that the scheme does not constitute an overdevelopment on the site and the quantum of units proposed is acceptable in its local setting, subject to all other material planning considerations being met. Officers are therefore satisfied that reasons 3

of the previously refused planning permission (HGY/2013/0470) has been satisfactorily addressed.

Design

Massing, Form, Development Pattern

- 6.1.21 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan seeks to enhance the quality of local places taking into account local character and density. Local Plan policy SP11 and saved UDP policy UD3 include similar requirements. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan also require that design takes into account context. Local Plan policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. To achieve this development is required to respect its local context and character and historic significance and to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality.
- 6.1.22 The proposals are for two blocks, aligned north-south, running across the site, creating two spaces between and to the east of the blocks; the longer block forms a "wall" alongside the boundary of the site with the mainline railway. This means the two blocks present a narrow building frontage to the southern boundary of the site, along the street, and to the north-east to the New River.
- 6.1.23 The two spaces are treated very differently; the space between the blocks is treated, from the southern boundary of the site, as a street; predominantly hard paved, with clear roadway and separate footpaths to either side with parking having the character of on-street parking between, and crucially *all of* the front doors to cores giving access to the flats. Towards the northern end it becomes less a street, more a pair of paths, with a hard paved seating area between, forming a viewing area, and possible future access point onto the New River. The other space, to the east, where the triangle becomes shallower as the New River gets close to the road, is actually between the eastern block and an electricity sub-station at the apex of the triangle. It is treated as a private garden.
- 6.1.24 This plan form could be criticised for failing to give the street sufficient urban enclosure. However Officers consider the details of the proposal give some urban enclosure and notwithstanding this, are consistent with the very different urban character of this stretch of Hampden Road / Station Approach. A sense of enclosure is created as the blocks are high; of which more below, and active frontage is created by housing commercial units in the ground floor ends of both blocks, accessed from the street. The spaces between the blocks provide a

varied silhouette to the street edge elevation, views through from the hard paved street to the green New River corridor and allow great day and sunlight penetration of the landscaped spaces. The form of block ends between spaces directly mirrors that of the 1st block on the south side of Hampden Road/Station Approach west of Wightman Road, where a 4 storey mansion block aligns with Wightman, with just a narrow edge containing a corner shop, facing Hampden, with then the wall to its back yard then the narrow end of a mews style 2 storey block parallel to it behind. Other sites on this short stretch of road are also not fully built up, particularly the depot to the south, which is largely open but with high walls either side of its gate. However, the site and its immediate neighbours feel distinctly separate from the general surroundings and the proposal maintains that separation.

6.1.25 Both blocks step dramatically in height from a low northern end of 4 storeys to 11 and 14 storeys, in a series of steps mirrored in the plan form and elevational treatment in a series of clearly differentiated apparently separated blocks, with some slight and some greater steps in plan. Officers consider that although the blocks do not match the triangular shape of the site, it however creates further triangular landscaped areas between the block ends and the New River, connecting together the landscaped spaces with a continuous landscaped edge to the New River boundary. The only non-rectilinear elements of the design are the canted southern ends of the block plans, canted to better align with the street frontage. Hence the blocks sit in a landscaped setting, but with an urban street edge to their south.

6.1.26 Objections have been received on the issue of design, siting, context and the proposal being out of keeping with the character of the area. In this instance the proposed development is acceptable for the above reasons.

Height, Suitability of the Site for a Tall Building

6.1.27 London Plan Policy 7.7 (Location and Design Tall and Large Buildings) seeks to ensure that tall or large buildings should “relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings, urban grain and public realm (including landscape features), particularly at street level”.

6.1.28 Draft DM Policy 6: Building heights seeks to ensure that proposals for taller buildings are justified in urban design terms, protect local and strategic views and at least conserve the significance of heritage assets.

- 6.1.29 The site as identified as (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 seeks to ensure that the height of development should be at its maximum adjacent to the rail line and Hampden Road and buildings along Hampden Road should create an appropriate street frontage, providing passive surveillance for users of Hornsey station.
- 6.1.30 Objections have been received on the issue of height, Officers consider that the height of the proposal is justified for a number of reasons. Firstly, the site is just within the Haringey Heartland Growth Area, which is acknowledged as an area of significant intensification and potential suitability for tall buildings; it marks the southernmost point of this. The whole growth area is partly so designated by virtue of having good access to public transport and local facilities; this site has particularly excellent access to public transport, being adjacent to Hornsey Station.
- 6.1.31 The wide expanse of the main line railway to its west and depot to its south means that there will be little immediate impact on neighbours of a tall building on this site; indeed the only potential impacts would be on the housing to the northeast of the New River, resolved by the block form stepping down to a matching 4 storeys at its northern end (ground level changes notwithstanding).
- 6.1.32 The proposed tall buildings would inevitably be visible from a wider area. This can be justified in part as providing a marker of the station; a significant local transport node and service, but arguably somewhat tucked away, embedded within the much greater expanse of railway tracks, not right on a road junction and particularly set away from more important streets to its east and north.
- 6.1.33 The site is not crossed by the view corridors of any Strategic Views (the only one in the borough is well away) or by Locally Significant Views as proposed in emerging policy (prepared as part of the Urban Characterisation Study, and proposed to be adopted in the emerging Development Management DPD). However a view corridor crosses just to the south west and others cross many other parts of the Growth Area; this site is one of the few developable sites in the Growth Area unaffected by Local Views.
- 6.1.34 Its visibility has been assessed in a number of Accurate Visual Assessments of Representative Views including views from within Conservation Areas and in proximity to heritage assets, within open spaces and where it will appear in street views. These demonstrate that it will be seen, including from parts of the Hornsey High Street and Hillfield Conservation Areas (including the High Street

itself and Hornsey Churchyard) and from Ducketts Common. However, the size of the visible towers will not be great and subject to the design being of sufficiently good quality it can be seen as a visible landmark.

Elevational Treatment & Fenestration

- 6.1.35 As stated above, the exceptional height of the proposal could be acceptable subject to the quality of the elevational treatment. Elevational treatment can help to mitigate height by giving human scale, pleasing proportions and identity to the overall block appearance, as well as the crucial distinctiveness to the highest points so that they are seen as worthy and interesting landmarks. It is therefore understandable that this element of the proposals has been subject of significant discussion between the Council and refinement of the architects' designs.
- 6.1.36 One of the most important ways in which the composition has been made more pleasing and the impact of the height of the proposals mitigated is by breaking the elevations into distinct elements at the steps, the height and between those, and then to emphasise the slenderness of the component steps. As well as distinguishing between each step as a visually distinct block, stair towers have been pulled out and given a distinctive elevational and material treatment, and wider blocks split with a slot designed in and variations in parapet height. Officers consider that this is particularly successful in making long views of the wide elevations of the blocks elegant and well proportioned, such that they appear as a crowd of separate slender blocks, cheek-by-jowl; best demonstrated in the view from the west, from the Hornsey Station footbridge.
- 6.1.37 In addition to slender vertical elements, it became clear that to achieve elegant elevations, pleasing proportions and a human scale, especially to the tallest elements, a vertical gradation was required. Treatment of a distinct, different "base", for the ground floor of the whole of both blocks, and for the lowest two floors of the highest elements, lifts and visually lightens the blocks, provides a contrasting human-scaled base where the human is in closest proximity. The base is cleverly distinguished in materials not by use of an additional different material but by "rusticating" the standard brick used elsewhere; that is projecting alternate courses to create shadows and therefore a darker appearance; this follows in a long tradition of rustication of bases to give them a more "earthy" appearance. Similarly, for the tallest elements, it has been found to be necessary to distinguish a "top" over 3 floors of the highest elements only.
- 6.1.38 Providing special elevational treatment of the tops of the highest parts of the proposal is also important in their landmark function and to make the elements seen from the longest distance away appear light, sparkling and distinctive.

Therefore the “tops” contain larger areas of glazing, stone details at the parapet and a clear visual break below them.

6.1.39 Over the height of the taller blocks, windows in the “middle”, between the separately expressed base and top, have been grouped over 3 floors, to give those elevations a sense of proportioning commensurate with their height.

6.1.40 Where the stair towers, otherwise distinguished as very slender, darker and plain blocks, emerge above the stepping down blocks, the applicants initially presented large unrelieved blank facades which looked less appealing in long views, especially from the west including in views from the nearby conservation areas. Adding a large picture window, actually proposed to be in glass planks, provides visual interest, variety, a subtle but enticing glow at night and better proportions to those north facing, stepping facades.

Materials and details

6.1.41 The materials palette is predominantly brick, which is appropriate as a durable, robust material that weathers well, as well as being established by precedent from local context. A limited palette of just 3 different bricks has been skilfully handled to provide sufficient variety, with bricks to compliment the predominant local weathered, highly brindle, red bricks found most typically in the area. The two main bricks are a lighter and darker red. A pale reconstituted stone will also be used to pick out the parapets to the highest elements.

6.1.42 The most sharply contrasting elements are designed to be the stair towers, and it is proposed that these will be in a grey brick, the 3rd proposed colour. I consider this will be an appropriate contrast; referencing different local contexts, particularly in the railway buildings, and providing a strong contrast that is distinctive but complimentary.

6.1.43 Windows, panelling and balustrades will be in matching metallic paint finish to be decided. Significant areas of panelling are used to group windows to create better proportions, to mark recessed slots between windows. Panelling to the top floors of the tallest blocks will be in painted glass, to give the impression of greater fenestration.

6.1.44 Conditions will be required to secure quality materials and that their detailing is robust, particularly of parapets, window reveals and around recessed balconies, including their soffits.

Quality Review Panel

6.1.45 Haringey's Quality Review Panel (QRP) has considered the development proposals on 16th March 2016 and 17th August 2016. The panel's comments are reproduced in full in the appendices; the panels are nevertheless also set out and addressed below;

QRP Comments	Response
<p>Massing and development density</p> <p>At the previous review, the panel expressed concerns that the development to the northern end should be lower to better relate to the properties across the New River.</p> <p>A cross section illustrating the relationship between the development and existing housing to the north.</p> <p>At the previous review, the panel emphasised that the taller block on Hampden Road would benefit from refinements to the massing and articulation, to increase its elegance.</p> <p>Place-making, character and relationship to surroundings</p> <p>Additional local views should be provided from a number of key points around the site.</p>	<p>Following QRP comments the applicants have reduced the northern ends of both blocks by two storeys, down to 4 storeys. The panel are now satisfied that this element of the scheme creates a more neighbourly interface with the neighbouring residential properties to the north, and helps give taller elements to the south a more slender appearance.</p> <p>Following QRP's comments, the applicant has provided a cross section which demonstrates how the reduced massing better integrates with the surroundings.</p> <p>Following QRP's comments, the slenderness of the 12-storey block has been enhanced by increasing the height to 14 towards to the south. The panel are satisfied that the adjustments in storey heights of the development now ranging from 4 storeys to 14 storeys, achieves a more neighbourly relationship with properties to the north of the site</p> <p>Key viewpoints have been identified and additional local views were produced. The Conservation and design officer are satisfied that the development would not adversely impact on strategic views.</p>

Architectural expression

The north and south terminations of the building could present a slightly different architectural treatment

The western facade was felt to be a bit too monolithic when viewed from the footbridge and/ or the railway.

A number of suggestions were made concerning the detail architectural expression of the façades: grouping some of the windows vertically, extending the rustication of the ground floor to the first level and enhancing the articulation of the elevations.

Following the 2nd QRP, the panel recommends a simpler approach to articulation of the top of the buildings, but acknowledges that this may be a subjective view.

Scheme layout

The panel welcomes the provision of multiple cores within the development, and the avoidance of long corridors

Following QRP's comments, the articulation of the elevation has been modified to feature a number of subtle variations along the full length of the blocks.

Following QRP's comments, the stair cores have been given a contrasting colour to help break down the appearance of the block and enhance its verticality.

The panel welcomes the move to create a more visually distinct 'base' to the development, through extending the ground floor elevational treatment up to include the first floor. The introduction of a slot within the elevations of the tower element help to increase the perception of slenderness, whilst adding a break into the roof-line parapet enables a more elegant solution.

Following a series of meetings with the Council, Officers are satisfied that the top floors feature a more significantly different treatment from the rest of the blocks. A series of studies have been produced to this effect, investigating the use of different architectural elements to emphasise the top floors. The final solutions adopts a series of glass spandrel panels, pre-cast concrete elements and soldier course parapets to emphasise the top three floors of the taller block.

Noted

<p>The panel welcomes the provision of an additional access to the play area. However, it will require very careful design, lighting and management due to the route of the link through the undercroft car park.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

6.1.46 Overall the proposed development is acceptable due to its high quality design which has been achieved to permit the exceptional height and visibility in this sensitive location and the relationship of the proposed development to the street and context is considered positive. Officers are also satisfied that reasons 6 of the previously refused planning permission (HGY/2013/0470) has been satisfactorily addressed.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the adjoining Conservation Area

6.1.47 The Legal Position on impacts on heritage assets is as follows, and Section 66 and 72 of the [Planning \(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#), are of relevance.

The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise."

The Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council says that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area

gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

- 6.1.48 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
- 6.1.49 Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (LP) (2015) requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (HLP) (2013) requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Saved policy CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) requires that alterations or extensions preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Draft DM Policy DM9 continues this approach.
- 6.1.50 The policy tests above concerns development within a conservation area but also covers development that affects the setting of a conservation area, including significant views into or out of the area.
- 6.1.51 The site lies outside the Hornsey village conservation area. Given the height of the proposal, the development would be visible from various view points within and outside of the conservation area. Additionally the site would also be visible in long distance views from Alexandra Palace (Grade II listed), Alexandra Palace Park Conservation area and Registered Historic Park and Hillfield Conservation Area. As such its impact would be on the townscape and setting of the heritage assets and given the limited visibility of the site, would be considered as 'less than substantial harm'.
- 6.1.52 The accompanying Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal dated April 2016 submitted with the planning application produced a number of views Officers considered satisfactory. The proposed development as amended would ensure that the overall bulk and massing of the tallest element of the development, which is most likely to be visible in the views, is animated to a degree so as to add interest to it. This has been achieved to a high enough quality so that the views to and from the heritage assets and their setting are

enhanced. As such the less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the heritage benefits of the scheme. In addition there are additional public benefits associated with the development such as affordable housing, regeneration and the creation of public space on site The development is therefore acceptable from a conservation point of view.

Affordable housing, mix, quality, layout and child playspace

Affordable Housing

6.1.53 The London Plan through Policy 3.11 seeks to maximise affordable housing provision across London and seeks to provide an average of 17,000 more affordable homes per year up to 2031 and requires 60% of affordable housing to be for social and affordable rent and 40% for intermediate rent or sale.

6.1.54 London Plan Policy 3.12 notes that in negotiating affordable housing on individual private housing and mixed use schemes Local Planning Authorities “should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability, the availability of public subsidy, the implications of phased development including provisions for reappraising the viability of schemes prior to implementation (‘contingent obligations’), and other scheme requirements”.

6.1.55 Haringey Council’s affordable housing policy is contained in Policy SP2 of the adopted strategic policies DPD (2013). This requires that the subject to viability schemes meet the 50% affordable housing borough wide target. The alterations to the Strategic Polices DPD, considered by Full Council in November, propose reducing this requirement to 40%, based upon evidence of development viability. The NPPF re-affirms the government’s commitment to ensure that obligations imposed by the planning process do not threaten the deliverability of sustainable development proposals.

6.1.56 The proposal provides for 55 affordable units consisting of a mix of 1,2 and 3 bedroom flats. The affordable housing mix is as follows;

No. of bedrooms	Affordable rent	Shared Ownership
1 bed units	11	10
2 bed units	11	13
3 bed units	10	0
TOTAL	32 units (124 hab rooms)	23 units (71 hab rooms)

6.1.57 The proposed 60:40 tenure split is considered acceptable as higher levels of affordable rent are proposed with the remainder providing intermediate tenure.

Notwithstanding this, the provision of a significant amount of affordable family accommodation is supported by the above policies.

6.1.58 The number of affordable units provided equates to 37.6% based on habitable rooms. Concerns have been raised that the proportion of affordable housing is too low, Officers consider that although this is below the adopted Local Plan and London Plan target borough wide target of 50% it is close to the 40% target within draft Policy SP2 contained in the proposed Alterations to the Strategic Polices Local Plan. The applicant has accordingly submitted an economic viability assessment to justify the level of on-site affordable units offered. The Council has appointed BNP Paribas to provide expert, independent advice on development viability in this case. They have provided a report to the Council which confirms that the proposed development provides the maximum level of affordable housing that the site can viably support when measured against the benchmark land value. This will be subject to a review mechanism, for re-appraisal to maximum cap of the policy requirement (40%) should the proposal not be implemented within 12 months.

6.1.59 The affordable rent units are proposed on the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth floor of the eastern block. The shared ownership units are proposed on ground, first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth floor of the eastern block. In this instance although all the affordable units are exclusively confined to the eastern block rather than pepper potting the tenures, this is considered acceptable given the size of the development in terms of management.

6.1.60 Officers consider that the level of affordable housing, the overall affordable housing mix and tenure split is considered appropriate in this instance.

Housing Mix

6.1.61 London Plan Policy 3.8 requires new residential developments to offer a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups and the changing roles of different sectors, including the private rented sector.

6.1.62 Officers need to be convinced that the private and affordable housing dwelling mix for all residential development proposals in the borough is acceptable in order to achieve mixed, sustainable and cohesive communities. Each individual scheme should be considered in its local context, availability of subsidy and viability.

6.1.63 The proposal is for 174 residential units. The general housing mix is as follows:

No. of bedrooms	No. of units	% of units
-----------------	--------------	------------

1 bed units	61	35
2 bed units	96	55
3 bed units	17	10
TOTAL	174	100

6.1.64 The proposed dwelling mix is mostly of 1 and 2 bedroom units. Whilst it would be preferable to have a mix containing more 3 and 4 bedroom units in principle and across development across the borough. However it is recognised that developments in highly public transport accessible locations and close to facilities are more suitable for smaller units where car ownership and use is lower and acceptance of noise and “liveliness” is greater, whilst developments in more peaceful and less accessible “hinterland” locations are more suitable for greater family sized (3 and 4 bedroom) units

6.1.65 Although the proposed housing mix has a large number of 1 and 2 bedroom units) and there is a shortage of family size units in comparison to the 1 and 2 bed units, in this instance the overall mix is considered appropriate given the location.

Layout and standard of accommodation

6.1.66 London Plan policy 3.5 requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwelling in particular to be of sufficient size and quality and draft DPD Policy DM12 reinforces this approach. The Mayor’s Housing SPG sets out the space standards for new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation is offered.

6.1.67 All flat layouts meet Mayors Housing SPG space and layout standards. It is particularly notable that care has been taken to ensure larger flats are provided with two separate living rooms; a dining-kitchen separate from the living room in most cases, and beyond the base requirement. The proposed units would be provided with an area of private amenity space which meets the Mayor’s minimum standards.

6.1.68 The larger units in the proposal are located at the ends of the blocks. Where the corners provide them with two of three aspects and the potential for larger private amenity space; ground floor private gardens or larger upper floor roof terraces at the frequent places where the block form steps. Indeed it is also notable that almost all the single aspect units in the proposal are one bedroom units, and that single aspect units are only ever east or west facing, never north or south.

6.1.69 Blocks are laid out with a fairly high number of cores so that with only one small exception there are never more than five units per floor accessed off a single core. This is much better than the Mayors Housing SPG maximum of eight. The height of the blocks mean there are inevitably more than 25 units per core in total for some cores, so video entry phones and/or 24hour concierges will be required.

Approach to the front door(s), Accessibility & Legibility of the street layout

- 6.1.70 As mentioned above, all the flats are accessed off cores with front doors opening off the “internal street” that forms the space between the two blocks. This in turn opens off Hampden Road/Station Approach as a natural extension of the street network. The “internal street” is straight and exceptionally clearly laid out; although it is landscaped it will be clearly visible from south to north, with all front doors to cores accessed directly off the internal street or via a short, straight, perpendicular path, avoiding being ever hidden behind set-backs.
- 6.1.71 Officers consider that whilst an alternative layout that permitted all the cores to be accessed directly off Station Approach/Hampden Road would in principle be preferable, it is unlikely such a layout would be physically possible given the depth of the site at its western end, and much greater benefits accrue from “turning” the blocks to more north-south alignment. Furthermore the architects have managed to achieve an exceptionally clear and equal approach to each and every core off the “internal street” with none in a significantly “worse”, less visible or less attractive location, than any others.
- 6.1.72 It would have been preferable in principle if there were some ground floor flats that had their own front doors. However, due to the inevitably large area of ancillary facilities as well as the commercial units, there are only 4no. ground floor flats; two each at the northern end of each block, generally not with any possibility of having a front door visible from the internal street of Hampden Road.
- 6.1.73 The two commercial units provide a contrasting use at the southern end of each block, animating them during the day and providing an active frontage to the busy end of the internal street and the Station Approach/Hampden Road frontage. Otherwise there are numerous doors to car parks, cycle parks and bin stores off the internal street, whilst the plant room for the district heating is buried in its own small basement. It is also notable that the parking is broken up into a number of small blocks, some as “on street” style parking on the internal street, some as small parking garages, to reduce its impact

Daylight/sunlight

- 6.1.74 A detailed analysis has been undertaken to examine the amount of daylight enjoyed by the habitable rooms of the proposed residential units which shows that overall 88% of the rooms achieve or exceed the recommended BRE average daylight factor (ADF). The rooms that do not achieve the BRE average daylight factor (ADF) levels are secondary bedrooms and others are within apartments where all the other rooms do achieve the numerical values.” The 1 and 2 bed units have large multi-function rooms which contain a kitchen element. The kitchen element within these rooms is, in most cases, located at the rear of the room with the intention of it being artificially lit. BRE guidance accepts this

situation may exist, stating that “If the layout means that a small galley-type kitchen is inevitable, it should be directly linked to a well day lit living room.” The overall level of daylight amenity within the residential elements of the development is, therefore, considered to be good. The detailed daylight/sunlight analysis has demonstrated that the level of sunlight the proposed amenity space will enjoy is well in excess of that recommended within the BRE Guidelines. The daylight/sunlight analysis of the neighbouring properties are discussed further on in the report.

Noise pollution

6.1.75 The noise from the railway line is a significant constraint on this site, and it is noted that units within the western block have been designed with bedroom windows facing the railway. The applicant has submitted a noise assessment report which concludes that appropriate noise mitigation measures (i.e. acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation) will need to be employed, but with these measures the development would provide a satisfactory noise environment for the affected units, therefore a condition will be imposed seeking a detailed design which incorporates measures to insulate the units against unacceptable noise. Overall the proposal subject to appropriate mitigation provides reasonable living conditions for prospective occupiers in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.5 and Local Plan Policy SP2.

Child Playspace

6.1.76 Policy 3.6 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals include suitable provision for play and recreation. Local Plan Policy SP2 requires residential development proposals to adopt the GLA Child Play Space Standards 2009, where London Plan Policy 3.6 and Local Plan Policy SP13 underline the need to make provision for children’s informal or formal play space. The provision of play space should integrate with the public realm without compromising the amenity needs/enjoyment of other residents and encourage children to play.

6.1.77 The Mayor’s ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation’ SPG sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable children’s playspace to be provided per child, with particular emphasis on playspace for children under five years old to be provided on-site. Based on the proposed tenure mix, a child yield of approximately 39 children could be expected from this development, of which 20 would be under five.

6.1.78 Based on the housing and tenure mix, the provision of play space would meet the London Plan requirements subject to a condition imposed seeking a detailed playspace design which includes suitable landscaping, climbable objects, fixed equipment, facilities for younger and older children and facilities suitable for disabled children and carers.

6.1.79 Overall, the quality of residential accommodation of the new development is considered to be acceptable for prospective occupants in meeting the policy aims and objectives of Local Plan Policies SP2 and SP13, London Plan Policies 3.5 and 3.6 and the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. Officers are also satisfied that reasons 4 of the previously refused planning permission (HGY/2013/0470) has been satisfactorily addressed.

Inclusive Access

6.1.80 Local Plan Policy SP2 and Policy 3.6 of the London Plan require that all housing units are built to Lifetime Homes Standards with a minimum of 10% wheelchair accessible housing or easily adaptable for wheelchair users

6.1.81 The proposals provide 10% of the units as wheelchair units (Part M4(3) compliant) as required in planning policy and the typical layout for the M4(3) is considered acceptable. The wheelchair accessible units would be provided at all floor levels and although the wheelchair units only apply to the 2 bed flats and not a variety of unit sizes. Officer consider the 2 bed units adaptable for wheelchair use is acceptable in this instance

Daylight, Sunlight/Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.1.82 Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy. In respect of tall buildings London Plan Policy 7.7 states that tall buildings should not affect their surroundings adversely in terms of overshadowing, noise and/or glare and should not impact on local or strategic views.

6.1.83 The site as identified as (SA 17) within the draft site allocations DPD Pre-Submission Version January 2016 seeks to ensure that the amenity of residential properties on the northern bank are respected.

Daylight/Sunlight

6.1.84 Significant concerns have been raised during the consultation from neighbouring properties in respect of the impact of the proposed development on surrounding daylight and sunlight. The applicant has submitted a Daylight, Sunlight Study in line with Building Research Establishment (BRE) 2011 guidelines, British Standard BS 8206:2008 Lightings for buildings and Planning Practice Guidance (2014) – Design. Daylight is measured by Vertical Sky Component (VSC) whereas the acceptable level of sunlight is calculated by Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH), The BRE Report suggest a VSC of 27% or more should

be achieved if a room is to be adequately day lit. In terms of sunlight, the acceptability criteria are greater than 25% for the whole year or more than 5% between 21st September and 21st March. Only the existing habitable rooms of the neighbouring buildings are considered for the purpose of the BRE calculation.

6.1.85 The applicant's daylight and sunlight report provides analysis on the loss of daylight and sunlight to windows of neighbouring residential properties Hollam House, 41-46 Denmark Road and Regis Court which are located north of the site on the other side of New River. The results of the analysis demonstrate that with regard to daylight all 96 windows analysed will achieve the recommended Vertical Sky Component. Within 41-46 Denmark Road, all except two bedrooms, which the BRE Guidelines state are secondary windows will have a significant portion of their area in front of the No Sky Line. All windows will achieve the recommended total APSH. Although they may not achieve the recommended level of sunlight during the winter months, this is not considered inappropriate for such an urban location and taking into account the under developed nature of the site.

6.1.86 In terms of sunlight, the analysis demonstrates that Hollam House and Regis Court will achieve an exceptional level of sunlight. In relation to 41-46 Denmark Road, all windows will achieve the recommended total APSH. Although they may not achieve the recommended level of sunlight during the winter months, this is not considered inappropriate for such an urban location and taking into account the under developed nature of the site.

6.1.87 With regards to the neighbouring amenity space, the analysis has considered the level of direct sunlight this will enjoy. This demonstrates that in all except one instance, where currently very limited direct sunlight is currently enjoyed, at least 50% or 0.8 times the existing area will enjoy at least 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st March.

6.1.88 In conclusion despite the concerns raised by the neighbours, taking account of the room arrangements to these properties existing levels of light to the windows in question it can be demonstrated that the development does not cause any breaches of BRE guidelines.

The proposed development is therefore considered acceptable and within the guidelines of BRE.

Privacy and overlooking

6.1.89 Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would result in loss of privacy/overlooking issues in particularly to the properties to the north of the site and on Wightman Road. Officers consider however that given the 26m distance of the proposed development from the neighbouring existing dwellings of Denmark Road, building angles and the trees in the New River corridor between them mean there would not be any concern from overlooking and loss of privacy to these dwellings. Similarly the distance between the two blocks rules

out any privacy or overlooking concern between the two proposed blocks. The buildings' height means that upper floors of both buildings will inevitably enjoy long views of Alexandra Palace and beyond from the upper floors communal areas. These elevated viewpoints across the Borough from homes exist in a range of locations across London and Haringey and whilst providing potential for overlooking across large areas, have nevertheless become commonplace in both inner and outer London.

Outlook

- 6.1.90 The proposed development will undoubtedly change the relationship between the buildings on the site and existing surrounding properties, in particular residential properties to the north of the site. The scale and height of the building will have an impact upon outlook from these surrounding homes and will be an obvious change from the existing building on the site. Surrounding residents will accordingly experience both actual and perceived changes in their amenity as a result of the development. Nevertheless, taking account the urban setting of the site and its current condition the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity and as such is considered to satisfy planning policy.
- 6.1.91 To conclude the proposed development has taken careful consideration of its layout, form and design to ensure that the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers will not be adversely affected. As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6 and policy UD3 of the UDP and draft DM Policy DM1

Parking and highway safety

- 6.1.92 Local Plan (2013) Policy SP7 Transport states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This approach is continued in Draft DM Policies DM31 and DM32.
- 6.1.93 Parking, highway, pedestrian conflict and increased traffic levels has been cited as a concern from neighbouring properties, the Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advised that the Transport Assessment and assorted appendices submitted considered the Transportation aspects, impacts and appropriate mitigation for the development proposal.
- 6.1.94 Officers consider the proposal is well placed for access to public transport services, and is located in areas of formal parking control. However a number of potential impacts can arise and suitable mitigation will be necessary to manage these to make the development acceptable in Transportation terms.

6.1.95 As proposed the application includes 52 parking spaces, including 17 No. blue badge spaces for the 10% of units that will be fully/wheelchair accessible. There may be some issues with parking stress arising from the development. Notwithstanding the above, Officers consider the development is acceptable subject to details of cycle parking and streetscape arrangements to Hampden Road, Delivery and Servicing Plan and Construction Logistics Plan would be conditioned consistent with policy and the developer has agreed to secure £20,000 towards improving the pedestrian routes to and from the site. The developer has agreed to secure £9,000 to investigate potential measures to mitigate issues with parking stress arising from the development. The developer has agreed that the site is to be permit/car free with respect to CPZ permits. The developer has agreed to secure £3000 for travel plan monitoring and offer free car club membership to all residents of the development for a period of the at least the first two years and include £50 car club credit for each unit. This will be secured by a S106 contribution. The developer has also agreed to secure £30,000 towards improving the Highway Environment and conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

6.1.96 Notwithstanding the above provision, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the surrounding highway network or significant increase on car parking demand in this location. Officers are therefore satisfied that reasons 1 of the previously refused planning permission (HGY/2013/0470) has been satisfactorily addressed in that off-street parking provision has been provided by creating 52 car parking spaces.

Trees

6.1.97 UDP (2006) Policy OS17 states that the Council will seek to protect and improve the contribution of trees, tree masses and spines to local landscape character by ensuring that, when unprotected trees are affected by development, a programme of tree replanting and replacement of at least equal amenity and ecological value and extent is approved by the Council.

6.1.98 The applicant has provided an Arboricultural Report which surveyed the trees on site. The report demonstrated that tree cover at this site consists of Lombardy poplars, with a limited life expectancy and self-seeded Sycamores. There are no trees of high quality and value (Category A). The vast majority of existing trees are of low quality and value and are Category C trees, in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. A small number of trees are proposed for removal to either, facilitate the development or because they are in a poor structural condition. The tree protection plan demonstrates that the existing trees located along the northern boundary, adjacent to the new river are to be retained. The Council Arboricultural Officer has assessed the report submitted and is satisfied that the removal of these trees will not result in a detrimental impact on the site or screening of it off site and the

re-development of the site would have minimal impact on the existing tree cover, if protective measures are installed in accordance with the recommendations of the Arboricultural Method Statement. New tree planting within the development is recommended to improve the sustainability of the site and enhance biodiversity, while also increasing the quality of life for future residents.

6.1.99 Therefore overall it is considered that subject to condition, the proposal would protect and improve the contribution of trees to local landscape character in accordance with above policy. The species and location of the replacement trees will be agreed with the LPA and planted during the next planning season after the completion of the development

Flooding and drainage

6.1.100 London Plan (2011) Policy 5.13 'Sustainable drainage' and Local Plan (2013) Policy SP5 'Water Management and Flooding' require developments to utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy:

- 1 store rainwater for later use
- 2 use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas
- 3 attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release
- 4 attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release
- 5 discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse
- 6 discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain
- 7 discharge rainwater to the combined sewer.

6.1.101 They also require drainage to be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation. Further guidance on implementing Policy 5.13 is provided in the Major's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014) including how to design a suitable SuDS scheme for a site. The SPG advises that if Greenfield runoff rates are not proposed, developers will be expected to clearly demonstrate how all opportunities to minimise final site runoff, as close to Greenfield rate as practical, have been taken. This should be done using calculations and drawings appropriate to the scale of the application. On previously developed sites, runoff rates should not be more than three times the calculated Greenfield rate. The SPG also advises that drainage designs incorporating SuDS measures should include details of how each SuDS feature, and the scheme as a whole, will be managed and maintained throughout its lifetime.

6.1.102 The applicant has provided a drainage strategy which states that the proposal will utilise SUDS and conform to the London Plan hierarchy. The Council's SUDS officer is satisfied with the strategy subject to further details of the management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This will be secured by condition.

6.1.103 The proposal will therefore provide sustainable drainage and will not increase flood risk in accordance with London Plan (2011) Policy 5.13 'Sustainable drainage' and Local Plan (2013) Policy SP5 'Water Management and Flooding'

Energy/Sustainability

6.1.104 The NPPF and London Plan Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10 and 5.11, and Local Plan Policy SP4 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design, including the conservation of energy and water; ensuring designs make the most of natural systems and the conserving and enhancing the natural environment. The London Plan requires all new homes to achieve a 35 per cent carbon reduction target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations (this is deemed to be broadly equivalent to the 40 per cent target beyond Part L 2010 of the Building Regulations, as specified in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan for 2015).

6.1.105 The applicant has updated the Energy Statement, Sustainable Design and Construction Statement and provided the Overheating Assessment. The Overheating assessment shows that the commercial and the shared spaces over heat. While several of the models residential units come close to overheating. The applicant has stated that the way that they would address this is by installing mechanical cooling. This in turn will increase the energy requirements for the development (as they state by 1.3%). At this late stage a redesign to minimise overheating risk is unlikely to be a viable option. Therefore the only way to mitigate against this is to accept a 1.3% increase in energy demand on the baseline of 187.7 tonnes (which will increase carbon emissions by 2.44 tonnes). Based on this I would expect that this increased carbon emissions that this amount is offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne and will require a contribution of £6,588 to the Councils Carbon Offsetting Fund.

6.1.106 With regards to sustainability design, the applicant has given the Council a BREEAM pre-assessment on the non-residential units. This shows that a BREEAM "very good" is achievable. Officers considered this satisfactory subject to condition. With regards to Community Energy Connection, the applicant has delivered a route map for connections to community heating. This runs through the car park into the highway. Officers consider this satisfactory subject to condition. The applicant has provided no details on the design of the living roofs this is referenced throughout the ecological assessment and highlights the biodiversity benefits. The floor plans show an area of approx 700m² allocated to living roofs. Officers considered this satisfactory subject to condition.

6.1.107 The proposal is therefore considered to be a sustainable design in accordance with the above policies.

Waste Storage

6.1.108 London Plan Policy 5.17 'Waste Capacity', Local Plan Policy SP6 'Waste and Recycling' and Saved UDP Policy UD7 'Waste Storage', require development proposals make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection

6.1.109 The applicant has provided details of the revised waste storage arrangements with 29 x 1100 L Euro bins for refuse, 18 x 1100L Euro bins for recycling, 12 x 140 L Food waste exterior box for the proposed flats. The commercial waste is separate from the residential waste and a total of 4no 1100L Euro bins. These would be spread across the site in 5 stores. Bulk waste containers are located no further than 10 metres from the point of collection. Routes from refuse stores to collection points are as straight as possible, with no kerbs or steps. Gradients are no greater than 1:20 and all surfaces are smooth with dropped kerbs. All doors and pathways are 200mm wider than any bins passing through them. Waste containers are to be lit to ensure safety for residents and collectors. All containers are housed to facilitate once per week collections. Access through security gates and doors for household waste collection, including codes, keys, transponders or any other type of access equipment will be provided to the council. A vehicle tracking plans for the proposed site layout is provided to demonstrate how the refuse vehicle will enter the development to make the collections and how the vehicle will manoeuvre through the area and make exit

6.1.110 As such, it is considered that the details included with the application are sufficient to demonstrate that refuse and recycling can be adequately stored on the site.

Contaminated land and air quality

6.1.111 Saved Policy ENV1 and draft DM Policy DM32 require development proposals on potentially contaminated land to follow a risk management based protocol to ensure contamination is properly addressed and carry out investigations to remove or mitigate any risks to local receptors.

6.1.112 The applicant has assessed the potential for contamination on the site and the impact of such contamination, The Council's Environmental Health Pollution Officer raises no objections subject to conditions

Air Quality

6.1.113 The London Plan, Policy 7.14 states that new development should: 'minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) where development is likely to be used by large numbers of those particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, such as children or older people) such as by design solutions, buffer zones or steps to promote greater use of sustainable transport modes through travel plans promote sustainable design and construction to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings; be at least 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)). The policy seeks to ensure that where provision needs to be made to reduce emissions from a development, this is usually made on-site.

6.1.114 UDP saved policy UD3 sets out that: "The Council will require development proposals to demonstrate that:

a) there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking, aspect and the avoidance of air, water, light and noise, pollution (including from the contamination of groundwater/water courses or from construction noise) and of fume and smell nuisance;.

6.1.115 An air quality assessment has been submitted to assess the air pollution impact of the proposed developments. The Council Lead Pollution Officer has assessed the report submitted and is not satisfied as the development will result in an increase in the vehicle movements and impact on air quality. Therefore measures such as reduced parking levels; the provision of electric charging facilities; and a travel plan are important to minimise the increases in emissions. The benchmarking comparison is also not appropriate, as the AQ neutral assessment has classified the borough as an 'outer' London borough however the GLA classes Haringey as an inner borough

6.1.116 For the commercial use the emissions benchmark has been based on 219 m² whereas the amount of commercial space is given as 160m². Therefore the benchmark value is overestimated.

6.1.117 It is stated that worst case assumptions have been made however the emission factor selected for the CHP emissions used in the AQ neutral calculation is assumed to be 81.41 mg/kWh. However no information on the proposed technology type or model of CHP that could be employed is provided. Therefore no evidence is provided to show that it is capable of meeting this emission level or that it will meet the emission standards set in the London plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG for Band B as the data again is not provided in units which are directly comparable to the standard. This should be provided and the reference conditions stated.

6.1.118 Therefore the conclusions of the AQ assessment are not accepted in this instance. Notwithstanding the above, a revised air quality assessment (including the air quality neutral assessment) taken into account the comments raised above shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority for approval in the form of a condition.

6.2 Conclusion

6.2.1 The proposed development optimises the potential of the site for a high quality mixed use development taking account of the character of the surrounding area, providing significant regeneration benefits.

6.2.2 The loss of the existing Steel Stockholders land and Wilmott House will be replaced by good quality residential accommodation, whilst contributing to the Borough's housing targets and the flexible B1 commercial floorspace proposed would add to the vitality and vibrancy of this section of Hampden Road.

6.2.3 The employment opportunities are considered to support the objectives within the Corporate Plan and Local Plan and will have a positive economic impact in the locality and planning obligation will secure opportunities to maximise the regeneration benefits of the proposal.

6.2.4 The visual and townscape assessments accompanying the application demonstrate that the overall bulk and massing of the tallest element of the development, which is most likely to be visible in the views, is animated to a degree so as to add interest to it. As such the less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the public benefit created by the development

6.2.5 The design is considered to be high quality which justifies a higher density than recommended in the London Plan guidance.

6.2.6 There would be 37.6% affordable units based on habitable rooms which an independent viability assessment has shown to be maximum level of affordable housing that the site can viably support.

6.2.7 The proposed mix of units is considered appropriate for a high density scheme at an accessible location with a larger number of smaller units but also some larger family units.

- 6.2.8 The proposed residential accommodation would be high quality and meet all the required London Plan Standards and meet the requirements for child playspace.
- 6.2.9 10% of the residential units will be fully wheelchair accessible.
- 6.2.10 In terms of impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties the proposal is acceptable and would not cause unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy or sense of enclosure or affect daylight/ sunlight.
- 6.2.11 The scheme subject to appropriate mitigation for the development proposal will have no adverse impact on the surrounding highway network or on car parking conditions in the area.
- 6.2.12 The level of carbon reduction proposed is considered acceptable in this instance and carbon offsetting is required through the S106 to reach the London Plan target. The building has been designed such that demand for cooling will be minimised. The proposal will provide sustainable drainage and will not increase flood risk and is considered to be a sustainable design.
- 6.2.13 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

6.6 CIL

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £357,368.62 (8,308 sqm x £35 x 1.229) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,444,844.28 (8,308sqm x £165 x 1.054). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 6538-D1000, 6538-D1100. 6538-D1101, 6538-D1102 6538-D1700, 6538-D1701, 6538-D1702, 6538-D9200, 6538-D9201, 6538-D9202, 6538-D9203, 6538-D9204, 6538-D9205, 6538-D9206, 6538-D9207, 6538-D9208, 6538-D9209, 6538-D9210, 6538-D9211, 6538-D9212, 6538-D9213, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9800, 6538-D9801, 6538-D9802, 6538-D9803, 6538-D9707, 6538-D9708, 6538-D9720, 6538-D9500, 6538-D9501, 6538-D9502.

- Air Quality Assessment prepared by MLM Environmental dated April 2016
- Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by Ian Keen Limited
- Archeological Desk-Based Assessment prepared by CgMs Consulting
- Geoenvironmental interpretative report prepared by CGL Providing Ground Solutions
- Cover letter prepared by Fairview New Homes Ltd dated April 2016
- Crime Impact Statement prepared by Formation Architects dated April 2016
- Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by CHP Surveyors Ltd dated April 2016
- Design and Access Statement prepared by Formation Architects dated April 2016
- Addendum to the Design and Access Statement dated August 2016
- Surface Water/SUDs Strategy prepared by Infrastructure Design Limited
- Ecology Assessment prepared by Ecology Solutions dated April 2016
- Employment Land report prepared by JLL dated April 2016
- Energy Statement prepared by Low Energy Consultancy Ltd dated May 2016
- Foul Sewerage and Utilities Assessment dated April 2016
- Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal prepared by NLP dated April 2016
- Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Grant Acoustics dated May 2016
- Planning Statement prepared by JLL dated April 2016
- Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Curtain & Co dated April 2016
- Sustainable Design and Construction Statement prepared by Low Energy C Ltd dated May 2016
- Transport Assessment prepared by AECOM consultancy dated April 2016
- Residential Travel Plan prepared by AECOM dated April 2016
- Arboricultural Report prepared by Ian Keen Ltd
- Waste Management Statement dated April 2016

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 accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

6538-D1000, 6538-D1100. 6538-D1101, 6538-D1102 6538-D1700, 6538-D1701, 6538-D1702, 6538-D9200, 6538-D9201, 6538-D9202, 6538-D9203, 6538-D9204, 6538-D9205, 6538-D9206, 6538-D9207, 6538-D9208, 6538-D9209, 6538-D9210, 6538-D9211, 6538-D9212, 6538-D9213, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9214, 6538-D9800, 6538-D9801, 6538-D9802, 6538-D9803, 6538-D9707, 6538-D9708, 6538-D9720, 6538-D9500, 6538-D9501, 6538-D9502.

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

3. Samples of all materials to be used in conjunction with the proposed development for all the external surfaces of buildings hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Samples should include type and shade of cladding, window frames and balcony frames, sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved samples.

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

4. Details of the proposed boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved boundary treatment shall thereafter be installed prior to occupation of the new residential unit.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers

5. The details of all levels on the site in relation to the surrounding area be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development

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 site.

- 6 No development (excluding demolition) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; implementation programme]. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed drawings of:

Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development, excluding demolition. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Local Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

- 7 A post construction certificate confirming that the development undertook a BREEAM UK New Construction 2014, for the office development on this site that will achieve a “very good” outcome (or equivalent) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority at least 6 months of completion on site.

In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the development, a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this

rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authorities approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.

Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2011) polices 5.1, 5.2,5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan.

- 8 The sustainability measures as set out in the set of environmental documents submitted as part of the application must be delivered.

Measures that the Council will expect to see delivered on site, and evidenced through the development process include:

- That the scheme has signed up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme and will demonstrate how best practice standards with a score of above 26 (as per the Sustainability Statement);
- That the development will incorporate bat boxes into the trees and other suitable locations along the river edge (as per the Ecological Assessment / Sustainability Assessment)
- That the buildings will integrate bird boxes on the northern flank on the buildings within the building structure (not wooden but integrated bricks) (as per the Ecological Assessment / Sustainability Assessment)
- That the buildings will integrate insect boxes (insect hotels) on the northern flank on the buildings within the building structure (not wooden but integrated bricks) (as per the Ecological Assessment / Sustainability Assessment)
- That an area of approx 350 m² of the total roof area is covered with PV panels (as per the Energy Strategy);
- That an area of approx of 700 m² of the roof space will be a living roof spread out over multiple roofs (as per the floor plan maps);

The applicants will provide evidence that the above have been delivered to the local planning authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval.

In the event that the development fails to deliver the required measures, a full schedule and costings of remedial works shall be submitted for our written approval. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authorities approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.

Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2011) polices 5.1, 5.2,5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan.

9. The Energy measures as set out in Energy Statement, Railway Approach, Hampden Road, Hornsey. By Low Energy Consultancy Ltd, version 3 and dated 25 July 2016 must be delivered.

The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and shall achieve the agreed carbon reduction of a 35.2% carbon reduction beyond building regulations 2013. The equipment and materials shall be maintained as such thereafter. Confirmation of this must be submitted to the local authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval and the applicant must allow for site access if required to verify delivery.

Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.

Reason: To comply with London Plan Policy 5.2. and local plan policy SP:04

10. Prior to commencement on site details of the living roofs shall submitted to the local authority for approval. This will include the following:

- A roof(s) plan identifying where the living roofs will be located and total area covered;
- Confirmation that the substrates depth range of between 100mm and 150mm across all the roof(s);
- Details on the diversity of substrate depths across the roof to provide contours of substrate. This could include substrate mounds in areas with the greatest structural support to provide a variation in habitat;
- Details on the diversity of substrate types and sizes;
- Details on bare areas of substrate to allow for self colonisation of local windblown seeds and invertebrates;
- Details on the range of native species of wildflowers and herbs planted to benefit native wildlife. That the living roofs will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native);
- Details of the location of log piles / flat stones for invertebrates;

The living roofs will not be used for amenity or sitting out space of any kind. Access will only be permitted for maintenance, repair or escape in an emergency.

The living roofs shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved by the Council and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and supports the water retention on site during rainfall. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13.

11. A revised air quality assessment (including the air quality neutral assessment) to show that it is capable of meeting this emission level or that it will meet the emission standards set in the London plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG for Band B as the data again is not provided in units which are directly comparable to the standard shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development meets the emission standards set in the London plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG for Band B

12. Prior to commencement of the development, details of the CHP must be submitted to evidence that the unit to be installed complies with the emissions standards and stack discharge velocity as set out in the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction for Band B. A CHP Information form must be submitted to and approved by the LPA.

Prior to installation details of all the chimney heights calculations, diameters and locations, maintenance schedules and confirmed emissions of selected CHP plant (including abatement equipment if relevant), to meet Band B of the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction and shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction, protect local air quality and ensure effective dispersal of emissions.

13. Before development commences other than for investigative work:

a) Using information obtained from the report CGL report dated May, 2016 (ref CG/18644) additional site investigation, sampling and analysis shall be undertaken.

The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:-

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.

b) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the

information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.

14. Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.

15. No works shall be carried out on the site until a detailed Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP), detailing the management of demolition and construction dust, has been submitted and approved by the LPA. The plan shall be in accordance with the GLA SPG Dust and Emissions Control and shall also include a Dust Risk Assessment.

Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan

16. Prior to the commencement of any works the site or Contractor Company is to register with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the LPA.

Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan

17. No works shall commence on the site until all plant and machinery to be used at the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Evidence is required to meet Stage IIIA of EU Directive 97/68/ EC for both NO_x and PM. No works shall be carried out on site until all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant to be used on the site of net power between 37kW and 560 kW has been registered at <http://nrmm.london/>. Proof of registration must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works on site.

Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.

18. No works shall commence on the site until all plant and machinery to be used at the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Evidence is required to meet Stage IIIA of EU Directive 97/68/ EC for both NO_x and PM. No works shall be carried out on

site until all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant to be used on the site of net power between 37kW and 560 kW has been registered at <http://nrmm.london/>. Proof of registration must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works on site.

Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.

19. A pre-commencement site meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (e.g. Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturist, Council Arboriculturist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees and discuss any construction works that may impact on the trees.

Reason: In order to safeguard the tree in the interest of visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

20. Robust protective fencing / ground protection must be installed under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition and retained until the completion of construction activities. It must be designed and installed as recommended in the Arboricultural method statement. The tree protective measures must be inspected or approved by the Council Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition. The tree protective measures must be periodically checked the Consultant Arboriculturist

Reason: In order to safeguard the tree in the interest of visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

21. All construction works within root protection areas (RPA) or that may impact on them, must be carried out under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist.

Reason: In order to safeguard the tree in the interest of visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

22. The development hereby permitted shall not be begun until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency. Those details shall include:

- a) Information about the design storm period and intensity, discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance, the methods employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- b) Any works required off-site to ensure adequate discharge of surface water without causing flooding or pollution (which should include refurbishment of existing culverts and headwalls or removal of unused culverts where relevant);
- c) Flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site;
- d) A timetable for its implementation, and
- e) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented, retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

23. No part of any phase of the development shall begin until details for the disposal of surface water using (Sustainable drainage systems) and sewage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. All works that form part of the approved scheme shall be carried out before any part of the development in that phase or sub phase is occupied.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality.

24. The drainage system must be maintained by the developer prior to adoption to ensure it functions as designed and in accordance with the approved drainage strategy. The maintenance requirements set out below must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the drainage system functions as designed and approved prior to adoption

25. No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detailed design prior to the use of the building commencing.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal.

26. No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the sustainable drainage scheme for this site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and maintained thereafter

27. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect groundwater. No site investigation fully characterises a site.

28. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a “long-term monitoring and maintenance plan”) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To protect groundwater

29. No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground at this site is permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval details.

Reason

To protect groundwater. Infiltrations SUDs/ soakaways through contaminated soils are unacceptable as contaminants can remobilise and cause groundwater pollution

30. Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason; To protect groundwater

31. The Environment Agency recommends the removal of all underground storage tanks (USTs) that are unlikely to be reused. Once the tanks and associated pipelines have been removed, samples of soil and groundwater should be taken to check for subsurface contamination. If soil or groundwater contamination is found, additional investigations (possibly including a risk assessment) should be carried out to determine the need for remediation

Reason; To protect groundwater

32. The proposed development is located within Source Protection Zone 1 of a groundwater abstraction source. These zones are used for potable water sources for public supply for which Thames Water has a statutory duty to protect. Consequently, development shall not commence until details have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water, of how the developer intends to ensure the water abstraction source is not detrimentally affected by the proposed development both during and after its construction.

Reason: To ensure that the water resource is not detrimentally affected by the development.

33. Thames Water requests that further information on foundation design be submitted for detailed consideration. This will include - a. the methods to be used b. the depths of the various structures involved c. the density of piling if used d.details of materials to be removed or imported to site. More detailed information can be obtained from Thames Water's Groundwater Resources Team by email at GroundwaterResources@Thameswater.co.uk or by telephone on 0203 577 3603.

Reason – to better assess the risk to water resources from the construction of the foundations

34. Development should not be commenced until: Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The studies

should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the/this additional demand.

35. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

36. Full details including scaled drawings and the manufacturer's specification for the proposed cycle parking arrangements will need to be provided, to confirm the arrangements proposed will be adequate in terms of spacing, manoeuvring room and the like to access the parking, and to demonstrate that the manufacturer's specifications for installation will be met. These details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation.

Reason: To promote travel by sustainable modes of transport to and from the site in particular by bicycles.

37. A Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development which details the numbers of expected movements, the types of vehicles that will visit the site and the arrangements for making deliveries so that there are no adverse impacts on the highway. It should also contain details of the arrangements for refuse and recycling collections.

Reason: To reduce congestion on the highways network

38. A Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of development The site is located in a busy area with existing demands on the Highway Network, and the demolition and build out needs to be carefully planned and managed to minimise construction impacts. The CLP needs to detail the following and can be covered by condition;

□

- Contract Programme/duration
- Numbers and types of construction vehicles attending the site on a daily/weekly basis

- Means of managing/scheduling the construction vehicles attending site to ensure highway impacts are minimised, including avoidance of movements in the AM and PM peak hours
- Details of any temporary Highway measures proposed to facilitate the works
- Arrangements to prevent/minimise travel by car to the site by construction staff and labour.

39. All excavations/ earthworks carried out in the vicinity of Network Rail property/ structures must be designed and executed such that no interference with the integrity of that property/ structure can occur. If temporary works compounds are to be located adjacent to the operational railway, these should be included in a method statement for approval by Network Rail. Prior to commencement of works, full details of excavations and earthworks to be carried out near the railway undertaker's boundary fence should be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Where development may affect the railway, consultation with the Asset Protection Project Manager should be undertaken. Network Rail will not accept any liability for any settlement, disturbance or damage caused to any development by failure of the railway infrastructure nor for any noise or vibration arising from the normal use and/or maintenance of the operational railway. No right of support is given or can be claimed from Network Rails infrastructure or railway land.

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

40. Where vibro-compaction machinery is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

41. Where new lighting is to be erected adjacent to the operational railway the potential for train drivers to be dazzled must be eliminated. In addition the location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway.

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

42. Consideration should be given to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land, and therefore all/any building should be situated at least 2 metres from Network Rail's boundary. This will allow construction and future maintenance to be carried out from the applicant's land, thus reducing the probability of provision

and costs of railway look-out protection, supervision and other facilities necessary when working from or on railway land.

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

- 43 Method statements may require to be submitted to Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager at the below address for approval prior to works commencing on site. This should include an outline of the proposed method of construction, risk assessment in relation to the railway and construction traffic management plan. Where appropriate an asset protection agreement will have to be entered into. Where any works cannot be carried out in a "fail-safe" manner, it will be necessary to restrict those works to periods when the railway is closed to rail traffic i.e. "possession" which must be booked via Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager and are subject to a minimum prior notice period for booking of 20 weeks. **Generally if excavations/piling/buildings are to be located within 10m of the railway boundary a method statement should be submitted for NR approval**

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

- 44 Once planning permission has been granted and at least six weeks prior to works commencing on site the Asset Protection Project Manager (OPE) MUST be contacted, contact details as below. The OPE will require to see any method statements/drawings relating to any excavation, drainage, demolition, lighting and building work or any works to be carried out on site that may affect the safety, operation, integrity and access to the railway.

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

45. The Developer should be aware that any development for residential use adjacent to an operational railway may result in neighbour issues arising. Consequently every endeavour should be made by the developer to provide adequate soundproofing for each dwelling. Please note that in a worst case scenario there could be trains running 24 hours a day and the soundproofing should take this into account.

Reason: To safeguard rail infrastructure

46. Prior to occupation of the development a detailed drawing demonstrating how the playspace design would be laid out shall submitted to the local authority for approval. It should be ensured that the on-site playspace provision includes suitable landscaping, climbable objects, fixed equipment, facilities for younger and older children and facilities suitable for disabled children and carers.

Reason: To ensure an adequate playspace facility

- 47 The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall

be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood

48. All homes within the Development shall be constructed to 'Lifetime Homes' standards, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where compliance cannot be met with regards specifically to units within the hereby approved converted buildings, details as to why and evidence that best endeavours have been undertaken to achieve 'Lifetime Homes' standards shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of the non-complying unit.

Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.8, Saved Policy HSG1 of the UDP.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE : In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

INFORMATIVE : CIL

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £357,368.62 (8,308 sqm x £35 x 1.166) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,444,844.28 (8,308 sqm x £165). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

INFORMATIVE :

Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE : Party Wall Act: The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

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

INFORMATIVE : The London Fire Brigade strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposals relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to businesses and housing providers, and can reduce the risk to life. The Brigade opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems in order to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupier. .

INFORMATIVE :

With regards to surface water drainage, it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water course, 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 groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.

INFORMATIVE : 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.

INFORMATIVE: Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out

INFORMATIVE: Former BR Land Smaller Land Issues: It is incumbent upon the applicant to investigate all the covenants and understand any restrictions relating to the site which may take precedence over planning conditions. Please note that the comments contained in this response to the council do not constitute formal agreement of any existing covenants.

INFORMATIVE: Fail Safe Use of Crane and Plant: All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no materials or plant are capable of falling within 3.0m of the nearest rail of the adjacent railway line, or where the railway is electrified, within 3.0m of overhead electrical equipment or supports.

INFORMATIVE: Security of Mutual Boundary: Security of the railway boundary will need to be maintained at all times. If the works require temporary or permanent alterations to the mutual boundary the applicant must contact Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager.

INFORMATIVE: Fencing: Because of the nature of the proposed developments we consider that there will be an increased risk of trespass onto the railway. The Developer must provide a suitable trespass proof fence adjacent to Network Rail's boundary (minimum approx. 1.8m high) and make provision for its future maintenance and renewal. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged.

INFORMATIVE: Demolition: Any demolition or refurbishment works must not be carried out on the development site that may endanger the safe operation of the railway, or the stability of the adjoining Network Rail structures. The demolition of buildings or other structures near to the operational railway infrastructure must be carried out in accordance with an agreed method statement. Approval of the method statement must be obtained from Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager before the development can commence.

INFORMATIVE: Vibro-impact Machinery: Where vibro-compaction machinery is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

INFORMATIVE: Scaffolding: Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed.

INFORMATIVE: Abnormal Loads: From the information supplied, it is not clear if any abnormal loads will be using routes that include any Network Rail assets (e.g. bridges, particularly the Hampden Road bridge over the river). We would have serious reservations if during the construction or operation of the site, abnormal loads will use routes that include Network Rail assets. Network Rail would request that the applicant contact our Asset Protection Project Manager to confirm that any proposed route is viable and to agree a strategy to protect our asset(s) from any potential damage caused by abnormal loads. I would also like to advise that where any damage, injury or delay to the rail network is caused by an abnormal load (related to the application site), the applicant or developer will incur full liability.

INFORMATIVE: Cranes With a development of a certain height that may/will require use of a crane, the developer must bear in mind the following. Crane usage adjacent to railway infrastructure is subject to stipulations on size, capacity etc. which needs to be agreed by the Asset Protection Project Manager prior to implementation.

INFORMATIVE: Encroachment: The developer/applicant must ensure that their proposal, both during construction, and after completion of works on site, does not affect the safety, operation or integrity of the operational railway, Network Rail and its infrastructure or undermine or damage or adversely affect any railway land and structures. There must be no physical encroachment of the proposal onto Network Rail land, no over-sailing into Network Rail air-space and no encroachment of foundations onto Network Rail land and soil. There must be no physical encroachment of any foundations onto Network Rail land. Any future maintenance must be conducted solely within the applicant's land ownership. Should the applicant require access to Network Rail land then must seek approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Team. Any unauthorised access to Network Rail land or air-space is an act of trespass and we would remind the council that this is a criminal offence (**s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949**). Should the applicant be granted access to Network Rail land then they will be liable for all costs incurred in facilitating the proposal.

INFORMATIVE: Trees/Shrubs/Landscaping: Where trees/shrubs are to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary. We would wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Where landscaping is proposed as part of an application adjacent to the railway it will be necessary for details of the landscaping to be known and approved to ensure it does not impact upon the railway infrastructure. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. Lists of trees that

are permitted and those that are not permitted are provided below and these should be added to any tree planting conditions:

Acceptable:

Birch (*Betula*), Crab Apple (*Malus Sylvestris*), Field Maple (*Acer Campestre*), Bird Cherry (*Prunus Padus*), Wild Pear (*Pyrus Communis*), Fir Trees – Pines (*Pinus*), Hawthorne (*Cretaegus*), Mountain Ash – Whitebeams (*Sorbus*), False Acacia (*Robinia*), Willow Shrubs (*Shrubby Salix*), Thuja Plicatata “Zebrina”

Not Acceptable:

Acer (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), Aspen – Poplar (*Populus*), Small-leaved Lime (*Tilia Cordata*), Sycamore – Norway Maple (*Acer*), Horse Chestnut (*Aesculus Hippocastanum*), Sweet Chestnut (*Castanea Sativa*), Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), Black poplar (*Populus nigra var, betulifolia*), Lombardy Poplar (*Populus nigra var, italica*), Large-leaved lime (*Tilia platyphyllos*), Common lime (*Tilia x europea*)

A comprehensive list of permitted tree species is available upon request.

INFORMATIVE: Access to Railway: All roads, paths or ways providing access to any part of the railway undertaker's land shall be kept open at all times during and after the development. In particular, access to the railway bridge and railway access point must be maintained at all times both during and after construction. Network Rail is required to recover all reasonable costs associated with facilitating these works.