

## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

### 1 APPLICATION DETAILS

**Reference No:**

**Ward:** Crouch End

HGY/2017/2220 - Planning Permission – Town Hall site  
HGY/2017/2221 - Listed Building Consent – Hornsey Library  
HGY/2017/2222 - Listed Building Consent – Town Hall  
HGY/2017/2223 - Listed Building Consent – Broadway Annex

**Address:** Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway N8 9JJ

**Proposal – Planning Permission:** *Refurbishment and change of use of the Hornsey Town Hall from B1 Use and Sui-Generis Use to a mixed use scheme comprising a hotel (Use Class C1), food and beverage uses (Use Classes A3 and A4), community uses (Use Class D1, D2 and Sui-Generis Use) and co-working use (Use Class B1). Use of the Town Hall roof terrace as a bar (Use Class A4). Removal of east wing extension and erection of east wing roof extensions to the Town Hall. Change of use of the ground floor of Broadway Annex Building East to food and beverage use/drinking establishment use (Use Class A3/A4). Provision of 146 residential units comprising: the erection of a 7 storey building; the erection of a part 4, part 5, part 6, part 7 storey building and associated car parking at basement level; change of use of the first and second floors of the Broadway Annexe to residential use and the erection of an extension to the rear of the Broadway Annex; the erection of a residential mews block to the rear of the Broadway Annexe. Alterations and landscaping improvements to the town hall square and open spaces. Provision of cycle parking. Demolition of the Weston Clinic building; courtyard infill extension to the Town Hall; Hornsey Library garage; Library annex and energy centre. Demolition and replacement of metal stairwell to the rear of the Assembly Hall and demolition and replacement of stage hoist structure adjoining the Assembly Hall. Provision of 11 Units of Affordable Housing.*

#### **Listed Building Consent Proposals:**

**Building 1:** Hornsey Library, Haringey Park, Hornsey N8 9JA.

*Listed Building Consent for demolition of library garage and energy centre in curtilage of Hornsey Library (Listed Grade II - HE Listing Ref: 1246935). No demolition to library building proposed. (Reference No: HGY/2017/2221)*

**Building 2:** Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway N8 9JJ

*Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to the Hornsey Town Hall (Grade II\* - HE Listing Ref: 1263688) including comprehensive programme of repair*

*works to brick and stonework, roofs, floor and wall surfaces, doors, decorative metalwork, joinery, ironmongery, etched glazing and windows. Various removals and insertion of internal partitions, doors, partial excavation of basement, lift insertions, ramp and access insertions and relocations, fire escape replacement, removal of stage hoist, balcony seating and 1972 roof addition. Repair of historic finishes, furnishings, commemorative plaques and war memorial. Curtilage demolition of the Weston Clinic Building and courtyard infill extension.*

**Building 3:** Broadway Annex Building, The Broadway, N8 9JJ

*Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to the Broadway Annex (Listed as 'Electricity Board Office and Showroom' - Grade II. HE Listing Ref: 1358881) including comprehensive programme of repair works to brick and stonework, roofs, floor and wall surfaces, doors, decorative metalwork, joinery, ironmongery and windows. Various removals and insertion of internal partitions, including insertion of French doors to the Town Hall square, fire escape replacement and facilitating works to allow insertion of extension.*

**Applicant:** Crouch End Far East Consortium (FEC) Ltd.

**Ownership:** Council/Private

**Case Officer Contact:** James Hughes

**Site Visit Date:** 28.04.2017 + 26.06.2017 + 01.08.2017 + 30.08.2017 + 20.10.2017

**Date received:** 25.07.2017

**Date Valid:** 01.08.2017

**Drawing number of plans and documents:** See **Appendix 1**

1.1 This application for planning permission is reported to Planning Sub-Committee as it is major development. The Listed Building Consent (LBC) applications are reported concurrently.

1.2 **SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- The development proposal will provide for the restoration and refurbishment of the Hornsey Town Hall and secure its future. A sustainable mix of uses for the Town Hall complex will allow for an economic contribution to the Crouch End District Centre and generate local employment. The principle of the provision of hotel, community, co-working and residential floorspace is in line with the site allocation and planning policy requirements.

- This restoration represents a significant inward investment and an improved position in relation to the 2010 planning permission. The restoration works are appropriately phased. Historic England (HE) supports the scheme and the development proposal will allow for the removal of the Hornsey Town Hall from HE's "At Risk" Register.
- In making a recommendation to grant planning permission, officers have considered the site history and the viability constraints identified with previous proposals that may have been insufficiently capitalised to deliver refurbishment works of a comprehensive scale.
- The overall density of the scheme is acceptable and falls within an acceptable range within London Plan Density Matrix. The mix of dwellings provided is acceptable given the site's location.
- The provision of 11 units of affordable housing representing 8% affordable housing by unit (6% by habitable room) is considered the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing the scheme can viability deliver. The tenure split of the affordable housing provision is acceptable and the Council's affordable housing position is protected by viability review mechanisms enshrined in the S106 agreement.
- The design of the new build elements of the proposal are judged to be of a high quality. The building footprints are similar to the 2010 permission and oriented to minimise the impact on the historic setting of the Town Square.
- The policy requirements for taller buildings have been met by the applicant. Blocks A and B are acceptable given the context of the area and the site allocation. The significance of historic assets is preserved. The new build blocks will be constructed of high quality materials. The replacement roof extension on the East Wing of the Town Hall is acceptable. The impacts on strategic and local views is compliant with London Plan policy and local policy.
- The scheme provides high quality new build and converted residential accommodation that meets with London Plan space standards. There are a limited number of single aspect units in the scheme and all units will receive good levels of daylight. The proposal incorporates a policy compliant level of accessible and adaptable units, and blue badge parking is provided. The units will be protected from noise impacts and will have adequate ventilation.
- Mature trees are retained on the site in line with the requirement of the site allocation and public access to the Town Square is maintained. The

delivery of a small local garden in an area of open space deficiency adds to the quality of the scheme.

- The re-configuration and re-design of the Town Square is comprehensive, sensitive to the historic environment and secures a viable future for the Town Square. The provision of child play space within the scheme is acceptable. The proposal makes an ecological and recreational contribution in an area with an open space deficiency.
- The effect of the proposal on the daylight and sunlight amenity to the majority of the surrounding residential properties is acceptable and in general conformity with BRE guidance subject. Where there are issues of non-compliance, these are considered to be negligible or minor.
- The site is an infill location that has long been allocated in the development plan. The impacts to privacy, outlook and the amenity of adjoining occupiers is minimised by design and/or mitigation. Where there are instances of planning harm, this harm is judged to be minor and outweighed by other material planning considerations. The temporary amenity effects of construction will be strictly controlled and monitored by the Local Authority.
- Subject to the conditions, it is considered that the heritage benefits outweigh the less than substantial planning harm caused by the increased massing of Blocks A and B on the setting of the Town Hall and Hornsey Library as well as the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area. This view takes into account the views of the Conservation Officer, Historic England and other contributors. This view also takes into account the setting of the Town Hall as the primary consideration as per the site allocation requirements.
- The car trip demand generated by the proposal can be accommodated subject to conditions and a contribution to address parking control measures. The impacts of the scheme on the public transportation network are acceptable subject to a contribution to Transport for London to increase bus capacity and update bus shelter infrastructure.
- The car parking provision of 45 spaces, yielding a ratio of 0.31 spaces per unit is policy compliant. The level of cycle parking and the proposed alternations to the public highway are acceptable. No taxi rank is proposed in the vicinity of the site. Future shuttle bus provision will be

address by way of a travel planning condition. The transportation impacts of the development are acceptable.

- The issues of ecology, flood risk, energy and sustainability, waste and servicing, basement development, water and waste water capacity, land contamination and archaeology are adequately addressed by the development proposal and where required will be mitigated by planning conditions.
- The scheme makes a significant contribution to the delivery of the Local Plan and the allocated site SA48, which seeks to meet Haringey's strategic aspirations and the wider regeneration of the borough.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Assistant Director of Planning and/or 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, and a section 278 legal agreement providing for the obligations set out in 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 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 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.
- 2.4 That Committee resolve to GRANT the three applications for Listed Building Consent and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to impose conditions and informatives and issue the Listed Building Consents following the appropriate endorsement by the Secretary of State.

Planning Conditions (HGY/2017/2220 - The full text of conditions is contained in **Appendix 1**)

- 1) Three Year Expiry (LBH Development Management)
- 2) Development in Accordance with Approved Drawings and Documents (LBH Development Management)
- 3) Materials Samples (LBH Development Management)
- 4) Hard and Soft Landscaping (LBH Development Management)

- 5) Roof Extension Details (Historic England)
- 6) Landscaping – Replacement of Trees and Plants (LBH Development Management)
- 7) Landscaping – Replacement of Ceremonial Tree (LBH Development Management)
- 8) Tree Protection Method Statement (LBH Tree & Nature Conservation)
- 9) Tree Protection Site Meeting (LBH Tree & Nature Conservation)
- 10) Inspection of Tree Protection Measures (LBH Tree & Nature Conservation)
- 11) Supervision of Root Protection Zones (LBH Tree and Nature Conservation)
- 12) Street Furniture Management Plan (LBH Development Management)
- 13) Public Realm Lighting Strategy (LBH Development Management)
- 14) Secure by Design Certificate (Metropolitan Police Service)
- 15) Hours of Operation -A3/A4 Uses (LBH Development Management)
- 16) Electric Vehicle Charging Points (Transport for London)
- 17) Parking Management Plan (LBH Transportation)
- 18) Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) (LBH Transportation)
- 19) Service and Delivery Plan (DSP) (LBH Transportation)
- 20) Wheelchair Dwellings (LBH Development Management)
- 21) Accessible & Adaptable Dwellings (LBH Development Management)
- 22) Noise from Plant and Associated Equipment (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 23) Noise Assessment (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 24) Internal Noise Levels within Residential Units (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 25) Noise leakage from Assembly Hall and Use Class A4 (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 26) Ventilation Details and NOx Filter Details – LBH Environmental Health)
- 27) Surface Water Drainage (Thames Water)
- 28) Public Sewer Crossings (Thames Water)
- 29) Piling Method Statement (Thames Water)
- 30) Details of Flood Risk Attenuation Measures (LBH Drainage)
- 31) Drainage Details – (LBH Drainage)
- 32) Confirmation of Energy Standards (LBH Carbon Management)
- 33) Carbon Offset Management Plan (LBH Carbon Management)
- 34) Combined Heat and Power Details (LBH Carbon Management)
- 35) Overheating Strategy – (LBH Carbon Management)
- 36) Post Construction Certification BREEAM and Home Quality Mark (LBH Carbon Management)

- 37) Remedial Works Plan BREEAM and Home Quality Mark (LBH Carbon Management)
- 38) Chimney Height Calculations (LBH Environmental Health)
- 39) Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Details (LBH Environmental Health)
- 40) Site Investigation (LBH Environmental Health)
- 41) Site Remediation (LBH Environmental Health)
- 42) Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (LBH Environmental Health)
- 43) Consideration Construction Registration (LBH Environmental Health)
- 44) Machinery Emissions (LBH Environmental Health)
- 45) Consideration Construction Registration (LBH Environmental Health)
- 46) Machinery Inventory (LBH Environmental Health)
- 47) Written Scheme of Investigation (Historic England – Archaeological Service)
- 48) Events/Local Area Management Plans – LBH Transportation
- 49) Cycle Parking Provision (LBH Transportation)
- 50) Hotel Management Plan (LBH Development Management)

**Informatives** (The full text of Informatives is contained in **Appendix 1**)

- 1) Working with the Applicant (LBH Development Management)
- 2) Community Infrastructure Levy (LBH Development Management)
- 3) Hours of Construction Work (LBH Development Management)
- 4) Party Wall Act (LBH Development Management)
- 5) Numbering New Development (LBH Development Management)
- 6) Asbestos Survey Where Required (LBH Environmental Health)
- 7) Written Scheme of Investigation – Suitably Qualified Person (Historic England)
- 8) Deemed Discharge Precluded (Historic England)
- 9) Composition of Written Scheme of Investigation (Historic England)
- 10) Disposal of Commercial Waste (LBH Waste Management)
- 11) Piling Method Statement Contact Details (Thames Water)
- 12) Minimum Water Pressure (Thames Water)
- 13) Paid Garden Waste Collection Service (LBH Development Management)
- 14) Sprinkler Installation (London Fire Brigade)
- 15) District Energy Connection – Hornsey Library (LBH Carbon Management)
- 16) Designing out Crime Officer Services (Metropolitan Police Service)

Listed Building Consent conditions (HGY/2017/2221- Hornsey Library. The full text of conditions is contained in **Appendix 1A.**)

- 1) 3 Year Expiry (LBH Development Management)
- 2) Development in Accordance with Approved Drawings and Documents (LBH Development Management)
- 3) Hidden Historic Features (LBH Development Management)

Listed Building Consent conditions (HGY/2017/2222 – Town Hall. The full text of Conditions is contained in **Appendix 1B.**)

- 1) 3 Year Expiry (Historic England)
- 2) Development in Accordance with Approved Drawings and Documents (LBH Development Management)
- 3) Approval of Contracted Work (Historic England)
- 4) Development Phasing (Historic England)
- 5) Works to Match Existing (Historic England)
- 6) Matching Brick to Existing (Historic England)
- 7) Hidden Historic Features (Historic England)
- 8) Removal of Redundant Installations (Historic England)
- 9) Building Fabric and Redundant Installations (Historic England)
- 10) Details of Relevant Works (Historic England)
- 11) Schedule of Historic Items and Salvage Strategy (Historic England)
- 12) Structural Drawings and Method Statement (Historic England)
- 13) Securing of Interior Features Program (Historic England)
- 14) Masonry Cleaning Program (Historic England)
- 15) Heritage Management and Maintenance Plan (Historic England)
- 16) Details of East Roof Extension (Historic England)
- 17) Services Not Shown on Drawings (Historic England)
- 18) Appurtenances Not Shown on Drawings (Historic England)

Listed Building Consent conditions (HGY/2017/2223 – Broadway Annex. The full text of conditions is contained in **Appendix 1C.**)

- 1) 3 Year Expiry (Historic England)
- 2) Development in Accordance with Approved Drawings and Documents (LBH Development Management)
- 3) Approval of Contracted Work (Historic England)
- 4) Development Phasing (Historic England)
- 5) Works to Match Existing (Historic England)
- 6) Matching Brick to Existing (Historic England)
- 7) Hidden Historic Features (Historic England)
- 8) Removal of Redundant Installations (Historic England)
- 9) Building Fabric and Redundant Installations (Historic England)

- 10) Details of Relevant Works (Historic England)
- 11) Schedule of Historic Items and Salvage Strategy (Historic England)
- 12) Structural Drawings and Method Statement (Historic England)
- 13) Securing of Interior Features Program (Historic England)
- 14) Masonry Cleaning Program (Historic England)
- 15) Heritage Management and Maintenance Plan (Historic England)
- 16) Services Not Shown on Drawings (Historic England)
- 17) Appurtenances Not Shown on Drawings (Historic England)

### **Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

#### *Affordable Housing*

- 1) **Affordable Housing** – 11 units of social rented accommodation (Social Rent - 8% affordable housing by unit) to be located within the Broadway Annex West.
- 2) **Viability Review Mechanism** should the proposal not be implemented within 18 months of the date of decision.
- 3) **Viability Review Mechanism at 75% Leasehold Sale completion** - Any additional value split 90/10 to the Council up to a blended value of £925 per square foot and split 60/40 to the Council over this level up to a level (to be agreed prior to the signing of the S106 agreement) that represents 40% affordable housing.
- 4) **Option for Council to Purchase Affordable Housing.**
  - a. Submission of an Affordable Housing Plan prior to the refurbishment works to the Broadway Annex.
  - b. Submission of an Acquisition Agreement upon receipt of an Affordable Housing Notice from the Council.

#### *Transportation*

- 5) **Car Capping** - No future occupiers will be entitled to apply for a residents or business parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development.
- 6) **Parking Control Measures** - £60,000 (sixty thousand pounds) towards the consultation and implementation of parking control measure in the local area surrounding the site.
- 7) **Residential Travel Plan** (as part of the detailed travel plan) comprising:
  - a) Appointment of a travel plan coordinator

- b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables, to every new resident.
- c) Establishment or operation of a car club scheme, which includes the provision of 2 car club bays and two cars with, two years' free membership for all units and £50.00 (fifty pounds in credit) per year for the first 2 years.
- d) Travel Information packs to be given to all residents and information available through a website.
- e) £3,000 (three thousand pounds) for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives.

8) **Commercial Travel Plan** (as part of a detailed travel plan) comprising:

- a) Appointment of a travel plan co-coordinator
- b) Provision of welcome induction packs for staff containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables to all staff, travel pack to be approved by the Councils transportation planning team.
- c) £3,000 (three thousand pounds) for monitoring
- d) Review of cycle parking provision annually for the first two years as part of the travel plan and provide additional cycle parking facility if required.
- e) Provision of public transport information (with ticketing [electronic or paper] where possible and on the website).

9) **Additional Capacity on the W7 Bus Route** and other bus routes - Obligation of **£150,000** (over 5 years) to **Transport for London**.

10) **Upgrades to Bus Shelter** CC located southbound on the A103 - Obligation of **£15,000** to **Transport for London**.

*Open Space Management*

11) **Public Space Access and Management Plan** for the public space to the front of the development from the Broadway (details on servicing and maintenance shall be provided)

*Community Use*

12) **Community Use Plan** in general conformity with Community Use and Access Agreement (between the Council and the applicant) executed on 8th February 2017, comprising:

- a) Objectives
- b) Maintenance of Community Use and Community Access
- c) Temporary Closure

- d) Marketing and Promotion
- e) Community Use and Access Steering Group

13) **Community Use Operations Plan** in general conformity with the relevant elements of the agreement between the applicant and the operator.

*Hotel Use*

14) **Leasehold Ownership** of Hotel Rooms precluded.

15) **Hotel Occupancy** restricted to 30 Days, subject to Local Authority review based on a business case in the future if required.

*Employment*

16) **Ultrafast Infrastructure and Connections**

17) **Re-location assistance** to existing business occupiers

*Skills and Training*

18) Participation in the **Haringey Employment & Recruitment Partnership** (HERP) to use local labour during the construction process.

*Carbon Management*

19) An updated Energy Plan and a developer financial contribution of **£211,221** addressing the **unachieved carbon reduction targets**, to be paid upon the implementation of the planning permission. Subject to a review mechanism if the energy efficiency can be improved through the detailed design phase.

*Development Phasing*

20) A full phasing strategy, proposing the following phases of works:

- 1) Phase 1: Block A & B, Public Realm (excluding Town Hall Square), Town Hall Enabling Works (Including Hazardous Materials Removal, Soft Strip, Survey Works, Demolition of Existing Clinic Building), Utilities Connections and Sub Station relocation;
- 2) Phase 2: Shell & Core Works to the Town Hall;
- 3) Phase 3: Fit Out to the Town Hall;
- 4) Phase 4: Broadway Annexe and Town Hall Square

The Plan shall propose the following phasing:

- a) Phase 1 works shall be completed FOLLOWING the implementation of the planning permission but PRIOR to the occupation of the 81 units representing approximately 60% of the market units;
- b) Phase 2 works shall be completed FOLLOWING the implementation of the planning permission, but PRIOR to the occupation of the 108 units representing approximately 80% of the market units;
- c) Phase 3 works shall be completed FOLLOWING the implementation of the planning permission, but PRIOR to residential occupation of the 122 units representing approximately 90% of the market units. The Plan shall propose the operation of the hotel at Phase 3 and 50% hotel room availability;
- d) Phase 4 works shall be completed PRIOR to residential occupation of the final 10% of the market new build residential units

### **Section 278 Heads of Terms:**

- 1) Section 1 - Footway reconstruction of north-western footway in front of Library on Haringey Park (£25,110)
- 2) Section 2 - Footway reconstruction of north-western footway between No. 13 Haringey Park and Bourne Road (£25,318)
- 3) Section 3 - Footway reconstruction of north-western footway between Hatherley Gardens and Crouch Hill (£9,839)
- 4) Section 4 - Carriageway surfacing of Hatherley Gardens and introduction of raised junctions at junctions of Haringey Park / Hatherley Gardens and Haringey Park / Ivy Gardens (£50,095)
- 5) Section 5 - Introduction of raised junction at Weston Park / The Broadway and Weston Road / Northern access to site. Footway and carriageway surfacing (£20,163)
- 6) Section 6 - Repaving of footway and introduction of raised kerb to improve access to bus (£31,207)

### **Total S278 Works Contribution: £161,731**

- 2.5 In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendations members will need to state their reasons.
- 2.6 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. *In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable housing and 2) viability review mechanisms 3) an Affordable Housing Acquisition Agreement the scheme would fail to foster mixed and balanced neighbourhoods where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposal is contrary*

to London Plan Policies 3.9, 3.11 and 3.12, Strategic Policy SP2, and DPD Policies DM 11 and DM 13, and Policy SA48.

- ii. *In the absence of a legal agreement securing local employment training opportunities, and ultrafast infrastructure connections, the proposal would fail to facilitate training and employment opportunities for the local population and the business needs of commercial users. The scheme would fail to contribute to the social and economic regeneration of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9, Policy DM48 and SA48.*
- iii. *In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) residential and commercial Travel Plans, and Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments to preclude the issue of parking permits, and 2) financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, and car club provision and parking control measures the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13. Spatial Policy SP7, Policy DM31 and Policy SA48.*
- iv. *In the absence of a legal agreement securing financial contributions for capacity upgrades to local bus services and quality improvements to the local bus shelter, the proposal would give rise to unsustainable modes of travel, overspill parking impacts and a poor quality public realm. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13. Spatial Policy SP7, Policy DM31 and Policy SA48.*
- v. *In the absence of the legal agreement securing an Open Space Management Plan and Community Use Plan the proposal would fail to secure publicly accessible community uses and open space, and compromise the Council's vision for the Hornsey Town Hall. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.5, 7.9, Policy SP12, Policy DM20 and Policy SA48.*
- vi. *In the absence of the legal agreement precluding leasehold ownership of hotel rooms and securing a 30-day occupancy restriction, the proposal would allow for the future loss of London's visitor accommodation and undermine the vitality of the Crouch End District Centre. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy 4.5, Policy SP10, DM41 and DM53.*
- vii. *In the absence of a legal agreement securing a carbon offset payment and an energy plan the proposal would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2 and Strategic Policy SP4, and emerging DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.*
- viii. *In the absence of a legal agreement securing a phasing plan for the restoration of the Town Hall, the proposal would fail to secure the future of an*

*'as risk' heritage asset and undermine its significance. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policy 7.8 and 7.9, Policy SP12, DM9 and SA48.*

- 2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.6) 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 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
- 4 CONSULATION RESPONSE
- 5 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
- 6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
- 7 RECOMMENDATION

## APPENDICES:

- 1. Appendix 1 – Planning Conditions and Informatives
  - a. Appendix 1A – Listed Building Consent Conditions – Hornsey Library
  - b. Appendix 1B - Listed Building Consent Conditions – Town Hall
  - c. Appendix 1C - Listed Building Consent Conditions – Broadway Annex
- 2. Appendix 2 – Quality Review Panel Comments 6.11.2017
- 3. Appendix 3 – Development Management Forum – Meeting Summary 10.07.2017
- 4. Appendix 4 – Internal Consultation Responses
- 5. Appendix 5 – External Consultation Responses
- 6. Appendix 6 – Individuals Comments – HGY/2017/2220
  - a. Appendix 6A – Individual Comments – HGY/2017/2221+2222+2223
- 7. Appendix 7 – Local Groups Responses
- 8. Appendix 8 – Councillors Responses
- 9. Appendix 9 – BNP Paribas Viability Review
- 10. Appendix 10 – Neighbour Daylight/Sunlight Assessment BRE
- 11. Appendix 11 – Site Plan
- 12. Appendix 12 – Images of the Existing Site
- 13. Appendix 13 – Plans
- 14. Appendix 14 – Elevations
- 15. Appendix 15 – 3D Images
- 16. Appendix 16 – Listed Building Consent Background

### 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

#### 3.1 Proposed development

3.1.1 The planning application is for the change of use and refurbishment of the Hornsey Town Hall to hotel and community use, food and beverage use, and co-working spaces. The applicant also proposes the change of use of the Broadway Annex building to food and beverage and residential use. New residential development is proposed to the rear of the Town Hall in two blocks and in a mews to the rear of the Broadway Annex. A new landscape design is proposed for the Town Hall Square fronting the Crouch End Broadway. Images of the development are set out in **Appendix 15** for member's reference.

##### *Change of Use and Refurbishment of the Town Hall*

- 3.1.2 The applicant proposes the conversion of the Town Hall to a mixed-use building, comprising café/restaurant use, hotel use, performance space and co-working offices. The total quantum of community use floorspace is 3,162m<sup>2</sup>. Community uses are proposed to be operated on a shared basis with the hotel use, located within the Foyer, the Assembly Hall, the Council Chamber, the Committee Rooms and the Mayor's Parlour. The hotel would comprise 67 rooms and would be primarily located in the east wing of the Town Hall. The total quantum of hotel floorspace is 2,689m<sup>2</sup>.
- 3.1.3 The shared use element of the proposal envisages the hotel operator and community groups using designated areas of the Town Hall at different times. The applicant has appointed an operator to administrate the use of shared space, governed by a legal agreement.
- 3.1.4 The change of use would be accompanied by a comprehensive programme of repair and refurbishment works to the Town Hall. This refurbishment is proposed to be linked by legal agreement to a programme of phased delivery for the new build residential elements of the scheme. The restoration works will include comprehensive repair of brick, stonework, roofs, floors and wall surfaces of the Town Hall. Internal and external doors, decorative metalwork, joinery, ironmongery, and windows will be refurbished and repaired where required.
- 3.1.5 The alterations (beyond repair) to the Town Hall exterior are minimal, however the applicant proposes new doors to the Town Hall lobby and dropping the cill height of the windows to the ground floor of the west wing to form doorways. A 1970s roof extension on the southern side of the East Wing of the Town Hall is proposed to be removed and a symmetrical roof extension (containing hotel floorspace) on the north and south sides of the East Wing erected. A terrace on the north-western roof of the Town Hall is to be used as a bar.

- 3.1.6 Key internal refurbishment include the insertion of lifts and ramps to make the building fully accessible for the public, and the insertion of a mezzanine level in the Assembly Hall. The insertion will provide additional co-working space.

*New Build Development – Blocks A and B*

- 3.1.7 Two new build blocks of residential accommodation to the rear of the Hornsey Town Hall are proposed. These are to be located south of the East Wing (Block B – 7 storeys) and along the eastern plotline of the site (Block A – Part 6/Part 7 storeys). Block A will contain 82 units and Block B will contain 39 units. These blocks are to be constructed of brick and stone materials with decorative balustrading. The development is proposed to contain 45 underground car parking spaces.

*Broadway Annex and Mews*

- 3.1.8 The applicant proposes the change of use of eastern ground floor of the Broadway Annex building to food and beverage use, and the upper floors to residential use. A single storey second floor extension to the rear of the building is proposed. The Broadway Annex East will incorporate 4 residential units. The change of use will also be accompanied by a comprehensive refurbishment of the listed building.
- 3.1.9 The western ground floor of the Broadway Annex is not included in the application, and is in restaurant use. The upper floors of the western Broadway Annex are proposed to be converted to residential use. This element of the scheme will contain 11 units of affordable housing.
- 3.1.10 Nine new build residential units are proposed to be erected to the rear of the Broadway Annex in a mews block, with a landscaped area between the mews and the rear of the Broadway Annex building. This new build block will rise to a height of three storeys and is proposed to be brick construction matching existing buildings.

*Public Realm*

- 3.1.11 The applicant proposes improvements to the Town Square including a reconfiguration of the green space and replacement of street furniture with modern alternatives in keeping with the historic setting of the area. The Town Hall square is proposed to be equipped with power points to facilitate public events. The fountain in the Town Square will be refurbished. A new public space open during the day ('Town Hall Gardens') is proposed south of the West Wing of the Town Hall and comprehensive landscaping between the new build blocks and adjoining residential occupiers is proposed throughout the site.

*Demolition*

3.1.12 The Weston Clinic building, a set of garages to the rear of the Hornsey Library and other curtilage walls within the site are proposed to be demolished.

## 3.2 **Site and Surroundings**

3.3 The site is located on the east side of the Crouch End Broadway and is 1.3 Ha in area. The site is irregular shaped and is bounded by Hornsey Library and Haringey Park to the south, and primarily Edwardian residential development to the north and east. It is bounded by Hatherley Gardens, and the Crouch End Broadway and various commercial uses to the west.

3.4 The key buildings on the site are the Hornsey Town Hall, the Weston Clinic Building, and the Broadway Annex building. The Hornsey Town Hall Building is statutory listed Grade II\*. The Broadway Annex building and the library are statutory listed Grade II. The site also contains green space (including the Town Square fronting the Town Hall) and surface car parking.

3.5 The site is located within the Couch End District Centre (CEDC) and Crouch End Conservation Area (CA). The site also lies within the Landmark Viewing Corridor to St. Pauls Cathedral and within its Wider Setting Consultation Area. A locally protected view from Parkland Walk crosses the site. The Town Hall and its environs are well served by the bus network – the site attracts a PTAL rating of 3. Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) CE-A surrounds the site and CPZ CE-B lies to west.

3.6 The site lies within SA48 (Hornsey Town Hall) pursuant to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The site excludes a small allocated area west of the Hornsey Library. The site allocation SA48 promotes “restoration of the existing listed buildings to create a sustainable future use for these buildings which complement Crouch End District Centre, with enabling residential development on the car parking areas.”

3.7 The allocation also notes that planning permission was granted in 2010 - for a refurbishment of the existing Town Hall, with an element of enabling residential development - and that “new uses will be considered by the Council, with the aim of finding a use that benefits the vibrancy and vitality of Crouch End District Centre. Sensitively designed residential development which appropriately enables this refurbishment will be considered”.

3.8 The site lies within an adopted Neighbourhood Forum area pursuant to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. While the Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum (CENF) was approved by the Council on 15th December 2015, a Neighbourhood Plan for the CENF area has not yet been adopted. The Town Hall and Town Hall square are an Asset of Community Value (ACV) pursuant to the Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012.

### 3.9 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- HGY/2010/0500 - Refurbishment and conversion of the Town Hall Building comprising alterations, extension and change of use from B1 (Business) and Sui Generis to a mixed use scheme incorporating: D1, D2, A3 & A4 and retaining existing B1 and Sui Generis uses and new residential development comprising 123 No. units in total (35 x 1 bed flats, 61 x 2 bed flats, 20 x 3 bed flats, 3 x 4 bed flats and 4 x 4 bed houses) and associated car parking at basement level, including residential accommodation in the existing Town hall (East Wing and Link Building), the Broadway Annexe (West Part) and Mews. Granted December 2010. EIA screening requested assessed pursuant to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999 in August 2009. Environmental Impact Assessment not be required.
- HGY/2010/0501 – Listed Building Consent in association with planning consent – granted HGY/2010/0500
- HGY/2010/0502 – Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing buildings in association with planning consent HGY/2010/0500 - granted December 2010.
- HGY/2010/1773 - Variation of condition 3 attached to HGY/2010/0502 to allow the demolition of the 1970's prefabricated block to the rear of Hornsey Town Hall. Granted December 2010.
- In 2013, three section 73 planning applications for minor material amendments to the planning, listed building and conservation area consents (as listed above) were submitted, which sought variations to a number of conditions to these consents, all of which were approved in September 2013, as follows:
  - HGY/2013/0694 – variation of conditions attached to planning permission reference HGY/2010/0500
  - HGY/2013/1384 - variation of conditions attached to conservation area consent reference HGY/2010/0502
  - HGY/2013/1383 – variation of conditions attached to listed building consent reference HGY/2010/0501
- HGY/2017/2009 – Request for Screening Opinion in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Granted - 25/07/2017.

There are additionally a number of historic applications for planning permission and Listed Building Consent in relation to the application site contained in the Council's records, however none are judged to be of relevance to the current proposals.

### 3.10 Consultation and Community Involvement

- 3.11 The applicant has undertaken pre-application public consultation prior to the submission of the application and has sought pre-application guidance. The scheme does not require referral to the Mayor of London on the basis of strategic views, building height or the amount of development proposed. The applicant and officers have met with Historic England during the application process.
- 3.12 The applicant has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Newington dated July 2017. Public exhibitions of the pre-application scheme occurred at the Hornsey Town Hall on 20th May (10am-4pm) and 23rd May (2pm-5pm and 6pm-9pm).
- 3.13 The exhibitions were publicised in local newspapers (The Hampstead and Highgate Express on 11<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> May) and by the delivery of 10,000 leaflets to residential and commercial properties in the vicinity of the site. According to the applicant approximately 540 people attended the pre-application exhibitions.
- 3.14 The scheme has also previously been considered by Haringey's Quality Review Panel (QRP) on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2017 and 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017. The scheme returned for a QRP's Chair's review on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017. The most recent QRP critique is set out in the design section below and attached as **Appendix 2**.
- 3.15 The proposal was presented at a Development Management Forum on 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at the pre-application stage. A summary of responses from the Forum are attached as **Appendix 3**. The scheme was also presented to Planning Sub-Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at the pre-application stage as a 'for information' briefing for members.
- 3.16 The applicant has undertaken individual meetings with various groups, including the following:
- Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust - 28 March 2017 and 28 September 2017
  - Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society - 28 March 2017 and 28 September 2017
  - Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum - 28 March 2017 and 28 September 2017
  - Crouch End Festival - 28 March 2017 and 10 October 2017
  - Friends of Town Hall Green - 16 November 2017
- 3.17 The applicant's appointed community use operator (Time + Space Co) has also undertaken the following engagement:
- Crouch End Festival - 25 October
  - HTH Tours - 25 October
  - Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum - 25 October

- Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust - 25 October
- Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society and representatives from Weston and Haringey Parks Residents' Association - 30 October
- Alan Midgley representing HTH businesses - 1 November
- Crouch End Festival/ Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum/ Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society and representatives from Weston and Haringey Parks Residents' Association - 15 November

## **4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

### Internal

- LBH Carbon Management
- LBH Housing Renewal Service Manager
- LBH Housing Design & Major Projects
- LBH Arboricultural Officer
- LBH Flood and Surface Water
- LBH Economic Regeneration
- LBH Cleansing
- LBH Parks
- LBH Environmental Health - Pollution/Air Quality/Contaminated Land
- LBH Environmental Health - Noise
- LBH Policy
- LBH Conservation Officer
- LBH Emergency Planning and Business Continuity
- LBH Building Control Building
- LBH Transportation Group
- LBH Hornsey Library

### External

- Transport for London
- London Fire Brigade
- Metropolitan Police - Designing Out Crime Officer
- The Theatres Trust
- Natural England
- Thames Water
- Historic England
- Historic England - Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service
- Twentieth Century Society
- Environment Agency
- Friends of the Earth

- Tottenham Civic Society
- YMCA North London
- Friends Of Priory Park
- Friends Of The Parkland Walk
- Hornsey Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum
- Hornsey Vale Community Centre
- Hornsey Town Hall Arts Centre
- Hornsey Town Hall Creative Trust
- Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society
- Hornsey Historical Society
- Catherine West – Member of Parliament for Hornsey & Wood Green
- Crouch End Festival
- CASCH
- Birkbeck Road RA
- Gladwell, Landrock, Cecile Park Action Group
- CASE
- Glasslyn, Montenotte & Tivoli Road RA
- MORRSH
- Haslemere Road Residents Association

A summary of the responses received are below. The full responses from internal consultees are contained in **Appendix 4** and responses from external consultees are contained in **Appendix 5**.

Internal:

1) LBH Economic Development

*No objection to proposal. The Council places great importance on creation of workspace provision and the number and range of job and training opportunities that can be made available to local people. Officers understand that the former Town Hall has largely been vacant or underused in employment terms for many years. The proposed development is likely to generate overall more jobs and a wider range of jobs including entry-level job particularly in the hospitality/catering sector. The potential provision of co-working space - although somewhat limited - is welcomed. New developments should provide ultrafast infrastructure and connections. S106 obligations to address training and skilling issues identified should be included.*

2) Environmental Health - Lead Officer - Pollution

*No objection to proposal. Development should be car-free. Gas CHP is proposed - a condition with respect to emissions from CHP is therefore*

*required. As chimneys / flues are associated with proposed development, a chimney height calculation or emissions dispersal assessments are required. Standard conditions around contaminated land and air quality management should be imposed.*

3) LBH Waste Management

*No objection to proposal. The above planning application has been given a RAG traffic light status of AMBER for waste storage and collection as although it would seem consideration has been made in relation to storage and collection, various points unclear. Issues outstanding with respect to the separation of residential and commercial waste onsite, separation of commercial and residential collection times, receptacle size for food waste. Condition for a Waste Management Plan required.*

4) LBH Carbon Management

*No objection to proposal subject to condition. Decision notice should include a S106 obligation to pay for a shortfall on zero carbon target. Mitigation needed – dynamic thermal model. Standard conditions imposed. The development will achieve BREEAM 2014 Refurbishment (Non-Domestic): Hotel & Community Hall targeting Good rating; (Part 1 & 2), and Home Quality Mark (HQM) for Residential Apartments achieving 3 stars.*

5) LBH Local Lead Flood Authority

*No objection to proposal subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.*

6) LBH Transportation Group

*No objection to proposal. Trip generation assumptions acceptable, however to achieve the proposed modal split, changes will be required to the existing Control Parking Zone (CPZ). S106 Contribution required. Significant resulting increase in the number of bus trips - concerns in relation to the cumulative impacts of trip generation. However subject to S106 contributions, sufficient capacity to accommodate additional trips.*

*0.31 car parking spaces per unit is acceptable subject to car capping - spaces to be allocated by way of a parking management plan. Electric vehicle charging points required by condition. Changes to the highways layout to be secured by a S278 agreement. Design of the scheme on the Broadway needs further input from the engineering team. Taxi rank not required. 24 hours a day access to Town square to be secured by S.106 agreement.*

7) LBH Tree & Nature Conservation Manager

*No objection to proposal. Careful design, installation and Arboricultural supervision will be necessary to ensure trees are protected from unnecessary damage. Impact Assessment is sufficient. All works within the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) must be carried out in accordance with submission.*

*If space cannot be found for additional new trees, then provision must be sought to allow for new trees to be planted on public realm outside of the site to maintain local tree cover. A condition must be made that specifies replacement trees are planted for any of the relocated trees that do not survive the transplanting process and fail to survive 5 years after re-planting. Other standard tree conditions required.*

*Current development proposal could be permitted on the condition all the important trees specified for retention are robustly protected and all works within the RPAs are undertaken as specified in the AIA and MS.*

Updated Comments 20.10.2017

*The pleached trees proposed to be planted as they are shown on the drawing differently to all the other existing and relocated trees. Tree Officer satisfied with what is proposed - planting 23 x Pyrus chanticleer trees of a 20-25cm nursery size would provide more than adequate replacements for the trees specified for removal. Offsite tree condition not required.*

8) LBH Principal Conservation Officer

*On balance the proposal would be acceptable. Delivery of the Town Hall phasing and closely tied in with the delivery of the residential development is important and required. This should be agreed legally as part of a Section 106 agreement.*

*On balance, the heritage benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm caused by the increased massing of Blocks A and B on the setting of the Town Hall (II\*) and Library (II) as well as the character and appearance of the Crouch End conservation area. Conditions required in consultation with Historic England.*

*The overall listed building works relating to the repair and conversion of the Town Hall and Broadway Annexe will enhance the significance of the building and not cause any harm to it. Curtilage demolition in vicinity of Hornsey library acceptable.*

9) LBH Environmental Health Officer – Noise

*No objection to proposal. EHO has examined the plans and the Sandy Brown Noise and Vibration Report (Ref 17119-R02-D) dated 28th September 2017 by Richard Deane, submitted in pursuant to the proposed mixed development. A site visit to the proposed development was conducted on the 18th October 2017. There are no objections made in principle to this application however conditions to be imposed.*

External:

10) Natural England

*No objection to proposal. Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes. Natural England has not assessed application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. Local Planning Authority should apply Standing Advice to this application. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Consultation Responses – position unchanged.*

11) Historic England

i) Planning Permission – 1<sup>st</sup> Submission of 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2017

*Proposal for refurbishment of Town Hall well formulated and are acceptable, subject to conditions requiring details of all works as per direction letter No objection to the repositioning of the steps to the theatre foyer subject to condition and suitable design. No objection to the provision of an external terrace and bar over the existing roof area subject to condition and suitable design. The proposed extensions over the east wing at second floor level accord with previous consent – conditions required. HE welcomes partial reinstatement of the original landscaping scheme at the front of the Town Hall, restoration of the circular fountain and the reinstatement of lamp standards.*

*No comment on detailed design of Block A and B however, proposed increase in height to both Blocks A and B, over that originally granted permission will result in harm to the historic environment.*

*The increase in height of Block A will result in this building appearing in a number of local townscape views, and particularly in the context of the suburban Edwardian villas. The proposed building is seen to rise above the general development plane and to visually interfere with the interesting rooflines of those Edwardian villas. The increase in height of Block B will result in this building appearing just above the roofline of the Town Hall in views from The Broadway and therefore interfering with the clean reclarlinear roofline of the Town Hall. The visibility of Block B is*

*further increased due to the use of contrasting materials and colour palate.*

### *Enabling Development*

*2010 scheme was enabling development. In the current planning submission, there is no reference to the scheme being considered as Enabling Development, with the justification for this approach being that the scheme is planning compliant. HE would therefore urge Council to ensure that the scheme is compliant with policies, but also to seek a mechanism that ensures that the delivery/occupation of the new buildings is linked to the phasing and delivery of the Town Hall scheme. If this is not the case, then the relationship between the viability of the Town Hall as a standalone element needs to be questioned. If the Town Hall is not considered to be a viable entity its own right or its viability would be compromised by development at the rear, then there is certainly an argument that could be made for the proposals causing unacceptable harm on viability grounds, in accordance with policy 134 of the NPPF.*

*HE would welcome changes to the scheme to mitigate the harm that we have identified. However, we are aware that the final decision on these planning issues will lie with the Council, as local planning authority, and we would therefore urge the Council to seek changes, where possible, whilst also balancing these potential changes against the heritage benefits that would result from the repair and reuse of the Town Hall, in accordance with policies within the NPPF.*

#### *ii) Planning Permission – Updated Comments of 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017 (Following scheme amendments of 20<sup>th</sup> October 2017)*

*HE has reviewed the amended proposals, which include changes to the height of proposed Block B. HE particularly welcome the reduction in the height of Block B, which should ensure that it is no longer visible in the backdrop setting of the Town Hall when viewed from The Broadway.*

*HE no longer consider the proposals to cause harm to the setting of the Town Hall and the surrounding conservation area in this view and acknowledge that in other views, particularly Winter View 02, the scale of the proposed buildings is similar in nature to the buildings that were previously granted planning permission. It should be noted that the previous permission considered those buildings to comprise 'Enabling Development', thereby securing significant heritage benefits through the repair and reuse of the Town Hall.*

*In accordance with letter of 2nd October 2017, HE continue to urge Council to agree a mechanism to ensure that the delivery/occupation of*

*the new buildings is linked to the phasing and full delivery of the Town Hall scheme, regardless of whether or not the current scheme strictly accords with the definition of 'Enabling Development'.*

iii) Listed Building Consent – Town Hall

*No direction to refuse application. If Council is minded to grant listed building consent, Council is directed by Historic England to attach relevant condition, in addition to any which Council is minded to impose.*

iv) Listed Building Consent – Broadway Annex

*Referral to Historic England not required – not principal demolition Grade II*

v) Listed Building Consent – Hornsey Library

*Referral to Historic England not required – not principal demolition Grade II*

12) Historic England – Archaeological Service

*No objection to proposal. The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest: Crouch End Village Archaeological Priority Area. Advice in regards to archaeology remains unchanged from previous scheme. The archaeological interest should be conserved by attaching a two-stage process of archaeological investigation comprising: first, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation. Historic Building Recording condition which was attached to the previous consented scheme may be waived.*

13) Theatres Trust

*No objection to proposal. The Theatres Trust supports the application. Comments only relate to the theatre/Assembly Hall aspects of the proposal. The Trust has engaged with the design team during both the design development and planning application phases to ensure the proposal respects the building's historic and cultural significance.*

14) 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society

*Objection to the proposal. Comments relate to the works affecting Hornsey Town Hall and its setting. Primary concern related to the dropping of the windows to the south-east elevation of the Town Hall Square and the two extensions to the east wing. More detail required with regards to some of the retained furniture and the re-use. Loss of the ticket office harmful in heritage*

*terms. Proposed roof extension will fundamentally compromise elevation. 'Block B' will cause harm to the setting of the east wing. Little information relating to the proposed management or operation of hotel and community spaces provided. Overall argument that the scheme will outweigh the harm caused through public benefit has not been adequately made.*

15) Environment Agency

*Environment Agency has assessed this application as falling outside statutory remit to comment on and therefore EA has no comments. Site is within a Critical Drainage Area, consult Lead Local Flood Authority.*

16) London Fire and Emergency Management Authority

Initial submission – 13<sup>th</sup> September 2017

*The Brigade is not satisfied with the proposal for firefighting access as compliance with Part B5 of the building regulations is not shown.*

Updated submission – 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017

*The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals for firefighting access. This Authority strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises.*

17) Thames Water

*No objection to proposal. Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, no objection to the above planning application. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. Surface Water disposal to follow The Mayor of London Drainage Hierarchy. Standard conditions provided for imposition.*

18) Transport for London

*No objection to the proposal subject to condition/S106 requirements and additional information. 45 residential car park spaces (including disabled) acceptable. Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) required. Cycle parking provision acceptable subject to further details. Full delivery and serving plan required. Travel Plan condition/S106 required. Events planning required.*

*Concerns about the impact the additional passengers on the bus network in both peak hours. Route W7 is at capacity, particularly towards Finsbury Park Station in the AM peak.*

*A significant proportion of trips would be attributed to route W7 towards Finsbury Park. TfL request a contribution of £475,000 over 5 years as part of the Section 106 agreements. TfL requests a contribution of £15,000 as part of the Section 106 agreement to upgrade the bus stop to meet the needs of the development.*

*Development is likely to create demand for taxis and Private Hire Vehicles (PHVs). The taxi rank would best manage taxi movements. Applicant should work with TfL to explore the possibility of including a taxi rank and pick up/drop off day.*

Updated comments 17.11.2017

*Revised offer of £150,000 for the W7 service (£75,000 per annum for two years) and £15,000 to upgrade bus stop CC are both appropriate contributions and are welcomed. TfL is satisfied and these contributions should be secured in the section 106 agreement. Taxi Rank options outlined. Taxi rank imposition should be pursued by the Council.*

#### 19) Metropolitan Police – Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)

*No objection subject to the imposition of conditions. If Haringey are to consider granting consent a Secure by Design Condition to mitigate the impact and deliver a safer development should be imposed. Concern noted around access routes.*

## **5 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

### 5.1 The following were consulted:

#### First Round of Consultation – August 2017

On 1st August 2017 notification was sent to the following:

- 320 Letters to neighbouring properties
- 10 Letters Residents Association and local groups (as noted above)
- 8 site notices erected close to the site, publicising:
  - an application for Planning Permission (Major Development)
  - development affecting the setting of Crouch End Conservation Area
- 3 site notices erected close to each subject building, publicising
  - An application for Listed Building Consent
- 5 Press Advertisements (placed in Haringey Independent on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017) publicising:
  - an application for Planning Permission (Major Development)

- development affecting the setting of the Crouch End Conservation Area, and
- 3 applications for Listed Building Consent.

### Second and Third Rounds of Consultation

- 5.2 Updates to the application were submitted by the applicant on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2017. On 29<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2017 a second and third round of consultation were undertaken respectively to publicise changes to the proposal. The second and third rounds of consultation replicated the first round of consultation in terms of letters and site notices, and e-mail notification to those who already commented was also sent. Press advertisements as per the above ran in the Haringey Independent on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2017 and on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2017.
- 5.3 Any submission received (from an individual commenter or group) related to material planning or Listed Building Consent matters was considered regardless of the application reference number given.
- 5.4 A number of representations have been received from neighbours, local groups etc. in response to the three rounds of notification and publicity (on all four applications). Given that Officers have committed to accepted responses up to committee, the full number of response supporting, objecting the scheme will be published in an addendum to the committee report prior to committee.
- 5.5 649 responses neighbour responses were received to 21<sup>st</sup> November 2017. A significant majority of these responses object to the proposal. The applicant's agent submitted a petition with 110 pro forma letters of support for the scheme, however because these responses needed the signatures redacted for data protection reasons, they will be attached to an addendum to the committee report prior to 11<sup>th</sup> December 2017.
- 5.6 The full responses from individual comments contained in HGY/2017/2220 made prior to 21st November 2017 are contained in **Appendix 6**. The full responses from individual commenters contained in other reference included HGY/2017/2221/2222 and 2223 made prior to 21st November 2017 are contained in **Appendix 6A**. All responses have been considered equally. The full responses from local groups are contained in **Appendix 7**. Any further responses from Local Groups will be published in an addendum to this report.
- 5.7 The following local groups/societies made representations:
- Weston and Haringey Parks Residents' Association

*Objection to the proposal. Height of new build blocks not in keeping with the area. The heights, proximity, massing and detailed design of Blocks A and B will have a detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings and CE Conservation Area. New build blocks encroach the Town Hall. Insufficient separation distances will lead to daylight/sunlight impacts. Density of the scheme is too high in relation to the Density Matrix. Scheme lacks open space. Additional pressure on public transport and congestion and parking pressure in Crouch. Infrastructure concerns around school places. Loss of existing meanwhile uses in the Town Hall.*

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Objection

*Objection to the proposal. Developer verified views inaccurate. Hotel rooms should not be converted to flats in the future. Height of new build development is excessive. Concerns regarding effect of development on listed buildings. Larger block footprints are inappropriate. Various discussion of 2010 planning permission and daylight/sunlight report. Council should provide an independent assessment of current daylight/sunlight assessment. Density calculations should be reassessed. Concerns around amenity space for mews development. Proposal will give rise to parking impacts in the local area. Cycle parking is insufficient.*

## 3<sup>rd</sup> Objection – Letter to Historic England

*Objection to the proposal. Historic England's view unsound following updates to scheme and re-assessment in relation to Conservation Area. Lack of information as to how Block B will adjoin Town Hall. Visualisations of development prepared by Residents' Association attached.*

- Stroud Green Residents Association

*Objection to the proposal. No objection to principle of Town Hall restoration. Current proposal is unsympathetic to its location. Proposed residential blocks are overbearing and not in keeping with the surrounding conservation area. Impacts to heritage assets. Significant negative impact on daylight and sunlight for neighbouring dwellings.*

*The present Town Hall creates more workspaces for small and start-up businesses. No provision for affordable housing which is contrary to policy. Crouch End not well served by public transport. Proposed 40 parking spaces inadequate. Increase in movement of goods and service vehicles in local residential streets is unacceptable. Infrastructure impacts in terms of local doctors, schools and nurseries, these already being oversubscribed.*

- Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society

*Objection to the proposal. The application should be referred to the Mayor of London. Concerns around viability, hotel use, lack of affordable housing, loss of meanwhile Town Hall uses, residential orientation of proposal, heritage preservation issues.*

- Amnesty International

*No objection to the scheme. No objection to re-location of tree in Town Square commemorating the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the signing of the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Condition to replace the tree in the event of it dies should be included.*

- Friends of the Earth

*Objection to the proposal. Development would achieve only about 44% of the carbon reductions specified in the GLA target. A new development provides an excellent opportunity for state of the art zero carbon building, which can achieve reductions more efficiently than retrofitting.*

*The fact that the developer expects to make a £22.6m profit underlines that there is every reason why the development should incorporate the highest environmental standards. Permission should be denied for any proposal which is not at or very close to the target in the GLA Zero Carbon Policy.*

- Hornsey Historical Society

*Objection to the proposal. Proposals to preserve and restore the Town Hall and to use the indicated areas for community use generally welcomed, however strong reservations about the scale and siting of the enabling development. Submitted plans require additional detail. Residential blocks A & B are out-of-scale with the urban fabric of Crouch End and the Town Hall. Spaces between buildings unacceptable and new build blocks are over height. Daylight sunlight issues to adjoining properties and new units. Large number of single aspect units proposed. Roof additional to Town Hall inappropriate. Submissions of Weston and Haringey Parks Residents' Association reflect the Society's views.*

(Secretary of Society also objected in a personal capacity – This objection is recorded in Appendix 6)

- Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum

*Objection to the proposal. Harm to the setting of Hornsey Town Hall and Hornsey Central Library through excessive scale and massing of the residential blocks, and a failure to preserve or enhance the character and*

*appearance of the Conservation Area. The absence of a detailed presentation of viable future uses for Hornsey Town Hall, and the sustainability of the proposals. Loss of workspace and the change of use from B1 to C1 (HTH), and B1 to C3 (Broadway Annexe). Over-development and excessive density of residential development. Harm to amenity of neighbouring residents through increased height and the positioning of the residential development. Transport and travel planning*

2<sup>nd</sup> Response 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017

*Objection maintained. Issues with Block A remain. More details of phasing and restoration costs required. Location of affordable units unsuitable. More detail on Town Square required.*

Other comments

*Economic Development comments should be withdrawn. Land ownership issues concerning cycle storage racks. Request for a Community Working Group to be established.*

- Crouch End Festival

*Comments restricted to elements of the development that directly affect CEF. Festival should not move to another venue. Square should be designed and planned for flexible use by the community in a variety of ways. Present plan is not flexible and does not take into account the current use by the Festival or everyday use by the community. The amount of grass and hardstanding and where this is positioned is crucial. Likewise seating should be flexible.*

*It is not clear what kind of access by the Town Hall is intended for vehicles with the current plans. Concerns regarding layout of green space, power points and provision for x-mas tree. Cafes and restaurants should enhance the square and not overwhelm it or take up public space. Consultation to date insufficient. The community use and access agreement in its present form is weak in structure.*

- Hornsey Town Hall Traders Association

*Current interim uses should be retained in the Town Hall. Traders currently pay rent. There is a lack of alternative sites for Local Users. Types of interim uses supported by local policy. There is a lack of demand for co-working spaces. Proposal will add to the public transport burden. There is no clear demand for hotel use. Broadway Annex would give rise to poor quality accommodation.*

- Catherine West, MP Hornsey and Wood Green

*Free community use in the HTH is essential, including the outside square and green space area which should not introduce charges for community groups to use.*

*If there is a residential element to the scheme, the Council Planning Dept should negotiate fifty percent genuinely affordable (i.e. at Council rent) homes. (Whilst the Council's current Policy is forty percent on large applications, the percentage should rise to at least fifty percent genuinely affordable on public land). The developer, FEC, has its company based in the Cayman Islands. Whilst this may not be strictly a planning matter, profits from public land should not be offshored in tax havens.*

*74 small businesses employing 130 people are based in HTH. It is essential that FEC and Haringey Council work together to ensure they receive the support they need to remain locally. While the 11 new affordable housing units is a welcome addition to the scheme, this does not approach the Council's 40 per cent policy yet.*

5.8 The following Councillors made representations. The full text of representations is available in **Appendix 8**. An officer summary of the objections is below.

- Councillor Clive Cater

*Limited restoration details of the Town Hall available. Insufficient funds allocated and restoration may run over budget similar to the Alexandra Palace. Disposal was misconceived. Tension between affordable housing and restoration.*

- Councillor Gail Engert

*No affordable or social rented homes have been included in the application, below target and original application. 'Block A' will impact light and views for surrounding residents. Height and scale is not in keeping with conservation area and is generally out of keeping with the low rise buildings in area. Design of the new buildings are not in keeping with the conservation area. More affordable homes required.*

*Clear commitment to public access required. The Green space at the front of the Hall should be retained along with the trees. Access required year round. year round. Parking and public transport and infrastructure impacts.*

Updated Comments

*Block still too high. Affordable housing provision not policy compliant. Council underwrite of affordable housing unacceptable. More public transport needs to be provided. Design still unacceptable.*

- Councillor Pippa Connor

*Site in Conservation Area. Development over height and completely out of keeping with this local area. Privacy concerns noted. Development will block sunlight from surrounding homes, and within the development itself. Zero affordable housing provision unacceptable. The loss of micro businesses should be retained. Further infrastructure assessment required. Questions around the current public green space not resolved.*

- 5.9 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are summarised as follows:

#### *Principle*

- The development will result in the loss of existing meanwhile employment
- There is no identified need for a hotel in the locality

#### *Housing*

- The proposal contains an insufficient level of affordable housing
- The Broadway Annex is an unsuitable location for affordable housing

#### *Infrastructure*

- Additional residents will put pressure on local services including health services, public transport and local schools
- The scheme will result in the loss of existing jobs on the site
- The Community Infrastructure Levy payment will be insufficient to address the impacts of the proposal

#### *Development Design*

- The height and bulk of the new build blocks are out of keeping with existing area.
- The density of the scheme is excessive. Crouch End is a suburban, not an urban location.
- The proposal will harm the listed buildings and the Crouch End Conservation Area
- The scheme represents a gated development
- The new build blocks do not have a sufficient set back from adjoining properties

#### *Local Amenity*

- The scheme will give rise to daylight/sunlight and privacy impacts to adjoining properties
- The proposal will result in additional air pollution in the local area.
- The roof top bar space will impact local amenity in terms of noise
- There is insufficient waste collection and servicing proposed, which will lead to local fly tipping.

#### *Transport*

- The proposal lacks sufficient parking and will add to parking pressure in the local area
- The servicing plans will lead to congestion
- Permit Free development will be insufficient to prevent parking on local roads.
- The proposal will give rise to air quality concerns arising from additional vehicle movements.

#### *Town Hall Refurbishment*

- The refurbishment will result in the loss of the plaques and war memorials and original furniture inside the Town Hall and Broadway Annex.
- The applicant will not maintain the historic features of the building.
- Alterations to right hand wing area of the stage of the Assembly Hall will limit future uses of this area.

#### *Town Square*

- Town Square design has insufficient space for local people to gather.
- There is excessive outdoor seating in the Town Square design and it will be overly commercial
- The Crouch End festival will be unable to use the square.
- The redesigned public area is of poor quality and layout

#### *Community Use*

- The community use element of the scheme is insufficient and the proposal is too oriented toward private use.
- The level of community use will change in the future, with reduced hours and space provided.

5.10 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- The application should be referred to the Mayor of London (Officer comment: the application does not meet the referral criteria set out in the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.)

- The application should be accompanied by an Environmental Statement (Officer comment: the proposal was not judged to meet the thresholds for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) pursuant to relevant regulations.)
- The selection of the applicant's consortium as the preferred bidder following an Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) Competitive Dialogue procurement is prejudicial to the planning process. (Officer comment: planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Any OJEU procurement process is not a material planning consideration.)
- The Council is the owner of the land and Local Councillors should not be the decision makers in respect of the planning decision. (Officer comment: land ownership issues are a civil matter and not material to planning. The Council is not the applicant, and the application does not fall within the scope of Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992)
- The development proposed is a departure from the planning permission granted in 2010 that is referenced in the site allocation. (Officer comment: there is no planning reason why the applicant cannot submit a fresh application. The development capacity attributed to SA48 is indicative and not prescriptive.)
- The applicant intends to convert the hotel to conventional residential use in the future. (Officer comments: Planning sub-committee is only able to consider the scheme submitted, not an alternative scheme.)
- The consultation was insufficient. (Officer comment: the three rounds of statutory consultation following material amendments to the scheme have met or exceeded planning regulatory requirements.)
- The applicant's material amendments to the scheme have prejudiced the planning process. (Officer comment: It is possible for an applicant to submit changes before the proposal is determined in line the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The Local Planning Authority has undertaken two additional rounds of consultation in response to changes submitted.)
- The proposal will impact the value of adjoining properties (Officer comment: adjoining land values are not a material planning issue.)
- The planning documents are too numerous and too complex for the local community to consider. (Officer comment: the Council has placed the submitted application documents in the planning register in line with the Development Management Procedure Order. The applicant has met validation requirements.)
- The housing will be sold to foreign buyers and will have limited availability in the local market. (Officer comment: the sale of market units post planning is not a material planning consideration)
- Development is proposed on land not wholly owned by Council to be leased to the developer (Officer comment: land ownership issues are a civil matter and not material to planning.)

*Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017*

- 5.11 The applicant submitted a request for a Screening Opinion on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017 pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. A Screening Opinion in relation to the proposed development was issued by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017. The proposal was not judged by the LPA to be EIA development. This position was also adopted in 2010 in relation to the previous scheme (HGY/2010/0500).

*The Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012*

- 5.12 An Asset of Community Value (ACV) is land or buildings nominated by a local voluntary or community group and which the Council decides meets the requirements to be listed pursuant to the Regulations. The Hornsey Town Hall and Square were listed as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2015. The listing remains for a period of 5-years.
- 5.13 While notification was given by the Council as land owner that it intended to dispose of the Town Hall in accordance with the Regulations, and consequent notifications of interest were received from the Crouch End Community Arts Festival and Hornsey Town Hall Appreciation Society, no community bid to buy the site emerged during the protected moratorium periods provided for in the Localism Act and relevant regulations. The Town Hall remains on the Council's ACV register.
- 5.14 Members should note that the listing of the site as an ACV does not place any restriction on what an owner can do with a listed property so long as it remains in their ownership. This is because it is planning policy that determines permitted uses for particular sites. The planning implications of the ACV listing are considered in Section 6 below.

## **6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the Planning Application are:

1. Principle of the Development
2. Development Density
3. Dwelling Unit Mix
4. Affordable Housing
5. Development Design
6. Quality of Hotel and Community Use Provision
7. Trees, Landscaping and Open Space
8. Strategic and Local View Corridors
9. Quality of Residential Accommodation
10. Amenity of Adjoining Occupiers
11. Heritage Conservation (including Listed Building Consent matters)
12. Transportation and Highway Safety
13. Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage
14. Energy and Sustainably
15. Basement Development
16. Waste and Servicing
17. Water and Waste Water Supply Capacity
18. Land Contamination
19. Archaeology

### **6.2 Principle of the development**

6.2.1 The NPPF establishes overarching principles of the planning system, including the requirement of the system to “drive and support development” through the local development plan process and supports “approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay”. The NPPF also expresses a “presumption in favour of sustainable development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.”

#### *The Development Plan*

6.2.2 For the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the Local Plan comprises the Strategic Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), Development Management Policies DPD and Site Allocations DPD, alongside the London Plan (2016).

6.2.3 The Strategic Policies DPD sets out the long term vision of how Haringey, and the places within it, should develop by 2026 and sets out the Council’s spatial strategy for achieving that vision. The Site Allocations development plan document (DPD) gives effect to the spatial strategy by allocating sufficient sites to accommodate the development needs. The Local Plan is informed by an

evidence base, including an Urban Characterisation Study (2015) and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update (2013).

- 6.2.4 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, setting out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London over the next 20–25 years. The consolidated London Plan (2016) sets a number of objectives for development through various policies. The policies in the London Plan are accompanied by a suite of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs) that provide further guidance.

#### *Site Allocation*

- 6.2.5 The application site is allocated as per the Site Allocations DPD as SA48-Hornsey Town Hall (excluding a small area northeast of the junction of Haringey Park and Hatherely Gardens). The site allocation promotes the restoration of the existing listed buildings to create a sustainable future use for them which complement the Crouch End District Centre, with enabling residential development on the car parking areas.

- 6.2.6 The site allocation aligns with the 2010 planning permission (HGY/2010/0500) in relation to development capacity. The following site requirements are noted:

- A sustainable new use for the existing listed buildings will be secured.
- The significance of the Town Hall should be the primary consideration when assessing the appropriateness of new enabling development in its setting.
- The site is suitable for mixed use development incorporating a range of town centre uses which should include publicly accessible community type uses within the refurbished town hall building.
- Applicants must consult with Thames Water regarding both wastewater and water supply capacity upon the preparation of a planning application.
- Any development or disposal of the site will need to have regard to the August 2015 determination of the Town Hall and Square as an 'Asset of Community Value',
- The public square and mature trees should be retained and public access maintained

- 6.2.7 The scheme submitted is considered to meet the site requirements as per the assessment in the sections below.

#### *Provision of Hotel Use*

- 6.2.8 London Plan Policy 4.5 supports the growth of London's visitor economy and seeks the improvement in the range and quality of provision, especially in outer London. This policy seeks to achieve 40,000 net additional hotel bedrooms by 2036. Policy DM53 supports hotel provision within existing town centres, subject

to set policy criteria. Policies SP10 and DM41 set out general requirements for development in Haringey's Town Centres.

- 6.2.9 The provision of 67 hotel rooms within the Town Hall will add to the stock of visitor accommodation in outer London and Haringey for which there is an identified need as set out in London Plan Policy 4.5. The scheme does not result in the loss of existing housing in the locality. The applicant has agreed a guest stay length of a maximum of 30 days to be secured in the S106 agreement to ensure the hotel is not permanently occupied.
- 6.2.10 As the assessment in the sections below indicates, the impacts of the hotel on residential amenity and the transportation network are acceptable and the hotel is judged to be of a high quality and accessible. The proposal incorporates suitable ancillary uses and its design is acceptable as per the evaluation below. The proposal is considered to meet the policy criteria for hotel provision set out in Part B of Policy DM 53.
- 6.2.11 The provision of hotel use would add to the vibrancy and vitality of the Crouch End District Centre (CEDC) by widening its role and offer in line with Policy SP10 and meet with the site requirements of SA48. A hotel is a town centre use and the scale of the proposal is considered commensurate with the size, role and function of the CEDC and its catchment. The hotel proposed would accord with the strengths of the CEDC including a comparatively strong night time economy. Hotel provision is acceptable in principle.

#### *Provision of Community Uses*

- 6.2.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities. London Plan Policy 3.16 states that development proposals which provide high quality social infrastructure will be supported.
- 6.2.13 Policy SP16 states the Council will seek to support community organisations to help them to meet their need for specific community facilities, and supports the provision of multi-purpose community facilities. Policy DM49 sets out that proposals for new community facilities will be supported provided they meet specific policy criteria.
- 6.2.14 Policy SP15 specifically identifies Hornsey Town Hall and its associated buildings as a 'cultural quarter' and promotes the creation of an interesting, lively focal point for Crouch End through the creation of an integrated complex of buildings, which promote a viable and vibrant mix of community, cultural, art, leisure, business and residential uses through appropriate development and enabling development. The site allocation (SA48) requires publicly accessible community type uses within the refurbished town hall building.

6.2.15 A community centre within the Town Hall would meet with London Plan and local policy supporting provision. The applicant's proposal incorporates the shared use of spaces within the Town Hall building to allow the hotel operator and local community groups to use designated areas of the Town Hall at different times. This shared use arrangement is proposed to be managed by a separate legal agreement and the applicant has appointed an operator to administrate the shared use element of the proposal.

6.2.16 As per the assessment in the sections below, the provision is considered to meet the policy criteria set out in DM49. The site is considered well located within a town centre and acceptable in transport and amenity terms. The principle of shared use community space is supported in policy terms and provision would meet with the principle of the site allocation to include provision within the refurbished town hall building. Community Use provision is acceptable in principle and will be secured by legal agreement.

#### *Provision of Co-Working Space*

6.2.17 A key priority in Haringey's Sustainable Community Strategy is to ensure economic vitality and prosperity is shared by all. While the application site is not within a designated or non-designated employment area, Policy SP8 supports the Borough-wide provision of B1a/b floorspace as part of mixed-use development on suitable sites, including town centre sites. Policy SP9 also supports small and medium sized businesses that need employment land and space. Policy DM40 seeks to facilitate the renewal and regeneration (including intensification) of existing employment land and floorspace in accessible locations.

6.2.18 Parts of Hornsey Town Hall are being operated on an interim basis by arts group ANA as the Hornsey Town Hall Arts Centre and the west wing of the Town Hall is currently in meanwhile employment use. Officers understand approximately 100 jobs are currently located on the site. However, meanwhile uses were not envisaged to endure on a long term basis, and the site is not considered an employment site. Officers note this is acknowledged in the submissions from the Hornsey Town Hall Traders which states that "as tenants of HTH, we are aware the current use was intended as 'interim' arrangements pending redevelopment of the building."

6.2.19 Notwithstanding this point, the provision of co-working spaces would meet with planning policy objectives seeking an improvement in the intensity and overall quality of employment floorspace in Haringey and the level of employment provided by the hotel and the co-working spaces is judged to be at least commensurate with the level of meanwhile employment generated by the current floorspace, although this employment floorspace it is not currently protected by adopted local policy. The amount of employment floorspace proposed is significantly above the 2010 position.

6.2.20 The Town Hall proposal will allow for a more efficient use of the site and bring redundant or underused areas of the building into employment use. The creation of a mezzanine level insertion to provide co-working space in the Assembly Hall roof would allow new provision on the site.

6.2.21 LBH Economic Development has reviewed the proposal and raises no in principle objection to the provision of co-working space, subject to S106 obligations around IT connectivity and local training opportunities. The provision of co-working space is consistent with the objectives of the Local Plan regarding the provision of suitable employment floorspace and is acceptable in principle.

#### *Provision of Residential Development*

6.2.22 London Plan Policy 3.3 sets a target for the Council to deliver a minimum of 15,019 homes in the period 2015-2025. Policy SP2 states that the Council will maximise the supply of additional housing to meet and exceed its minimum strategic housing requirement.

6.2.23 The Site Allocations DPD identifies and allocates development sites with the capacity to accommodate new homes. The Town Hall site is allocated in the DPD as an appropriate place for residential development (alongside a mix of other uses) and the principle of the provision of new homes on the site is therefore acceptable. The Council also granted planning permission for residential development on the site in 2010. The details of the location, amount and design of proposed new housing is considered in the sections below.

#### *Town Hall and Town Square as an Asset of Community Value*

6.2.24 The Localism Act 2011 introduced the listing of Assets of Community Value (ACV), nominated by community and voluntary bodies, and which are assessed and agreed by the Local Planning Authority and placed on a list. As per the section above, the Town Hall is an Asset of Community Value.

6.2.25 Central Government guidance states that it is for the local authority to decide whether ACV listing is a material consideration for planning purposes. The weight to be given to any material consideration is a matter for the decision-maker, subject to the decision being reasonable and rational in all the circumstances.

6.2.26 Policy DM 49 provides guidance on the assessment of proposals designated as Assets of Community Value. Paragraph 7.18 states that “whilst the designation is important, and indicates the community value placed on a community use, it is not an objective assessment of community value and would be inappropriate to treat the designation as a material consideration. Nevertheless, development proposals which affect a listed ACV are required to consult the local community to ensure that new and enhanced community facilities of all types, best meet

their needs and aspirations. The value of an ACV is assessed objectively on a case-by-case basis”.

#### *ACV Background – Town Hall and Town Square*

- 6.2.27 An application for ACV listing of the Town Hall and Town Square was made by Crouch End Festival (London Community Arts CIC) and Haringey’s Assessment Panel, following review of the application particulars, designated the Town Hall and Town Square on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
- 6.2.28 In forming a view around the merit of the application, the Assessment Panel considered that the Town Hall (including the Town Square) had a current non-ancillary use that would meet with the purposes of Section 88(2) of the Localism Act 2011. The Panel also considered it was realistic to think that there could be a time in the next five years when this use could further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. The ACV tests were therefore met, and the Town Hall (including the Town Square) were consequently listed.
- 6.2.29 It should be noted the primary purpose of ACV listing is to afford the community an opportunity to purchase a listed property, not to prevent otherwise acceptable development from occurring. As per the assessment above, no community bidder has emerged from the ACV process despite notification of disposal. Notwithstanding this point, the site allocation SA48 indicates that any development proposal must have regard to the site’s ACV status.
- 6.2.30 Officers therefore consider the ACV listing should be accorded some weight by the decision maker. Officer assessment indicates the ACV listing would generally weigh in favour of granting planning permission, as the community use element of the development proposal would further the social wellbeing and social interests of the local community, in line with listing objectives enshrined in the Localism Act (and the requirements of the site allocation SA48), for the reasons set out below.
- 6.2.31 The proposal will retain the green space noted by Crouch End Festival’s ACV application (with a revised layout) and officers consider this space would continue to be well-used by local people as a place of recreation and relaxation following refurbishment. The grant of planning permission would not preclude the use of the Town Square by local groups as public access is proposed to be secured by legal agreement. Officers note the applicant’s liaison with the Crouch End Festival during the application process, and that this entity has not lodged a formal objection to the development proposal (with their comments neither objecting to nor supporting the scheme).
- 6.2.32 The grant of planning permission would still allow for the community use of the Town Hall, including for the type of events noted in the listing application. The appointment of an arts operators and the creation of a steering committee to

guide public uses indicates the development proposal is likely to accord with listing objectives around public use and access of space.

6.2.33 Finally, the community use together with the commercial element of the development proposal would ensure the Town Hall makes a contribution to the local economy of the locality in line with planning policy objectives cited in the listing application.

6.2.34 The development would therefore further the social wellbeing and social interests of the local community and allow for the community uses described in the ACV application to continue. This community use proposed is in line with the requirements of the site allocation, which has had regard for the ACV status of the Town Hall and Town Square. The ACV status of the site therefore is of some material weight but weighs in favour of granting planning permission.

#### *Principle of the Development - Summary*

6.2.35 The principle of hotel accommodation is supported given the site allocation and the location of the development in a District Centre. The site is not a non-designated employment site, but will still make an economic contribution to the locality and provide employment. The provision of community use also meets with site allocation requirements and local and London Plan policy requirements around provision. The site is suitable for residential development and the site's status as an Asset of Community Value is material, but weighs in favour of granting planning permission.

#### *Development Density*

6.2.36 London Plan Policy 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential) indicates that a rigorous appreciation of housing density is crucial to realising the optimum potential of sites, but it is only the start of planning housing development, not the end. The reasoned justification to policy states that it is not appropriate to apply the London Plan Density Matrix mechanistically - its density ranges for particular types of locations are broad, enabling account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential.

6.2.37 The gross site area is 1.32 ha. The proportion of non-residential floorspace within the site is 7,239m<sup>2</sup> (as per accommodation schedule Rev2 16.10.2017) which represents 32% of the total floorspace. The applicant has therefore reduced the gross site area by this percentage. (1.32 – 0.42 ha = 0.9ha). The site has a PTAL Rating of 3. The scheme contains 146 units and 405 habitable rooms. The scheme consequently yields a density of **162 units/ha** (146 units/0.9ha) and **450 hr/ha** (405 habitable rooms/0.9ha). The London Plan Density range for an urban site with a PTAL of 3 is 45–175 units/ha and 200–450 hr/ha. The proposed density of the scheme is in line with the London Plan

Density Matrix for both dwellings per hectare and habitable rooms per hectare. The density of the scheme is therefore acceptable.

6.2.38 Quality considerations are particularly important for high density schemes and the quality of the scheme supports the proposed density, as is discussed in the section below.

6.2.39 Officers have had regard for the objections of the Weston and Haringey Park Residents Association and other local groups in coming to a view around density. Officers consider the area of the Town Square should not be excluded from the site area in calculating density. London Plan Policy 3.4 notes that ancillary open spaces should be included in calculations. The Town Square was also included in the site allocation at the plan making stage. The site is not a ‘very large site’ within an Opportunity Area.

6.2.40 The applicant has reduced the site area allowing for the non-residential uses in line with London Plan guidance. The site is judged to be urban, not suburban, as part of the site lies within a District Centre and it is surrounded by a mix of uses and medium building footprints. The density of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable and the scheme optimises the site potential in accordance with the policy cited above.

#### *Dwelling Unit Mix*

6.2.41 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. Strategic Policy SP2 (Housing) and DPD Policy DM11 continue this approach.

6.2.42 The scheme proposes the following unit mix:

No. of bedrooms	No. of units
Studio	9
1 bed units	34
2 bed units	93
3 bed units	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>

6.2.43 The proposed dwelling mix is mostly of 1 and 2 bedroom units however the proposal is considered larger development as per Policy DM11. Haringey’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that within the Borough there are differences in typology, with larger house-based stock tending to be in the West of the Borough and purpose built flats concentrated in the East. Haringey’s Housing Strategy also indicates that market sale schemes should focus on delivering smaller, one and two bedroom units.

6.2.44 The provision of the dwelling mix identified within a large purpose-built primarily market development within the west of the borough is considered to accord with London Plan Policy 3.8 and DPD Policy DM11 and offer a range of housing choice.

#### *Affordable Housing*

6.2.45 The NPPF states that where it is identified that affordable housing is needed, planning policies should be set for meeting this need on site. London Plan Policy 3.11 indicates that Boroughs should set an overall target in LDFs for the amount of affordable housing provision needed over the plan period. The London Plan (2011), Policy 3.12 states that Boroughs should seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes.

6.2.46 The Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing provision when negotiating for proposals of more than 10 dwellings, having regard to Policy SP2 and the target of 40% affordable housing provision. This approach is reflected in DPD Policy DM 13. The affordable housing tenure split in Haringey is typically required to be 40% intermediate accommodation and 60% affordable rented accommodation, in accordance with Policy SP2 and Policy DM13.

6.2.47 The Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) provides guidance to ensure that existing affordable housing policy is as effective as possible. The SPG focuses on affordable housing and viability and includes guidance on the threshold approach to viability appraisals and on viability assessments.

6.2.48 The applicant submitted a Viability Appraisal report (prepared by ULL Property dated July 2017). This statement included a Cost Estimate (prepared by Fulkers) as well as two appraisals using Argus development feasibility software for the current scheme and an Existing Use Values (EUUV) scheme. The developer updated the Cost Estimate following discussion with officers on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2017.

6.2.49 The Council's appointed consultant BNP Paribas (BNPP) undertook a third party review of the applicant's VA (including the updated costs assessment). BNPP concluded the development can viably provide 11 affordable housing units without recourse to grant funding and no subsidy from the Council save for the provision of the 'top up' funding from the Council's right-to-buy receipt.

6.2.50 On the basis of BNPP's assessment, Officers and the applicant have further discussed the issue of affordable housing. The applicants considered the viability position and amended the scheme to provide 11 units of affordable housing. This equates to 8 percent affordable housing by unit and 6% by habitable room.

6.2.51 The affordable housing is proposed to be located within the first and second floors of the Broadway Annex West Building. The tenure of these units is 100% social rented units with the additional Council funding.

6.2.52 While the Council had initially proposed the potential use of land receipt funds to underwrite the 11 affordable housing units, subsequent robust viability negotiations with the developer (as per the above) confirmed this was unnecessary, and the affordable units will be principally funded by the developer. A 'top up' of approximately £250,000 (to be confirmed at the S106 stage) is required to be funded from the Council's right-to-buy receipts in order for these units to be delivered as social rented homes at target rents.

#### *Affordable Housing Tenure Split and Occupier Type*

6.2.53 The affordable housing tenure split in Haringey is typically required to be 40% intermediate accommodation and 60% affordable rented accommodation in accordance with Policy SP2 and Policy DM13. Policy DM13 also states the Council may seek to alter the tenure of affordable provision to be secured on a case-by-case basis.

6.2.54 The current tenure split is 100% social rented. However, given the proposed number of affordable units, and their location within the wider development and in Crouch End (which has higher rates of home ownership than in eastern parts of the borough) the proposed tenure split is judged acceptable and in accordance with the negotiated approach to affordable housing set out in Policy SP2 and DM13.

#### *Affordable Housing Provision and Viability*

6.2.55 As per the assessment above, there are viability constraints with the scheme that reflect the requirements to comprehensively restore the Town Hall in line with the site allocation SA48. In assessing viability, the Council has also taken into account the financial impacts of other planning obligations including transport contributions.

6.2.56 Officers consider the assessment of scheme costs is based on robust evidence which is reflective of market conditions. The assessment of value is in line with industry practice and the profit level is reflective of the risk. The Council's viability consultant is recognised as an industry leader that has provided a robust consideration of the viability issues associated with the scheme. The applicant's viability position is therefore considered acceptable to justify the level of affordable housing provided, and the provision of 11 units of social rented accommodation with the top of funding noted above, is the maximum level of affordable housing that can be delivered on the site.

#### *Viability Review Mechanisms*

6.2.57 The applicant has agreed to the inclusion of a late stage review mechanism in the S106 agreement. This review mechanism will allow for re-consideration of viability matters. In the event the review at 75% completion of the development demonstrates any additional value in the scheme, this additional value is proposed to be split 90/10 to the Council (up to a blended value of £925 per square foot) and split 60/40 to the Council over this level (up to a level to be agreed prior the signing of the S106 agreement, that represents 40% affordable housing). Viability will also be reviewed afresh in the event the permission remains unimplemented for 18 months.

#### *Affordable Housing – Summary*

6.2.58 Following a consideration of viability and other obligations, 11 units of affordable housing representing 8% affordable housing by unit (6% by habitable room) is considered the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing the scheme can viably deliver. The tenure of the affordable housing provision is considered acceptable given the size and location of the affordable units, and the social rented housing will meet an identified need in accordance with the Haringey Housing Strategy. The Council's affordable housing position is protected by the review mechanisms enshrined in the S106 agreement. This provision of affordable housing is therefore considered to be in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12, and Policies SP2 and DM13.

### **6.3 Development Design**

6.3.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan Policy SP11, and Policy DM1. Policy DM1 states that all development must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Further, developments should respect their surroundings by being sympathetic to the prevailing form, scale, materials and architectural detailing. 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.

6.3.2 Policy 3.5 and the Mayor's SPG Housing speak to the flexibility necessary to respond to the constraints and opportunities presented by individual sites. As with all development proposals, implementation of planning policy should take account of the range of policy concerns and physical characteristics bearing on a particular site. The Mayor's SPG Housing states a consideration of site constraints is particularly relevant in and around town centres.

6.3.3 The development primarily consists of a comprehensive refurbishment of the Town Hall Building and Annex Building, and the erecting of new build residential blocks to the rear of the Town Hall and Annex Building. This section considers issue of access and the design of the new build elements of the proposal (Blocks A and B and the Mews Block). The refurbishment of the Town Hall and the

Broadway Annex is considered in detail in the Listed Building Section of this report.

#### *Blocks A and B - Siting and Layout*

- 6.3.4 The applicant proposes a 7 storey new build block (Block B) that is orientated to adjoin the Town Hall to the south of the East Wing. A second mansion-style block separated into pavilions is proposed to align with the eastern plot boundary of the site (Block A).
- 6.3.5 The building layouts are judged to allow for sufficient open space and circulation within the site and the linear orientation of the blocks responds well to existing building volumes. The proposed layout of the new buildings to the rear of the site is considered to minimise the impacts of new development on the open character of the Town Hall Square to the front of the site.
- 6.3.6 The Blocks are of a sufficient setback within the site and their footprints are generally within the previously approved footprints as per the 2010 consent. As per the Transportation Officers comments below, the applicant has submitted a swept path analysis demonstrating vehicle manoeuvrability within the block layouts. The layout of buildings is considered to be acceptable. The impact of the new buildings on the amenity of adjoining occupiers is considered in the sections below.

#### *Building Height and Massing*

- 6.3.7 Policy DM6 states the Council expects building heights to be of an appropriate scale which respond positively to site surroundings, the local context, and the need to achieve a high standard of design in accordance with Policy DM1. The development proposal does not contain any 'Tall Buildings' (as defined by policy as 10 storeys or more) but Block A and Block B are considered to be 'Taller Buildings', defined as those that are two to three storeys higher than the prevailing surrounding building heights.
- 6.3.8 Policy DM5 requires that proposals for taller buildings be justified in urban design terms and should conform to the following general design requirements:
- a) Be of a high standard of architectural quality and design, including a high quality urban realm;
  - b) Protect and preserve existing locally important and London wide strategic views in accordance with Policy DM5; and
  - c) Conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment that would be sensitive to taller buildings (as per DM9).

- 6.3.9 Block A is sub-divided in four pavilion blocks. The north and south pavilion blocks are each 6 storeys with the middle two pavilions blocks each seven storeys. The massing of Block A has been moderated by breaking up the linear form to give an articulated appearance. A stepped roof design to Block A has been retained from the 2010 position. Block A is proposed to rise 68.1 m Above Ordinance Datum (AOD) (as per Plan 2252 Rev 2). While the site levels vary due to the topography of the land, Block A will rise to approximately 22 m from ground level.
- 6.3.10 Block B is seven stories. Block B has twice been reduced in scale during the pre-application and application process. The most recent alterations to the scheme omit roof plant from Block B and reduce individual storey heights to allow a 900mm reduction to that originally submitted with the planning application on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017. Block B is proposed to rise 65.1m AOD (as per Plan PX2251 Rev2), and while site levels vary, Block B will rise to approximately 20m from ground level.
- 6.3.11 While the proposed heights of Block A and Block B rise above the 2010 planning position, each planning application must be considered on its individual merit. While the new build blocks rise above the Town Hall, they are subservient to the Town Hall tower, and the new build blocks will not be visible from the Town Square when viewed from the Crouch End Broadway, a key Crouch End Conservation Area view.
- 6.3.12 While the comments of local residents are noted, there are precedents for taller buildings in the Crouch End area. Haringey's Urban Characterisation Study (2015) notes that Avenue Heights, a modernist 12 storey residential tower with a height of 40m, is one of the tallest building in the locality. This building is approximately 300m from the boundary of the Crouch End District Centre southwest of the application site. This building is located within a wholly residential area.
- 6.3.13 The various 4 and 5 storey Ravensdale Mansion blocks opposite the development site along Haringey Park sit above the highway on raised embankments. Due to the decreasing northward slope of application site, the heights of these existing buildings will generally correspond with proposed building heights and allow the proposed blocks to sit in context along Haringey Park.
- 6.3.14 The articulated massing of Block A is considered acceptable and will limit the built form of the development as it presents along Haringey Park. Block B is a more uniform structure, but is designed to accord with the volumes of the Town Hall complex and will not be visible from Haringey Park or rise above the profile of the Hornsey Library.

- 6.3.15 The heights of Blocks A and B as Taller Buildings are considered to be justified. In coming to this view, officers have had regard for the preservation of London Plan and local views in accordance with Policy DM5(b), as per the assessment in the section below. Officers have also had regard for the comments of the Chair of QRP in coming to this view. While the QRP Chair notes that the amended scheme “represent(s) the absolute maximum that the site will support” the panel does not object to the height of the scheme as reduced provided that high quality design is incorporated, in line with the local policy approach. Officers note the Panel has offered broad support for the proposal pending resolution of outstanding design issues, which are proposed to be the subject of additional planning conditions.
- 6.3.16 The proposal is judged to be of a high standard of architectural quality in line with Policy DM5(a). The blocks are considered to incorporate a high quality pallet of materials that draws from existing heritage structures and the character of the Crouch End Conservation Area. As per QRP comments, alternative 3D renderings of the materials samples will be presented by the applicant at the condition stage. The massing of the buildings is stepped back to moderate the impact of their height and buildings are judged to be well detailed. The wider development will improve the urban realm with a refurbishment of the Town Square and high quality landscaping.
- 6.3.17 The proposal also conserves the significance of heritage assets as per Policies DM5c and DM9. While it is acknowledged as per the assessment below that some planning harm to historic assets arises (as per the comments of the Principal Conservation Officer and Historic England) this harm is less than substantial, and justified when balanced against the benefits to the wider historic environment, which enables a comprehensive restoration of a ‘At Risk’ asset. There are also other public benefits to the proposal including the provision of housing (8 percent of which is affordable), which justifies the less than substantial planning harm arising. On this basis the scheme conserves the significance of heritage assets, and the policy tests set for taller buildings have been met by the applicant.
- 6.3.18 The height and massing of Blocks A and B are therefore considered to be justified and respond positively to the site’s surroundings, the local context, and the need to achieve a high standard of design.

#### *Appearance and Materials*

- 6.3.19 The visual appearance of the new build blocks is proposed to be a blend of materials that incorporates elements of the Town Hall and the Hornsey Library, also drawing from the Crouch End Conservation Area. For Block A, a mix of 75% brick and 25% stone is proposed. The applicant’s use of textures and finishes in keeping with detailing of the Town Hall considered suitable and of a

high quality. The appearance of Block A is considered a significant improvement from the 2010 position in relation to materials.

- 6.3.20 Block B seeks to incorporate precast concrete panels with relief detailing arranged in different combinations to give a more abstract appearance than Block A. Block B seeks to incorporate historic details of the Town Hall in its balustrading. The design and materials appearance of the new build development relate well to the existing site context and its modern heritage and will allow the infill blocks to sit between the two heritage structures built in different eras.
- 6.3.21 Reconstituted stone framing of the windows and balconies is considered to be visually appealing. The blocks are considered to be evenly fenestrated and the predominantly brick façades will provide a textured building envelope which is an appropriate approach in design terms. While the comments of QRP are noted in respect of a calmer approach to materials treatment, the proposed mixture of brick and stone materials for Blocks A and B are considered to be achieve a high standard of design beyond that secured in 2010. Subject to condition that will require full samples of materials and specific product specifications, in addition to 3D rendering of material alternatives, the appearance of Blocks A and B is considered to be acceptable and is in accordance with London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

#### *Roof Addition to Town Hall*

- 6.3.22 The applicant proposes the removal of the 1970s roof extension on the east wing of the Town Hall, replacing the extension to the south of the stair tower; this would be matched with an extension to the north of the stair tower.
- 6.3.23 This extension is not an original feature to the modernist building, but would be constructed of matching brick and is in keeping with the proportions and volumes of the rear of the Town Hall. The proposal would remove the out-of-keeping and visually imbalanced extension.
- 6.3.24 Officers consider the principle of the roof extension to be established and acceptable and the proportions of the extension to be suitable, however given the comments of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society, the materiality of the extension requires further detailed assessment.
- 6.3.25 A condition requiring further details of the roof extension is recommended to be imposed to allow for consultation with Historic England around the visual appearance of the new additions to the Grade II\* structure. Subject to this condition, the roof extension to the Town Hall is considered acceptable.

#### *Site Access*

- 6.3.26 The Design and Access statement sets out the proposed pedestrian and vehicular access arrangements. The key vehicular access to the Town Hall building and the sub-grade parking in Block A will be by way of Haringey Park east of the Hornsey Library. The remaining pedestrian accesses to the Town Hall group are retained, including pedestrian access via the Town Hall square.
- 6.3.27 The access from the public space next to the public toilets into the site at the southwest corner is a positive design feature provided gating details and access times to ensure the privacy of residential terraces along the east side of Hatherley Gardens are secured by the imposition of a planning condition.
- 6.3.28 Officers have had regard for the comments of QRP with respect to the access to Block B. QRP's support for the amended entry sequent to Block B is noted and while QRP has outstanding concerns regarding the legibility of this access officers consider (in light of the broad support offered by QRP Chair for the scheme overall) that the access arrangements to Block B can be address by way of a planning condition.
- 6.3.29 A gated north-south connection from Haringey Park through to Weston Park was initially considered by the developer, however officers considered an open and permeable connection that would allow pedestrian movement at all hours would be preferable in design terms to ensure the site is well integrated into existing urban fabric.
- 6.3.30 The Metropolitan Police Designing out Crime Officer (DOCO) has assessed the access routes for the proposal and considers the main access route across the site north-south requires further clarity given the location to ensure security. A condition requiring a pre-occupation Designing Out Crime Certificate is included in Appendix 1. Subject to this condition, the access the development is considered acceptable. In coming to this view officers have had regard for the submission of objectors noting a conflict between hotel and residential users entering the Town Hall from the Town Square access.
- 6.3.31 Officers note a Hotel Management Plan is required to be submitted, and a common external access for hotel guests and residents accessing Blocks A and B would not give rise to any substantive planning harm subject to appropriate management arrangements.

#### 6.3.32 *Summary – Blocks A and B*

The building footprints are oriented to minimise the impact on the historic setting of the Town Square. The policy requirements for taller buildings have been met by the applicant. Blocks A and B are of a suitable massing and height given the context of the area, and significance of historic assets is preserved. The new build blocks will be constructed of high quality materials and are of a high quality

appearance. A replacement roof extension on the East Wing of the Town Hall is acceptable.

#### *Mews Block*

6.3.33 The mews block is proposed to be a flat roofed, three storey structure that will rise to a height of 55m AOD. While the site levels may vary, the mews block will be approximately 9.2 metres from ground level. The mews block is proposed to be brick built and will incorporate a set back at third storey level facing the dwellings on Weston Park. High level windows at first and second floor level are inserted on the north elevation of the building.

6.3.34 The mews block is considered to sit comfortably in the site context and will create a sense of enclosure between the built form of the Broadway Annex and the area fronting the new building. The orientation of the access to the block away from adjoining residential properties to the north is the correct approach and the layout of the block is considered suitable.

6.3.35 The design is in keeping with the numerous laneway and mews block typologies around Crouch End. The height of the block at three storeys is in keeping with the area. As per the assessment below, a condition around privacy is included to address overlooking impacts. Subject to a condition around material samples, the matching brick design is considered in keeping with the Town Hall and Crouch End Conservation Area. The development design of the Mews Block is in accordance with the design policy cited above.

#### *New Build Development Design – Summary*

6.3.36 The access and layout of the scheme is considered rational and suitable to the context of the site and generally accords with the established planning position. Officers welcome the reduction in the height of Block B. The policy requirements for taller buildings have been met by the applicant and the height and massing of new building blocks is considered to be acceptable.

6.3.37 The visual appearance of the buildings draws from the existing historical context and is considered to be high quality. Details of materials are required by the imposition of a planning condition. The mews block is considered to be high quality design in keeping with the site context. The roof extension to the Town Hall is acceptable subject to condition.

6.3.38 The design of the new build development is acceptable. In coming to this view officers have had regard for the requirements of the site allocation, and consider that the significance of the Town Hall was the primary consideration when assessing the appropriateness of new development in its vicinity. The previous planning permission granted in 2010 has also been considered in addition to the views of adjoining occupiers and consultees. The development achieves a high

standard of design and contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and the Local Plan.

### **Quality of Hotel and Heritage Investment**

- 6.4 The applicant proposes a conventional hotel of 4-stars as would be awarded by Visits England or the Automobile Association (AA). A hotel use within the Town Hall (either a hotel or an apart-hotel which are both within Use Class C1) that is appropriate to the scale of the Crouch End District Centre and incorporates community uses would meet with site allocation (SA48) requirements.
- 6.4.1 A hotel of 4 stars is judged to meet the quality requirements of the Policy DM53 B(d) that indicates that new hotel uses shall provide an adequate standard of amenity for occupants. The amenities, including a restaurant and private courtyard space, adds to the quality of provision. The applicant's consortium includes a specialist hotel operator that has successfully re-developed heritage properties to hotel uses in other parts of London, including in Hammersmith and Fulham. The use of the proposed hotel is sufficiently separated from proposed residential uses (an improvement from the 2010 position) and the hotel element of the scheme is considered to be high quality and meets the policy criteria noted in DM53.

#### *Heritage Investment in the Hornsey Town Hall and Broadway Annex*

- 6.4.2 The applicant proposes a significant restoration and investment in the fabric of the Town Hall to facilitate the provision of the hotel, community and co-working uses within the listed structure. The supporting text to SP15 states that the Council's vision for Hornsey Town Hall, its associated buildings and surrounding area is the creation of an interesting, lively focal point for Crouch End through the creation of an integrated complex of buildings, which promote a viable and vibrant mix of community, cultural, arts, leisure, business and residential uses through appropriate refurbishment and further enabling development.
- 6.4.3 Key to the allocation of the Hornsey Town Hall in the Local Plan (SA48) is restoration of the existing listed buildings to create a sustainable future for them. This is judged to include both a restoration of the "physical fabric" and sustainable new uses for the buildings. This approach accords with London Plan Policy 7.9 which promotes the restoration of buildings at risk and heritage-led regeneration.
- 6.4.4 The applicant has provided a structural condition survey prepared by Bradbrook dated July 2017 that assesses the condition of the listed buildings and seeks to set out the repairs required to the Town Hall and Broadway Annex to bring them up to a reasonable standard to facilitate sustainable uses.

- 6.4.5 The Town Hall is noted as a 'Priority D' property on Historic England's At Risk Register ('Slow Decay'). Nationally, 3.8% of grade I and II\* listed buildings (excluding places of worship) are on the Register. The applicant's survey report notes the Town Hall building is in fair condition but has been poorly maintained over the last 20 years. A significant backlog of repairs exists.
- 6.4.6 The report notes key issues throughout the Town Hall building, including a requirement for flat roof replacement, localised roof steelwork repairs, various settlement issues, external and internal brick repairs, and major plastering works, amongst many other issues that require capital expenditure to secure a future for the building. Similar issues exist for the Broadway Annex, but not to the same scale as the Town Hall.
- 6.4.7 With respect to the Town Hall, the applicant has submitted a costs break down noting the essential works to remove the Town Hall from the At Risk Register. These costs are drawn from the applicant's survey of the building, and total more than £20 million of investment.

Strip out of existing services, asbestos removal, underpinning to the Town Hall, structural stabilisation and crack remedial works, resolving damp issues and removal of defective timbers as well as improving thermal and fire protection measures.	£5,700,000
Allowance for upgrades to existing Statutory supplies (such as Gas, Water, BT) and a new substation.	£500,000
Renewal and significant repairs to the existing roofs, parapets, roof access systems and existing roof lights including a new public roof terrace.	£1,450,000
Refurbishment to the facades including vegetation removal, crack remedial works, and patch repairs where necessary.	£2,350,000
Allowance for new mechanical and electrical installations, including lighting, heating, safety systems, intruder alarm and ventilation systems.	£2,500,000
Allowance to install a new site wide energy centre to provide heating to the Town Hall.	£400,000
Overhaul existing sprung timber floor, wall panels, stage (excl. specialist lighting rigs), and heritage ceiling	£1,700,000

	and chandeliers to the Assembly Hall. Acoustic treatment to improve performance of Assembly Hall.	
6.4.8	Allowance for repairs, refurbishment, and improving acoustic properties of the existing windows. A	£1,200,000
	Allowance to overhaul, refurbish, and relocate legacy furniture back into the Town Hall. t	£300,000
	Allowance for repairs and refurbishment to the existing Council Chamber, Committee Rooms, Mayor's Room. a	£750,000
	Allowance for repairs and refurbishment to the existing Supper Room whilst also providing a new servery. l	150,000
	Miscellaneous repairs and refurbishment to the main entrance, overhaul the existing lifts, primary and secondary staircases, halls, corridors, offices, toilets, and ancillary areas. t	£2,900,000
	Allowance for repairs / renewing the existing site drainage.	£200,000
	<b>Sub-Total for Essential Works to the Town Hall</b>	<b>£20,100,000</b>

ost breakdown notes, the essential works to the Town Hall to bring it to a standard that would allow removal from the Register amount to an investment of more than £20 million. These works accompany a programme of works to facilitate the change the use of the Town Hall to community and hotel use and upgrades to the site drainage and public realm. These 'Fit for Purpose' works represent an additional £5.4 million of inward investment. Alongside the Town Hall, investment to refurbish the Broadway Annex comprising essential and 'fit for purposes' works comprises approximately £3.4 million.

6.4.9 The Council's viability consultant, BNP Paribas has reviewed the applicant's project costs including the cost of refurbishing the Town Hall and considers that given the works required to the existing structures (including listed structures) these costs are appropriate.

6.4.10 Based on the applicant's Design and Access Statement and Heritage Building Report, the proposed restoration of the 1930s historic building fabric of the Town Hall and Broadway Annex (including the spaces of critical significance within the Town Hall) are judged to be high quality and preserves the historic setting of the

buildings. The areas of critical significance will be restored with a minimal intervention.

- 6.4.11 Officers note the view of the Principal Conservation Officer and Historic England that the programme of works to the Town Hall and Broadway Annex is welcomed, and the restoration and the significant inward investment secured is an improvement in relation the 2010 position which will enhance the historic significance of the Town Hall complex.
- 6.4.12 A programme of phasing secured by legal agreement is key to ensuring that other development in the vicinity of the heritage asset is linked to the Town Hall restoration in line with site allocation requirements. The phasing agreement as per the S106 Heads of Terms above, a secures a detailed programme of works linked to the completed unit sales across the site. This phasing is considered to be realistic and fit for purpose, and will allow for the capitalisation of required works.
- 6.4.13 In coming to the view the works to the Town Hall and Broadway Annex are sufficient to secure a sustainable future for the Town Hall buildings in line with the requirement of SA48 and secure the removal of the Town Hall from Historic England's 'At Risk' Register, officers have had regard for the views of Historic England, the Principal Conservation Officer and local groups and residents.
- 6.4.14 Officers have also taken into account the site history and viability constraints identified with previous proposals that may have been insufficiently capitalised to deliver refurbishment works of a comprehensive scale and to a prescribed timetable. Officers consider the phasing schedules will allow progression of the wider scheme to allow capitalisation but safeguard the revitalisation of heritage assets.
- 6.4.15 The development proposal, and the investment to refurbish and repurpose the Town Hall complex, is considered to support the vision articulated in local policy for the Town Hall and the provision of social and cultural venues in the borough. The hotel provision is judged to be of a high quality and policy compliant.
- 6.4.16 The proposed restoration and use of the Town Hall meet the aspirations of London Plan Policy 7.9 which promotes the restoration of buildings at risk. The scheme is considered to draw the required investment to the Town Hall complex that will establish and maintain sustainable communities and economic vitality, and secure a future for the Hornsey Town Hall.

### **Trees, Landscaping and Open Space**

- 6.5 Policy DM20 states that development that protects and enhances Haringey's open spaces will be supported. This policy is informed by Haringey's Open Space and Diversity Study (2013). London Plan Policy 7.5 indicates that

landscape treatment, street furniture and infrastructure of public spaces should be of the highest quality, have a clear purpose, maintain uncluttered spaces and contribute to the easy movement of people.

- 6.5.1 While the wider Crouch End ward has sufficient open space, the application site lies in an area within the ward that is identified as having an open space deficiency. The unpaved portion of the Town Square as well as vegetated area south of the Town Hall (which is not currently accessible to the public) are local green spaces, but are not designated as areas of Strategic Importance of Nature Conservation (SINCs).
- 6.5.2 Policy DM20 states that sites over 1Ha in size which are located in identified areas of open space deficiency should seek to create new publically accessible open space.

#### *Re-design of the Town Hall Square*

- 6.5.3 The applicant proposes the re-landscaping the Town Hall square to a design inspired by the original layout (excluding the road access) which incorporates the same proportion of lawn to hard landscaping as existing. The grassed area would be arranged in a 'comma' shape and frame a turning circle centred on the 1930s fountain, which would be retained in-situ and repaired. Reproduced Victorian-style street lamps, bollards and fencing which are out of character with the Town Square would be removed and replaced by lamps and bollards in a 1930s style design.
- 6.5.4 The areas of hardstanding through the Town Square would be repaved. The mature trees would be retained and the tree planted in 1998 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the signing of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights would be relocated within the lawn of the Town Square. For clarity, this ceremonial tree is not programed to be removed.
- 6.5.5 The Council's Tree Officer has assessed the re-location and considers it to be acceptable. A condition to ensure replanting in consultation with the local chapter of Amnesty International in the event re-location results in the loss of the tree is recommended for imposition.
- 6.5.6 The Design and Access Statement notes the applicant has worked with the Crouch End Festival to test the layout of the Town Hall Square for event use to ensure suitable utility provision. Power points are now incorporated into the design of the greenspace.
- 6.5.7 Ramped access to the Assembly Hall entrance is proposed by extending the existing paving fronting the West Wing of the Town Hall around the building to the access in the east elevation. The provision of ramped access is supported

but high quality Yorkstone paving should be incorporated that respects the character of the Grade II\* listed asset.

- 6.5.8 In coming to a view around ramped access, officers have had regard for the views of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society, however officers consider the external level access to the Assembly Hall entrance can be achieved in a sensitive way that protects the modern character of the Town Square. Officers note Historic England also shares this view, and officers note any materials for the level access extension will be required to be assessed at the condition stage.
- 6.5.9 The provision of flexible outdoor seating is supported in the north and south areas of the square, and will allow for activation of the space and normal pedestrian movement. To ensure the street furniture integrates visually with the historic public realm and the surrounding area, in line with Policy DM8 and Policy DM20, a condition for street furniture management is recommended for imposition.

#### *Trees and Landscaping*

- 6.5.10 Within the wider site it is proposed to remove 10 trees and 2 groups of small trees and shrubs. As per the Tree Officer's Assessment, 3 of the trees to be removed are Category B and 7 are Category C, assessed in accordance with British Standards. All trees programed for removal are within the area to the rear of the Town Hall and Library and are of low/moderate quality and amenity value.
- 6.5.11 All of the Category A trees and the majority of category B trees are to be retained. This includes all those which are of high amenity value, such as T2 (Sycamore) and T3 (Red Chestnut) in the Town Hall square and T5-T7 (Lime x 3) and G21 (Lime x 4) which are located outside, and to the right of the Library on Haringey Park. The Tree Officer notes that planting 23 x Pyrus chanticleer trees of a 20-25cm nursery size would provide more than adequate replacements for the trees specified for removal.
- 6.5.12 Subject to the conditions noted by the Tree Officer in the consultation response, the tree removals, re-locations and re-plants are considered to be acceptable. The applicant will be required to undertake comprehensive tree protection measures prior to the commencement of the works.

#### *Open Space Provision*

- 6.5.13 The applicant proposes a new publicly accessible space ('Town Hall Gardens') to the south of the west wing of the Town Hall that connects Hornsey Town Hall and Hornsey Library. This new public realm is approximately 530m<sup>2</sup> and will be raised to the same level as the ground floor of the Town Hall. This public space will allow for a pedestrian connection from the Town Square to the access point proposed at the northeast corner of the public space west of the Hornsey library.

6.5.14 East of the Town Hall Gardens, at a lower level, a private child play space area serving the residential development is proposed. The development also incorporates the east wing gardens, a landscaped area of approximately 120m<sup>2</sup> north of the access of Block B, and a private hotel garden for guests. This garden would remove a poor quality and visually unappealing wooden infill extension east of the Council Chamber. Additional landscaping for the site is proposed for the residential gardens adjoining Block A and in the areas fronting Block A. Details of this landscaping are proposed to be secured by condition.

#### *Child Playspace*

6.5.15 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.

6.5.16 Based on the Mayor's Playspace SPG and playspace calculator, 17 children are predicted to live in the development, of which 11 would be under the age of 5. Implementation Point 1 of the 'Shaping Neighbourhood: Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012)' indicates that new housing developments that will accommodate 10 children or more are expected to make provision for play and informal recreation on site.

6.5.17 The proposal includes approximately 208m<sup>2</sup> of enclosed play space with provision judged Doorstep playable space and suitable for under-fives. The quantum comfortably exceeds the London Plan minimum of 10m<sup>2</sup> per child and is judged to be of a high quality. The site is less than 800m (taking into account of natural barriers) from Stationer's Park for 11+ provision.

#### *Trees, Landscaping and Open Space – Summary*

6.5.18 Mature trees are retained in line with the Site Allocation (SA48) requirement and public access to the Town Square is maintained. The delivery of a small local garden in an area of deficiency and releasing a local green space to public use weighs in favour of the proposal. The re-design of the Town Square would improve the quality and accessibility of the local environment.

6.5.19 The reconfiguration of the Town Square is supported as there is no net loss of open space or green areas within the site. The re-configuration is comprehensive, sensitive to the historic environment and secures a viable future for the Town Square. The provision of child play space within the scheme is acceptable. The proposal makes an ecological and recreational contribution in an area with an open space deficiency.

#### *Ecology*

- 6.6 London Plan Policy 7.19 indicates that whenever possible development should make a positive contribution to protection enhancement creation and management of biodiversity. Priority is given to sites with ecological designations. Local Plan Policy SP13 states that all development must protect and improve site of biodiversity and nature conservation.
- 6.6.1 The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Phlorum dated July 2017. The assessment notes that the site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory ecological designations. An environmental statement is not required to accompany the application.
- 6.6.2 Natural England has assessed the proposal and raises no objection subject to the application of standing advice. Natural England advises the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes. The applicant has undertaken preliminary surveys with respect to protected species.
- 6.6.3 Based on the results of the preliminary assessment, the proposed buildings are not considered to provide any suitable roosting opportunities for bats and works can be undertaken without any constraints. The results of a reptile survey have been submitted in the course of the application and do not indicate mitigation is required in this area.
- 6.6.4 The issue of the provision of bird and bat boxes, and a bat-sensitive lighting design that are noted in the applicant's submission are able to be addressed by the imposition of planning conditions. The ecological impacts of the development subject to condition are acceptable and in accordance with the policy cited above.

## 6.7 **Strategic and Local View Corridors**

- 6.7.1 London's Strategic Views are defined in and protected by the London Plan, including Policies 7.11 and 7.12. Haringey's Strategic Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM5 set out how the Council will protect the Strategic and Local View Corridors. The London Plan identifies one designated Strategic View with effect on Haringey. This panoramic view originates from Alexandra Palace with a view to St. Paul's cathedral to Central London. The site falls within this view. The site also lies within a locally protected view from Parkland Walk to the Crouch End Valley.
- 6.7.2 The applicant has presented verified views within the updated Design and Access Statement (Rev2) from Alexandra Palace from the Assessment Points noted in the London Plan View Management Framework at 1A.1 and 1A.2. Only Assessment Point 1A.2 is a protected vista within the Framework.

- 6.7.3 The application site redline area is over-sailed by both Wider Setting Consultation Area 1 (WSCA1) and the Landmark Viewing Corridor (LVC) of Assessment Point 1A.2 but does not exceed the Threshold Plane for either. (Referral to the Mayor of London on the basis of strategic views is therefore not required.) The new build Blocks A and B would lie within the WSCA1, north of the LVC for the Protected Vista and the new build development would appear in the middle ground of the wider panorama.
- 6.7.4 The location of the proposed development is judged to preserve the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate the Strategically Important Landmark (the dome and the towers of St. Paul's Cathedral from Alexandra Palace) as required by the Mayor's London View Management Framework SPG, and the impact on the Protected Vista is judged acceptable.
- 6.7.5 With respect to the panorama, the scale of the buildings is judged to preserve the distinction between the lower density residential character of the middle ground and the higher density character of central London in the background. The buildings would sit below the Town Hall Tower, which would be the most visible element of this area of the protected view.
- 6.7.6 Regarding the locally protected linear view from Parkland Walk (from the bridge over St James Lane) to the Crouch End Valley ridge and London landmarks, the new build Blocks A and B will lie south of the ridge visible from this Assessment Point and will sit in the middle ground below the London landmarks. The proposal is judged to generally enhance the viewers' ability to recognise and appreciate the London landmarks being viewed. The new building blocks will be subservient to the Town Hall Tower when viewed from the locally protected view.
- 6.7.7 The impact on strategic and local views is considered to be compliant with the London Plan policy and local policy noted above. In coming to this view, officers have considered the comments of adjoining occupiers with regard to the quality and perspective of views submitted by the applicant.
- 6.7.8 As the applicant's Design and Access Statement notes, the views are verified and the photomontages presented are accurate interpretations of height, location and geometry as well as form and use of materials of the proposed development. Officers consider the submission sufficient to judge the impact to strategic and local views against adopted policy. The development's impacts on Conservation Area views are considered in the heritage section of this report.

## 6.8 **Quality of Residential Accommodation**

- 6.8.1 London Plan Policy 3.5 requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for dwellings in particular to be of sufficient size and quality. Strategic Policy SP2 and Policy DM12 reinforce 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.

- 6.8.2 All of the units in the scheme meet the space standards in the Mayor's Housing SPG and the scheme is considered to provide a high standard of residential accommodation. The internal layout of new build development achieves an efficient floorplan that provides separation from the hotel element of the proposal, an improvement from the 2010 position. The provision of private amenity spaces for the units in Blocks A and B is also an improvement from the previous planning position. All units meet the minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5 metres
- 6.8.3 The only units that do not provide private amenity space are in the Broadway Annex, however officers agree with the applicant's assessment that the physical and heritage constraints of the building do not allow for such provision without damage to the historic environment. These units however are on the Town Square and therefore have immediate access to a large area of public open space, as well as the Town Hall Gardens.
- 6.8.4 All the new build residential units are dual aspect except 3 units on the lower ground floor and 2 units on the ground floor of Block B, which are single aspect. The majority of these units are south facing. 7 units within the Broadway Annex are single aspect. This is due to the constrained nature of the Grade II Listed Building. The number of single aspect units amounts to 8% of the overall total, which is considered acceptable.
- 6.8.5 The number of units per core is acceptable. Block A is divided into two separate cores and Block B comprises a single core. Cores comprise 6 or less units across cores, per floor. Each core is served by a lift. This conforms with Standard 12 of the Mayor's SPG Housing which seeks accessible cores of generally no more than eight units on each floor per core.
- 6.8.6 While some inter-looking between Blocks A and B may occur due to the location of the blocks, the scheme is generally designed with Block B units oriented north-south and Block A units oriented east-west. The new build development is considered to give future occupiers a high degree of privacy. The privacy impacts to adjoining occupiers are considered in the section below.

#### *Quality of Affordable Housing*

- 6.8.7 The proposed housing provision in the Broadway Annex West is considered to be of a high quality for occupiers. Whilst these units do not have private amenity space, they are in close proximity to the communal amenity spaces of the Town Hall Square and proposed Town Hall Gardens. The units are generally south facing with a wide aspect. The units will be required to conform with British Standards for daytime and night time noise, as per the condition recommended from the Environmental Health Officer. The 11 units are social rented dwellings.

6.8.8 The Broadway Annex West building has lift provision and is judged suitable for nominated residents as it has good access to services in accordance with Haringey's Housing Strategy. Mixed used housing fits with the Core Principles of the NPPF and is in accordance with local policy and common in Crouch End, including within the Broadway House building above Barclay's Bank, opposite the site. The access to Broadway Annex building will allow for entry at the rear if the Town Square is programmed with high levels of activity.

*Residential Inclusive Access*

6.8.9 Local Plan Policy SP2 and Policy 3.8 of the London Plan require that all housing units are built with a minimum of 10% wheelchair accessible housing or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

6.8.10 The proposed development provides 14 wheelchair units which meets the 10% requirement in planning policy and the layouts are considered acceptable. As per the Design and Access Statement all the units are contained within Block A. The new build blocks with wheelchair units have lift provision and are appropriately sized.

6.8.11 The wheelchair units are required to be fully compliant with Building Regulations Approved Document M4(3) and all other units are fully compliant with Approved Document M4(2). This requirement is the subject of a planning condition. The provision of Blue Badge parking for wheelchair users meets with Table 6.2 of the London Plan and is located within Block A.

*Daylight/Sunlight Provision to Proposed Units*

6.8.12 The Mayor's Housing SPG states that in relation to daylight and sunlight provision to new development an appropriate degree of flexibility needs to be applied when using Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines. Guidelines should be applied sensitively to higher density development, especially in opportunity areas, town centres, large sites and accessible locations, where BRE advice suggests considering the use of alternative targets.

6.8.13 The applicant has submitted a Daylight/Sunlight Assessment prepared by Pointed Surveys dated July 2017, which has been updated (Rev2) to reflect the alterations to the scheme during the application process.

6.8.14 The applicant's consultant has undertaken an Average Daylight Factor (ADF) assessment of the proposed units. All habitable rooms contained within the lower-ground floor of residential Block B were tested, together with key habitable rooms on the ground floor of residential Block A.

6.8.15 The analysis results show that all rooms meet the recommended ADF targets with the exception of one Living Room located on the lower ground floor of Block B. The consultant's report notes, this room retains an ADF value of 0.98%

(against a target ADF of 1.5%). For the proposed Mews, the ADF results demonstrate that all rooms tested exceed the recommended BRE targets.

- 6.8.16 A single non-compliance is considered to be acceptable in a market unit within the scheme. Officers are in agreement with the applicant's consultant that the levels of daylight within the proposed units are considered acceptable for an urban development project having regard to the suburban basis of the BRE guidance, and the orientation and configuration of the site. The provision of daylight to the new build units created is acceptable.

#### *Ventilation/Extraction*

- 6.8.17 The applicant has submitted a Ventilation/Extraction Statement prepared by Sweco dated July 2017. For Blocks A and B ventilation plant will be provided as part of the residential plant module and will be connected to the shell and core infrastructure. Connections to the façade are proposed to be carried out as part of the fit out work together with the installation of the apartment ventilation. The Mews and Broadway Annex will be ventilated by openable windows. The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the scheme and raises no objection to the above element of the proposal. Ventilation of the units is considered acceptable.

#### *Residential Noise*

- 6.8.18 The applicant has submitted an updated environmental noise survey prepared by Sandy Brown Consultants dated September 2017. This assessment concludes the site is suitable for new residential development given prevailing noise conditions. An initial facade sound insulation assessment has been carried out to determine the required acoustic performance. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has assessed the new residential units in relation to noise and concludes that subject to conditions addressing adherence to British Standards around façade performance, the units will be of a suitable quality with respect to noise transmission.

#### *Residential Water Consumption*

- 6.8.19 The applicant's Water Survey prepared by Sweco dated July 2017 indicates the proposed new build units will meet with London Plan Policy 5.15 water consumption targets for residential schemes of 105 litres or less per head per day.

#### *Fire Safety and Security*

- 6.8.20 Fire safety is not a planning matter and it is usually addressed by Building Regulations. Building Regulations are minimum standards for design and construction for the erection of new buildings and the alterations of existing

buildings. The regulations cover many areas including requirements surrounding structure, fire, sound resistance, ventilation, drainage, conservation of fuel, electrical installations, security and access for disabled people. In light of recent events at Grenfell Tower the following information around fire safety and security is provided.

6.8.21 The development would be required to meet the Building Regulations in force at the time of its construction. The Building Control Body (the Local Authority or an Approved Inspector) would carry out an examination of drawings for the proposed works and carry out site inspections during the course of the work to ensure the works are carried out correctly as far as can be ascertained. As part of the plan checking process a consultation with the Fire Service would also be carried out. On completion of work the Building Control Body will issue a Completion Certificate to confirm that the works comply with the requirement of the Building Regulations.

#### *Provision of sprinklers*

6.8.22 The applicant has confirmed that sprinklers will be included throughout the building in both new build and converted elements. The London Fire and Emergency Management Authority has confirmed in a second consultation letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> October 2017 that they are satisfied with the proposal.

#### *Materials*

6.8.23 When the materials are submitted for the discharge of the materials condition the materials will need to meet the Building Regulations in force at the time and also take account of the current Government Guidance. The highest possible quality of fire resistance will be required.

6.8.24 Exact materials on the elevations of the building have yet to be confirmed. However, the applicant has confirmed the development will be brick built non-combustible materials and the issue of fire safety will be addressed at the Building Regulations stage.

6.8.25 As such, it is considered that the suite of measures proposed for the development, including a sprinkler system and non-combustible materials, is sufficient for the application to be acceptable in terms of its fire safety measures.

#### *Quality of Residential Accommodation – Summary*

6.8.26 The scheme provides high quality residential accommodation that meets London Plan space standards. There are a limited number of single aspect units in the scheme and the units will receive good levels of daylight. The proposal incorporates a policy compliant level of accessible and adaptable units, and blue badge parking is provided.

6.8.27 The units will be protected from noise impacts and will have adequate ventilation. The development will be fire safe. Overall the quality of the proposed housing is considered to be good and will meet with Policy SP2 and SP13, London Plan Policies 3.5 and 3.6 and the Mayor's Housing SPG.

## 6.9 Amenity of Adjoining Occupiers

6.9.1 The London Plan Policy 7.6 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Policy DM1 continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours. The key impacts to adjoining occupiers assessed below are daylight/sunlight issues, outlook and privacy, noise and comings and goings.

### *Daylight/Sunlight – Application of Guidance*

6.9.2 The Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) Housing indicates that BRE guidelines on assessing daylight and sunlight should be applied sensitively to higher density development in London, particularly in central and urban settings, recognising the London Plan's strategic approach to optimise housing output (Policy 3.4) and the need to accommodate additional housing supply in locations with good accessibility suitable for higher density development (Policy 3.3).

6.9.3 Quantitative standards on daylight and sunlight should not be applied rigidly, without carefully considering the location and context and standards experienced in broadly comparable housing typologies in London. The applicant has submitted a revised Daylight/Sunlight assessment dated July 2017 prepared by Point 2 Surveyors.

6.9.4 Officer's note this submission has been the subject of a third party assessment by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) commissioned by local residents. This document was received late in the application process. This document is **Appendix 10**.

6.9.5 The Council has commissioned a third party review of both the applicant's and neighbour's daylight/sunlight documents (and the applicant's response) by an independent consultant (GL Hearn). Officers note the content of the BRE report from residents, however GL Hearn's review confirms the applicant's view that the proposal is acceptable in terms of impacts on neighbouring properties. The Council's third party review is **Appendix 10A**. A consideration of the BRE neighbour report and GL Hearn's report to the assessment follows a summary of the daylight/sunlight impacts.

### *Daylight/Sunlight – Methodology*

- 6.9.6 The impacts of daylight provision to adjoining properties arising from proposed development is considered in the planning process using advisory Building Research Establishment (BRE) criteria. A key measure of the impacts is the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test.
- 6.9.7 In conjunction with the VSC tests, the BRE guidelines and British Standards indicate that the distribution of daylight should be assessed using the No Sky Line (NSL) test. This test separates those areas of a 'working plane' that can receive direct skylight and those that cannot.
- 6.9.8 If following construction of a new development, the no sky line moves so that the area of the existing room, which does receive direct skylight, is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value, this will be noticeable to the occupants and more of the room will appear poorly lit.
- 6.9.9 The BRE Guide recommends that a room with 27% VSC will usually be adequately lit without any special measures, based on a low density suburban model. This may not be appropriate for higher density, urban London locations and the Mayor's Housing SPD notes that guidance should not be applied rigidly to proposals in urban areas for this very reason in that developments in urban areas are of much higher density than developments in more suburban areas.
- 6.9.10 It is considered that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable within a high density urban location. Paragraph 2.3.47 of the Mayor's Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city.
- 6.9.11 The acceptable level of sunlight to adjoining properties is calculated using the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test. 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.
- 6.9.12 BRE guidelines that state in Appendix F that sometimes there may be an extant planning permission for a site but the developer wants to change the design. In assessing the loss of light to existing windows nearby, the local authority may allow the vertical sky component (VSC) and annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) for the permitted scheme to be used as alternate benchmarks.
- 6.9.13 A Sun Hours On Ground (SHOG) assessment considers if existing amenity spaces will receive the levels of sunlight as recommended within the BRE guidelines.

6.9.14 It should also be noted that a number of properties enjoy a significant benefit due to the nature of the site currently and its comparative lack of development, and as such this impacts on their score.

*Daylight Assessment to Adjoining Properties*

6.9.15 The applicant's daylight assessment concludes that the effect of the construction of the proposed development upon the daylight amenity to the majority of the surrounding residential rooms tested is considered to be negligible on the basis that the daylight amenity alterations are fully compliant with BRE guidance. This means that the occupants of these rooms are unlikely to notice any alteration to their levels of daylight amenity.

6.9.16 Overall, the applicant's consultant concludes the proposal will relate well to the neighbouring residential properties. Where there are deviations from BRE guidance in terms of VSC and NSL alterations, these are considered to be minor in nature and acceptable due to the relatively minor alteration in VSC and NSL values in real terms.

6.9.17 The applicant's consultant notes that the following neighbouring properties contain residential accommodation and due to their proximity to the development site, have been assessed in terms of the effects of the proposal on their daylight and sunlight amenity:

- 2 – 10 Hatherley Gardens
- 29 – 31 Haringey Park
- 13 & 14 Haringey Park
- Prime Zone Mews
- 1-3 Rose Place
- 21 – 33 Weston Park
- 5 - 19 Weston Park
- 28 - 44 The Broadway
- 1 - 19 The Broadway

6.9.18 When tested against the existing site conditions, the VSC results demonstrate that 400 out of 423 windows (95%) meet the BRE guideline's recommended levels. For the second daylight test, NSL, the results demonstrate that 257 out of 276 rooms (93%) meet the BRE guideline's recommended levels.

6.9.19 Of the tested properties, the consultant notes that the effect of the construction on the daylight amenity of the following properties is considered to be negligible to minor:

- 36 Broadway
- 1 Rose Place
- Nos. 5, 9 & 11 Weston Park
- 25 & 29 Weston Park
- 13 & 14 Haringey Park

- 29 Haringey Park

6.9.20 However additional consideration was required for windows in the properties below, given the testing results:

- Prime Zone Mews
- 7 Weston Park

6.9.21 With respect to Primezone Mews, the consultant has undertaken additional assessment of 6 ground floor windows and 3 first floor windows. The consultant's ADF results suggests that each ground floor bedroom would continue to meet the daylighting requirement for new development.

6.9.22 There are 3 bedrooms located on first floor that experience a 30% reduction in VSC and ADF when compared to consented levels. The applicant considers the daylight effect to the windows are considered to be minor.

6.9.23 7 Weston Park contains 6 rooms with 6 rear windows with a view of the proposed Mews. When tested against the existing site conditions, 4 out of 6 windows would meet the recommendations of the BRE guidelines. The remaining 2 windows are located on ground floor and the applicant's consultant asserts serve a Morning Room and Kitchen. Both windows incur a 35% reduction in VSC with retained values of 17 and 15 VSC points respectively. The applicant notes these retained levels are considered to be commensurate with windows in a typical urban setting.

6.9.24 The applicant's consultant considers the ground floor windows are partially blinkered by adjoining extensions at nos. 5 & 9 Weston Park, which limit their ability to receive mitigating daylight obliquely. The NSL results demonstrate that around half the ground floor rooms' area would maintain a direct view of sky over the development despite NSL reductions of 38% and 55% respectively.

6.9.25 Officers consider the overall effects to the windows the subject of additional consideration in Prime Zone Mews and 7 Weston Park to be minor. While these are not compliant with BRE criteria, impacts are judged to be acceptable in the London context. This view is in line with the Mayor's Housing SPD which supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely populated areas.

#### *Sunlighting Assessment to Neighbouring Properties*

6.9.26 When tested against the existing site conditions, the APSH results demonstrate that 186 out of 195 predominantly south facing rooms (95%) meet the BRE guidelines around recommended sunlight levels.

6.9.27 The APSH analysis results demonstrate that the effect upon the sunlight amenity of following properties will be negligible on the basis that any recorded APSH alterations that may occur will be fully BRE compliant:

- 1-19 (odd) Broadway
- 28-44 (even) Broadway
- 1 Rose Place
- 9-33 (odd) Weston Park
- Prime Zone Mews - A
- 30 Haringey Park

6.9.28 The applicant has undertaken additional consideration with respect 13 and 14 Haringey Park and the assessment concludes the overall level of sunlight provision despite non-compliance to assessed windows is considered to be negligible to minor. With respect to Prime Zone Mews 5 & 7 Weston Park and the overall sunlight effect to non-compliant windows is considered to be negligible to minor.

*Sun Hours On Ground (SHOG) to Existing Amenity Spaces*

6.9.29 The results of the Sun Hours On Ground (“SHOG”) results demonstrate that the majority of neighbouring amenity spaces would meet the recommendations of the BRE guidelines in that they would experience no change to their SHOG levels or retain over 50% coverage or retain at least 0.8 times former SHOG value. The sunlight effect to these gardens is considered negligible.

6.9.30 There are additional reductions recorded against the rear gardens of nos. 5, 7 & 9 Weston Park and the rear of 13 Haringey Park beyond the levels recommended in the BRE guidelines for March 21, however additional assessment indicates the impacts of non-compliance would be minor.

*Transient Overshadowing Study*

6.9.31 The applicant’s assessment indicates that with respect to the rear gardens of nos. 5, 7 & 9 Weston Park, the transient shadow results demonstrate that the majority of the garden areas will receive direct sunlight throughout the daytime (8am to 7pm) on the 21st June (Summer Solstice). For 13 Haringey Park, the transient results demonstrate that the garden receives direct sunlight to a significant proportion of its area from 7am to 4pm on the 21st June, which the applicant’s consultant considers good in light of the North facing aspect of this garden.

*BRE Neighbour Assessment and Council’s GL Hearn Assessment*

6.9.32 The neighbour report by BRE focuses on properties that could have a loss of daylight and sunlight at 5-9 and 25-29 Weston Park, Prime Zone Mews, and 13 Haringey Park. A brief outline of the BRE report’s assessment followed by the Council’s consultant’s view of these same properties is provided below.

6.9.33 The BRE consultant’s view is that at 5-9 Weston Park, the ground floor rooms at the rear (living rooms and kitchens) would experience sizeable reductions in

daylight, caused by the new mews block. However, GL Hearn, following a review of the windows noted in the consultant's report at 3.2.2 agrees with the applicant's consultant that the daylight/sunlight transgression from BRE criteria at 5 Weston Park is negligible to minor adverse. In terms of overshadowing GL Hearn notes the impacts to be minor to moderate adverse. Likewise, GL Heane notes that daylight and sunlight effects to 7 Weston Park are considered to be minor adverse. Overshadowing is considered to be moderate adverse. The daylight/sunlight impacts to 9 Weston Park is concluded to be negligible to minor adverse. Overshadowing is considered to be moderate adverse.

6.9.34 The neighbour BRE report asserts predicted losses of daylight outside the BRE guidelines to six rooms in 25-29 Weston Park. The BRE report states that losses of light would be worse than for the consented scheme. However, GL Hearn notes only two transgressions. These transgressions occur to two windows serving the ground floor kitchen/diner at 27 Weston Park. However, the room is served by 6 other windows which will comply with the BRE Report guidance. As such the effect on the daylight within the room would be negligible. The overall conclusion by GL Hearn is that for the 25-29 Weston Park the daylight effects are considered to be negligible.

6.9.35 At 13 Haringey Park, the BRE neighbour report notes there would be a substantial loss of daylight (over half their vertical sky component) to two windows in the side elevation although both appear to light rooms with another window in them. This does not accord with the view of GL Hearn (in the report independently commissioned by the Council) which concludes that overall the effect of the Proposed Development on daylight amenity at 13 Haringey Park would be minor adverse.

6.9.36 The neighbour BRE report finally notes the bedrooms at the rear of Prime Zone Mews would have substantial reductions of daylight, losing over half their light in some cases. The report notes the losses are significantly worse than for the consented scheme. GL Hearn's consideration of the impacts of the Prime Zone Mews takes into account the impact of the removal of existing vegetation in addition to the applicant's testing. The report concludes that taking all the identified factors into account at paragraph 3.3.6 GL Hearn considers the effects on Prime Zone Mews B to be moderate adverse.

6.9.37 Officers have therefore considered the neighbour BRE report, but consider that the conclusions of the Council's independent consultant indicate that where there are instances of BRE non-compliance, these would not be severe and the planning harm arising would be localised to a small number of properties adjoining the site and give rise to predominantly minor harm.

#### *Daylight Sunlight/Conclusion*

6.9.38 The applicant's overarching conclusion in daylight/sunlight terms - that the significant majority of properties tested would continue to receive adequate levels of daylight and sunlight and would receive negligible impacts – is sound. In coming to this view, officers have again noted the Mayor's guidance around the sensitive application of BRE criteria in context and that the site has long been allocated in the local plan for redevelopment. Many properties currently enjoy a significant benefit due to the nature of the current site and its comparative lack of development, and as such the impacts on their dwellings must take this into consideration when forming a view around daylight/sunlight.

6.9.39 Given the overall level of compliance, the current condition of the site and the need to consider the applicability of the BRE guidelines to urban areas the daylight/sunlight impacts to adjoining properties are acceptable and the proposal is in conformity with London Plan Policy 7.6 and Policy DM1 with respect to the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

#### *Privacy and Outlook*

6.9.40 It is acknowledged the scheme will be in close proximity to adjoining occupiers, however the 2010 proposal considered the privacy impacts for buildings with a comparable foot print and officers note planning permission was granted for this scheme. The applicant has submitted a Supplementary Statement on Overlooking and Privacy prepared by Make dated August 2017. Objections to the proposal have made reference to issues of privacy and outlook to adjoining occupiers. The applicants have also submitted a response prepared by Make to the BRE report commissioned by adjoining occupiers addressing overlooking issues.

6.9.41 The statement sets out the impacts where privacy issues may arise. These are identified as:

- No.25 & No.27 Weston Park
- Primezone Mews
- No. 13 Haringey Park
- Nos. 5 to 9 Weston Park (backing onto the proposed Mews building)

The impacts to each property or group of properties is considered below.

#### *No.25 & No.27 Weston Park*

6.9.42 The applicant notes the boundary between the development site and the gardens to the rear of Weston Park is separated by mature trees beyond the site boundary. These trees will provide screening to Block A in season. The set back from the northern face of Block A to the closest rear face of 27 Weston Park is 14m, with the distance to the face of the rear projection of the dwelling is 17m. This is commensurate with the 2010 scheme, but notwithstanding the previous permission, this set back is acceptable in an urban London context.

6.9.43 While there are amenity areas on Level 3 and Level 5 of Block A oriented northbound toward Weston Park (Plan F2003 Rev2, Plan F2005 Rev2) the balustrading is set back on Level 3 and the amenity area set back on Level 5 to minimise overlooking. The Level 3 balustrade setback of approximately 1m is an improvement on the 2010 position. The applicant notes in the privacy statement that two additional existing trees will be relocated within the site to this boundary to provide a further visual barrier. The mitigation in the form of the design setbacks and privacy screening noted above will sufficiently preserve the privacy of adjoining occupiers at 23 and 25 Weston Park. The amenity impacts are acceptable.

#### *Primezone Mews*

6.9.44 Officers have visited the rear of the western block of Prime Zone Mews (No. 23-28) in the course of determining the application and generally are in agreement with the applicant's assessment that the pre-existing boundary wall to the rear of the ground floor dwellings restricts the outlook, and that Block A would not be immediately visible from the eastern facing ground floor windows. The residential gardens created east of Block A would be set below this boundary wall.

6.9.45 The setback distance between the eastern face of Block A to the western elevation of the Prime Zone Mews block at ground floor level is 9m, rising to 12m at first floor level. As per the privacy statement, the applicant proposes to replace the existing trees with a "vertical orchard" of trained fruit trees to mitigate inter-looking between units. This vegetation is proposed to rise to a height above the window level on the first floor of the Prime Zone mews block. The details of this landscaping are proposed to be secured by condition.

6.9.46 While officers acknowledge the setback distances to Prime Zone Mews (itself an urban infill development inserted into an existing residential area) are limited, and that external amenity areas are present on the eastern elevation of Block A, however the mitigation in terms of proposed vegetation (which is an improvement from the 2010 planning permission) and, centrally, the pre-existing boundary treatment at ground floor level will sufficiently preserve the privacy and outlook of adjoining occupiers in the Prime Zone Mews block.

6.9.47 While some inter-looking between the first floor windows in Prime Zone Mews and northern first floor units of Block A may occur despite landscaping treatment, this planning harm is judged to be limited and acceptable in the wider context of the proposal and the site location in urban London. In coming to this view, officers have also had regard for the allocation of the Town Hall site in Haringey's former Unitary Development Plan (H11) as pre-dating the grant of planning consent for Prime Zone Mews. Occupiers would be aware of the status of adjoining land as a development site at the time of purchase. Officers have also

had regard for the 2010 planning permission and the comments of the BRE report commissioned by neighbours.

*No. 13 Haringey Park*

6.9.48 The applicant's privacy statement notes the garage at No. 13 Haringey Park comes up to the boundary wall with the access road, which creates the eastern boundary of the development site. Officers are in general agreement with the applicant's assessment that only two windows are set into the western elevation of this structure and while there are external amenity areas in the units in the eastern elevation of Block A, the outlook and inter-looking impacts, given the setback of approximately 9m and the window placements at No. 13 Haringey Park, are negligible. The impacts on 13 Haringey Park are broadly commensurate to the 2010 consented position. The amenity impacts to 13 Haringey Park are acceptable.

*Nos. 5 to 9 Weston Park*

6.9.49 The applicant's privacy statement notes the proposed mews blocks has been designed without habitable windows facing onto the houses and gardens of Weston Park. The only windows on the north elevation are high level windows in the common corridors for smoke extraction. While the height of the proposed building is higher and has a larger footprint than the demolished mews studio building, the impacts of the 4 mews houses (rising to 3 storeys with the incorporation of onsite car parking) consented in 2010 are broadly commensurate with the outlook impacts of the current proposal. In coming to this view officers have had regard for the comments of the BRE report noting that a view around privacy or inter-looking impacts that have the potential to arise due to the proposed mews block design.

6.9.50 While officers acknowledge the scheme is of an infill nature, its density does not exceed the London Plan Density Matrix and the design seeks to mitigate issues of privacy and outlook. The nature of urban London is such that some impacts to amenity may arise from development, but the planning harm arising is balanced against other benefits of the scheme (as set out in the other sections of this report) and the harm is judged acceptable.

6.9.51 Officers have had regard for the overlooking issues addressed in the BRE report, specifically the potential overlooking arising from the inter-facing windows in the rear of the mews and the potential overlooking from the amenity area of the eastern top floor unit of the mews blocks. Officers note the 2010 position and again consider the impacts to be broadly commensurate, but also consider that a supplementary planning condition proposing mitigation measures for the mews block will address these concerns. Mitigation may include screening and partial obscure glazing where required.

### *Noise Impacts and Comings and Goings*

- 6.9.52 The applicant has submitted an updated noise survey prepared by Sandy Brown Associates dated September 2017. The survey sets out an assessment of construction noise and vibration, as well an assessment of noise breakout from the proposed performance space within the Assembly Hall and the noise effects of plant introduced to the application site. The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the proposal and the survey, and visited the site. He concludes that subject to condition, the operational noise impacts of the development on adjoining occupiers is acceptable. Conditions are recommended to control noise from the assembly hall, installed plant and A4 uses.
- 6.9.53 As per the noise assessment, the impacts of noise breakout from the use of the assembly hall will be mitigated by upgrading of the building fabric and controlled by condition. While the venue on the roof of the Town Hall has the potential to create additional noise and disturbance, this venue will be controlled by condition and will not operate at unsociable hours.
- 6.9.54 In planning terms, while the development will give rise to additional comings and goings to the Town Hall complex, vehicular traffic from the Weston Park access (with its close proximity to adjoining dwellings) will be eliminated. While the introduction of new and converted residential development will give rise to additional comings and goings, the operational residential noise (both pedestrian and vehicular) would not create a level of disturbance over and above that of typical dwellings in close proximity to a District Centre in an urban location. Movement within the scheme is oriented inwards, with residential and service access located to the interior of the development.
- 6.9.55 While the hotel and community use will create both additional vehicular and pedestrian movements, it is noted the resumption of the historic use of the site (including the unrestricted use of the assembly hall [at current levels of insulation] and municipal office function) would not require planning permission and may have commensurate or more severe planning impacts than the proposed position. The level of disturbance is mitigated by the design of the scheme and by the conditions noted above. The operational site noise and increased comings and goings are acceptable given the context of the site and its historic uses, as well as the mitigating effect of conditions and design.

### *Construction Noise*

- 6.9.56 The impacts of construction noise are temporary and are proposed to be controlled by condition. A construction management plan and a construction logistics plan are required to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development. The applicant will also be required to join the Considerate Contractors scheme, with proof of registration provided to the Local Authority. The Local Authority has allocated additional resources to monitoring construction and demolition impacts and will address any breaches of condition through

monitoring. Subject to conditions and monitoring, the impacts of construction noise are acceptable.

### *Air Quality*

- 6.9.57 Policy DM4 and DM23 provide guidance on air quality in relation to development proposals. Policy indicates that development proposals should consider air quality and be designed to improve or mitigate the impact on air quality in the Borough and improve or mitigate the impact on air quality for the occupiers of the building or users of development. Air Quality Assessments will be required for all major developments and other development proposals, where appropriate.
- 6.9.58 Where adequate mitigation is not provided planning permission will be refused. This approach is reflected in the London Plan Policy 7.14 and supported by London Plan SPGs around dust control and sustainable design and construction. Haringey is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).
- 6.9.59 The applicant has submitted an Air Quality Assessment prepared by Sweco dated July 2017. The site is considered suitable for the development proposed in air quality terms, however with respect to the Air Quality Neutral assessment, the results of the comparison to the Building Emissions Benchmark demonstrates that the proposed development leads to emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> which are higher than the emissions benchmark. On this basis additional mitigation may be required to be detailed at the conditions stage.
- 6.9.60 With respect to the impacts on local air quality arising from the development, an assessment has been undertaken by the applicant's consultant. The results show that the forecast concentrations of nitrogen dioxide from road traffic emissions do not exceed the Air Quality Objective at any assessed locations. Also, the assessment of the potential impact from the development shows that the increases in emissions are minimal (<0.1%).
- 6.9.61 The results of the consultant's construction dust assessment conclude that although dust is likely to occur from site activities through demolition and construction, this can be reduced to low risk through the application of appropriate mitigation measures. A construction management plan is therefore proposed to be secured by the imposition of a planning condition.
- 6.9.62 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has assessed the scheme in relation to air quality and raises no objection either for future occupiers or existing occupiers, subject to the imposition of suitable planning conditions. These conditions are noted in Appendix 1. The air quality impacts of the scheme are therefore acceptable.

### *Impacts to Amenity – Summary*

- 6.9.63 The effect of the proposal on the daylight and sunlight amenity to the majority of the surrounding residential properties is acceptable and in general conformity with BRE guidance. Where there are issues of non-compliance, these are considered to be negligible or minor. The site is an infill location that has long been allocated in development plan. Pending third party will confirm technical assessment of daylight/sunlight is correct. The privacy and outlook of adjoining occupiers is generally protected by design and/or mitigation. Where there are instances of planning harm, this harm is judged to be minor and outweighed by other material planning considerations.
- 6.9.64 The additional noise and comings and goings created by the development would be commensurate with an urban London setting. The air quality impacts created by the development are acceptable subject to migration to be secured by condition. Temporary amenity effects of construction will be strictly controlled and monitored by the Local Authority. The impacts to adjoining occupiers are acceptable.
- 6.9.65 In coming to a view on amenity, officers have had regard for the view of the Weston and Haringey Parks Residents' Association, and other local groups and commenters. While the Association makes reference policy distance between facing habitable windows, no current policy stipulates a specific separation distance

## **6.10 Heritage Conservation**

- 6.10.1 The application site lies within the Crouch End Conservation Area and contains the Hornsey Town Hall, a Grade II\* listed building, and the Broadway Annex Building, a Grade II listed building. These buildings form part of a group of civic structures that includes the Hornsey Library (Grade II) and Broadway House (Grade II) which lie outside the redline site area. The Town Hall square is an open space that forms the centre piece of the civic group in the heart of Crouch End Broadway. The listed building consent applications (including the Listed Building Consent application history, Listed Building descriptions from Historic England's register and works to listed building fabric) are set out in **Appendix 16**.
- 6.10.2 The Weston Clinic Building lies to the rear of the Town Hall. This building dates from the early 20th century and is a designed in the neo Georgian style. It is not listed in its own right, but listed by virtue of being within the Curtilage of the Town Hall. An energy centre and garage are also in the curtilage of the Hornsey library, and are therefore listed structures. The applicant has submitted a revised Historic Building Report prepared by Donald Insall Associates dated October 2017.

### *Policy and Legal Background*

- 6.10.3 London Plan Policy 7.8 seeks that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. London Plan Policy 7.9 seek to restore at risk heritage assets through regeneration.
- 6.10.4 Policy SP12 of the Local Plan seeks to maintain the status and character of the borough's conservation areas. Policy DM6 continues this approach and requires proposals affecting conservation areas and statutory listed buildings, to preserve or enhance their historic qualities, recognise and respect their character and appearance and protect their special interest. Policy indicates that heritage assets should be put to viable uses consistent with their conservation, including through the adaptive re-use of vacant historic buildings, reinstating street frontages and historic street patterns, wherever possible.
- 6.10.5 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF states that the LPA should assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the development. Paragraph 131-2 states that the LPA should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and that great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 133 sets out that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.
- 6.10.6 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
- 6.10.7 There is a legal requirement for the protection of the Conservation Area. The Legal Position on the impact on these heritage assets is as follows, Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 provide: *"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."* Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are *"the planning Acts"*.
- 6.10.8 Section 66 of the Act contains a general duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions. Section 66 (1) provides: *"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."*

6.10.9 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) intended that the desirability of preserving 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."

6.10.10 The judgment in the case of 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 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 or a Historic Park, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. The authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area remains a matter for its own planning judgment but subject to giving such harm the appropriate level of weight and consideration. As the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, 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 strong statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

6.10.11 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 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.

## 6.11 *Assessment of Significance*

6.11.1 An identification of the significance of relevant assets is set out below including the Crouch End Conservation Area, The Town Hall, The Broadway Annex and Hornsey Library as well as the Weston Clinic Building.

### *Crouch End Conservation Area*

- 6.11.2 The Crouch End Conservation Area is centred on the Crouch End town centre that includes the Broadway and contains the former Hornsey Town Hall, associated Civic buildings and Hornsey Central Library. The clock tower provides the town centre with a notable and memorable landmark.
- 6.11.3 Crouch End Town Centre forms the retail, commercial and social core of the conservation area. Its street pattern has a very distinctive and broadly consistent late Victorian and early Edwardian character and appearance, interrupted by a few later infill buildings. The urban pattern is that of fine grain two and three storey terraces with shops on the ground floor and either residential or commercial accommodation above. Building materials vary but the most common are red brick with contrasting stone and stucco, often in horizontal stripes, used elaborately.
- 6.11.4 Paragraph 4.3 of the Crouch End Conservation Area Appraisal (Adopted 2010) states “The two notable landmarks that contribute significantly to the identity of Crouch End Town Centre are the tower of the former Town Hall and the Clock Tower. The public square to the west of the former Town Hall is an important, but currently underused, undervalued and poorly designed civic open space in a key position at the centre of The Broadway.”
- 6.11.5 It is clear that the appraisal acknowledged the townscape importance of the civic buildings within its town centre but also highlighted the underused and unkempt nature of the Town Square as well as the rear car park, that detract from the setting of this important group. It could therefore be concluded that the civic buildings including the town hall are significant in their contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, whereas the rear car park and the town hall square are areas that would need enhancement.

#### *Hornsey Town Hall*

- 6.11.6 Hornsey Town Hall was designed by the New Zealand architect R H Uren in 1935. It forms the centre piece of a Civic square flanked by the Gas Board (Broadway House, grade II) and Electricity Board Showroom (Broadway Annexe, grade II). The building was an important influence on others built subsequently.
- 6.11.7 The building is two storeys with an ‘L’ shaped footprint, built in handmade pinkish bricks with stone dressings, flat roofs and stone coped parapets. The narrower wing to the south side has a setback flat roof and both the Assembly Hall and the Council Chambers have hipped tile roofs. A tall rectangular tower marks the junction of the two wings. Interior decoration and furnishing were all custom designed as part of the original conception and much is still preserved.
- 6.11.8 Overall, the building’s significance is high and is derived from the following values as per Historic England’s ‘Conservation Principles, Policies and guidance’:

- **Evidential Value:** High quality surviving interiors of an architectural style and period (high).
- **Historical Value:** Municipal centre of Hornsey from 1935 until 1965 and thereafter a place of local entertainment (high).
- **Aesthetic Value:** High architectural interest as a combination of Internal Modern style and Arts and Crafts with excellent craftsmanship displayed externally and internally. The building became a pioneer of its type in England for years to come (high).
- **Communal Value:** Association with R H Uren and general association with the locals as a place for ceremonies and public events (high)

6.11.9 Despite being an extremely important asset to the borough, the building has been on the Historic England's 'At Risk' Register since 2000. Its condition is described as 'Poor' and there has been a general lack of investment towards the maintenance and upkeep of the building.

#### *Setting of the Hornsey Town Hall*

6.11.10 The building's setting also adds considerably to its significance. The forecourt includes a public square with its original Uren designed circular fountain with the Gas Board (Broadway House, grade II) and Electricity Board Showroom (Broadway Annexe, grade II) flanking either side of it. This forms a distinct centrepiece within the otherwise Victorian and Edwardian town centre.

6.11.11 To the rear, the post-war modernist Library building (grade II) forms another dimension to the Civic setting of the town hall along Haringey Park. Beyond that the residential hinterland characterised by late Victorian and Edwardian terraces forms the wider setting of the building. The immediate setting however is compromised by the tarmac and the now demolished rear annexe building. This was a pre-fabricated porta-cabin block that detracted from the setting of the building. The site now lies empty with a plinth structure still remaining.

6.11.12 The Clinic building is located to the north eastern corner of the site, built in 1932. The building is Edwardian in style with red brick and stone dressings. Whilst not listed in its own right it falls within the curtilage of Town Hall and it is considered to have modest aesthetic significance that contributes positively to the setting of the Town Hall. The building was agreed to be demolished as part of the previous application.

#### *Broadway Annex*

6.11.13 Shortly following the construction of Hornsey Town Hall by the New Zealand architect R H Uren in 1935, additional utilities offices were erected on either side of the Town Hall forecourt. Formerly known as Electricity and Gas Showrooms (Broadway Annexe and Broadway House respectively) these buildings were also constructed in brick with stonework details by Ayers, and formed a pleasing inter-war composition with the Town Hall as its dominant centrepiece.

6.11.14 The building is divided into two sections- the Electricity Supply Showroom (western block) and the Telephone Exchange (eastern block). The west block links to the telephone exchange with a circular foyer, creating a 'knuckle' between the two blocks. Here, its original 1930s finishes remain, as does its main terrazzo staircase beyond.

6.11.15 Overall, the building's significance is medium and is derived from the following values as per Historic England's 'Conservation Principles, Policies and guidance':

- **Evidential Value:** Partly surviving interiors of an architectural style and period (medium).
- **Historical Value:** Associated with the municipal centre of Hornsey from 1935 until 1965 (medium).
- **Aesthetic Value:** Medium interest as forming a group with the Town Hall and of a similar architectural language (medium).
- **Communal Value:** Association with R H Uren and general association with the locals as a civic centre (medium)

6.11.16 The building also forms a group along with the Town Hall and contributes to the significance of the civic square within the conservation area. As such the building also contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

#### *Hornsey Library*

6.11.17 Hornsey Library was designed in 1963-65 by the then borough architects F Ley and G F S Jarvis as a purpose built building. The building is two storeys with a basement, in reinforced concrete with a pre-cast concrete curved wall to the front and brick facings with flat roofs. Windows are double glazed aluminium with polished granite columns.

6.11.18 Overall, the building's significance is medium and is derived from the following values as per Historic England's 'Conservation Principles, Policies and guidance':

- **Evidential Value:**

- a. The library is a fine example of public buildings designed purposely during the post war era (high).
  - b. Its location and grouping with the other civic buildings provides evidence of the growth and settlement of Hornsey as a borough prior to being included within Haringey (high).
  - c. It provides substantial evidence of design and details of the post war modernist architectural style and period (high).
- **Historical Value:**
    - a. Associated with the municipal borough of Hornsey from 1935 until 1965 (medium).
  - **Aesthetic Value:**
    - a. High interest as a purpose built library with attention to detail about user's interface as well as user and visitor experience.
    - b. Post war modernist design with a bold sweeping concave concrete front elevation, granite columns, aluminium frames and darker brick.
  - **Communal Value:**
    - a. Association with Hornsey borough and general association with the locals as a civic building (medium)

## 6.12 *Proposed Development*

6.12.1 The proposed development comprises the demolition of Weston Clinic and curtilage structures around the library, alterations and reuse of the Town Hall, alterations and reuse of the Broadway annex, alternations to the Town Hall square and the erection of new build residential development including the mews building and Blocks A and B.

### *Demolition of the Weston Clinic Building and Library Curtilage Buildings*

6.12.2 The removal of the Weston Clinic building was considered and approved in 2010. The Conservation Officer notes the building currently has modest significance but that removal would enable the comprehensive delivery of a proposed master plan that would include two residential blocks to the rear of the Town Hall. The buildings in the curtilage of the library are of no historic merit.

### *Hornsey Town Hall*

6.12.3 The scheme would entail the conversion of the Town Hall to a mixed-use building, comprising café/restaurants, a hotel, a performance space and co-working offices, with community uses in the principal spaces including the Foyer,

the Assembly Hall, the Council Chamber, the Committee Rooms and the Mayor's Parlour.

6.12.4 As per the Conservation Officer's assessment, there are firstly interventions relating to the permeability and accessibility of the building, including:

- a. Insertion of lifts, ramps and passenger lift. These would benefit future users making the building more accessible. The locations have been chosen carefully in order to cause minimum harm to the fabric of the building. The ramp to the front leading from the square into the Town Hall will allow the uses within the Town hall to spill out to the wider area. Whilst some minor harm would be caused due to loss of some historic fabric, this will be outweighed by the benefits of the new uses and enhanced accessibility.
- b. Dropping cill heights of windows of the ground floor west wing facing the 'square': This scheme proposes to install doors on the dropped cills to facilitate uses and activities between the Town Hall and the Square and connect the West Wing to the public realm. This will lead to some loss of historic fabric and minor alteration to the overall composition of the building.

However, the foundation stone would be retained and the cill height of the end window would be remain as original. This will retain the general symmetry of the elevation. The minor harm would be mitigated by ensuring that the design of the new doors respects the fenestration pattern of the windows and by facilitating the new uses and activities within the west wing.

- c. Provision of doors from the Town Hall Lobby into works space areas: Similar to above, this will facilitate the accessibility of the building without causing harm to the fabric of the building and will be considered as an enhancement.

6.12.5 With regards to the Assembly Hall (with the Town Hall), the proposals include introduction of two new performance spaces with bleacher seating to the rear. The first floor performance space will be accessed from the committee rooms and could also be used as a cinema room for small screenings. This would require a small part of the wall in the committee room corridor to be demolished and a roof light to be raised. Given the improvement on the functionality and accessibility of this space and the limited harm caused to the significance of the building, the proposal would be acceptable. Overall the uses and alteration proposed for the Assembly Hall are considered in keeping with the historic character and aesthetic of the building and would provide a much needed sustainable use for this vast space. The proposals would cause minor harm to the historic fabric but would be considerably outweighed by the repair works and new uses and would be acceptable.

6.12.6 In addition, the condition survey gives further recommendations on the repair of the building such as extensive repairs to the Assembly Hall roof and further

works to the internal fabric of the building in general. This include repair of the 1930s original security grills to the assembly hall entrance. These works are essential for the repair and refurbishment of the Town Hall and do not involve any alterations to the fabric but localised like for like repair works. As such these works are acceptable subject to further details and methodology statement which should be conditioned.

6.12.7 The works also propose upgrading of the original windows with introduction of slimline double glazing or secondary glazing. This is especially required within the Assembly Hall and the Council Chambers to increase the acoustic performance of these spaces and to ensure that any future functions do not disturb neighbours. As such the proposal is acceptable in principle but would need to be further assessed based on additional details and methodology and should be conditioned. From a conservation point of view, preference would be secondary glazing.

6.12.8 The conversion of the eastern wing of the building to a Hotel use is acceptable in principle. The new arrangement of hotel rooms will follow the historic plan form. This is considered to be an improvement on the 2010 approved proposals as it would allow the retention of the original 'corridor' style layout. Whilst the works would require considerable works in terms of repositioning and removal of existing partitions, the overall layout is proposed to remain the same with original joinery, ironmongery and other features to be repaired, reused and reinstated. As such the overall proposal would lead to considerable heritage benefits and would be acceptable.

6.12.9 The scheme also proposes to remove the 1970s extension and replace it with extensions on both sides of the stair well. These extensions are carefully designed for the use of the Hotel. This was also approved in 2010 and therefore is acceptable in principle. The insertion of this roof level extension would cause some harm however, as this would impact the overall architectural composition of the building. It is considered that the removal of the existing temporary roof extension is a considerable heritage benefit that would outweigh the harm. In order to mitigate the harm further, the stepped elevation of the original design should remain distinctly visible and that the new extensions should be built in contrasting materials such as glass or a different coloured brick. This is the subject of a planning condition.

6.12.10 Overall, the scheme is considered to be an improvement on the consented 2010 proposal in the following way:

- a. Greater public access to the building by conversion to a hotel and co-working office than to residential use;
- b. Greater degree of community use, for example to rooms such as the Mayor's Parlour which was not included as part of the consented scheme;

- c. Removal of harmful elements of the consented scheme, such as new balconies subdividing the internal walls of the assembly hall;
- d. Greater degree of restoration of lost features;
- e. A more sensitive approach to retaining plan form and features of interest in the more ordinary 1930s parts of the building;
- f. A more sensitive approach to the public realm fronting the Broadway, including retaining the 1930s fountain in-situ and creating a new scheme inspired by the original design.

6.12.11 It is considered that the scheme is an improvement to that approved in 2010 and that the proposal would enable the sustainable use of the building and its repair that would enhance its significance.

#### *Town Hall Square proposals*

6.12.12 Proposals relating to the Town Hall Square includes the repair of the original fountain designed by Uren and re-landscaping of the area to allow for a greater level of activities in and around the Town Square. These have been designed so that the activities are conducive to the prevailing uses within the town centre and the Broadway. This would enhance the setting of the Town Hall, the listed buildings flanking the square as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.

#### *Residential development*

6.12.13 The proposed new residential development follows on from the previously approved scheme in terms of the layout, footprint and positioning. However, the new Blocks A and B are now taller by at least two storeys and this additional massing has been fully assessed as part of the application from a conservation point of view.

6.12.14 Block A, similar to previous scheme, features four linked pavilions laid out parallel to the site's eastern boundary. The layout allows pedestrian access from Haringey Park and Weston Park, with primary vehicular access from Haringey Park. This enables greater permeability of the site. The architectural form takes its cues from the adjacent residential areas with use of two different types of bricks and pre-cast stone. The details continue on the rest of the site to relate to the rear façade of the Library and Block B. The architectural detailing has been carefully designed taking hints from the Victorian and Edwardian detailing within the wider conservation area. As such the overall architectural language as well as layout is considered to be well thought out and of high quality and would be acceptable in principle.

6.12.15 Unlike the approved scheme, however, the massing of Block A is now increased from four to seven storeys creating a taller element in the central section of the block. At seven storeys, the block is considered to be a 'taller'

building that is likely to dominate the setting the rear of the Town Hall and the Library. The flank elevation of Block A, with the greater height, would be visible from Haringey Park and is likely to compete with the front elevation of the grade II Listed Library. However, given the relatively large and civic scale of the Library and the Town Hall, and the distance from the Block, the impact is considered to be less significant and would not harm the immediate surrounding of these listed buildings.

- 6.12.16 Block A would also be visible from various views within the conservation area that is characterised primarily with two and three storey terraces. Block A essentially introduces a more urban scale within the 'residential hinterland' of the town centre and civic centre of the Broadway. As such, the block's relationship with its immediate surrounding in terms of massing is considered to be poor and would cause harm to the character and significance of the conservation area. The NPPF paragraphs 132-134 require an Authority to "give great weight to the asset's conservation" and to assess the degree of harm as 'substantial' or 'less than substantial'. The NPPG gives further understanding of the two categories and imply that "in determining whether works to a listed building {or heritage assets} constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact "seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest." It further goes on to state that "It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed."
- 6.12.17 The degree of harm has been assessed as per the NPPF and NPPG. The proposed development would not cause total loss of this part of the conservation area's significance or its setting. Although there are material impacts, particularly on the setting of the Conservation Area, the integrity of the special architectural interest is maintained and the impacts do not fall on a key element of the CA. Therefore, the harm has been quantified as 'less than substantial' as per NPPF.
- 6.12.18 Block B, similar to the approved scheme, is located immediately east of the eastern wing of the Town Hall. The rear of the eastern wing of the Town Hall is considered to be less significant than the western part of the rear elevation and as such the positioning of the block at this location is considered to be acceptable in principle. However, at seven storeys, Block B would result in a dominant form of massing that would detract from the immediate setting of both the Town Hall and Library. Following previous concerns raised, the massing of the block, whilst still seven storeys, has been reduced so that it is no longer visible from the front of the Town Hall when viewed from the Broadway. To the rear, the block's close proximity to the Library means that the block will also dominate, and therefore harm, the setting of the Library building. As per paragraph 34 above, the harm has been assessed under NPPF paragraphs 132-134 and as per the NPPG. It is considered that the proposed development will not cause significant adverse impact to a key element of either of the two

buildings or their setting. Therefore, the harm is quantified to less than substantial.

6.12.19 In respect of the wider conservation area, the positioning of Block B is such that its impact would be less than substantial on the character and appearance of the area and would not cause harm to it.

6.12.20 In comparison, it is considered that the increased height of proposed blocks A and B of the scheme would cause greater level of harm than that envisaged in the scheme approved in 2010. On the other hand, the retention of the corridor layout in the southern part of the Town Hall and the lesser degree of interventions in the Assembly Hall and the Town Hall Square are greater heritage benefits in comparison with the approved scheme.

#### *Assessment of Impact*

6.12.21 The Town Hall lost its original use a while ago and has been in meanwhile uses for some time. This has caused slow decay to the interiors of the building especially the most significant spaces such as the Assembly Hall and the Council Chambers. To ensure its sustainable future, innovative new uses that comply with contemporary needs and standards would be required and are likely to require a level of intervention.

6.12.22 Having considered all the works proposed including the details of repair works, it is considered that the overall works relating to the repair and conversion of the Town Hall building are in keeping with its character and significance. Whilst the works would cause minor localised harm, the conversion would unlock the potential of this large building and ensure its long term use. The most significant spaces within the Town Hall will remain in public use and access and would therefore enhance its understanding and appreciation. The hotel use would further ensure the building's sustainable use and allow for the original layout of the eastern wing to be retained. The panelled rooms would be incorporated within the hotel use, allowing for their appreciation and understanding.

6.12.23 It is clear that the primary objective of the proposal is to achieve the refurbishment and conversion of the Town Hall, whilst preserving the significance and setting of this and related buildings; both to secure the future use of the building and to allow for the overdue repair works that would enable the building to be removed from Historic England's 'At Risk' register. The proposal would bring community uses to the building whilst allowing the Hotel to be in commercial use and generate the income to restore and operate the Town Hall.

6.12.24 Overall the conversion and refurbishment programme for the Town Hall is considered to be a major benefit to the Town Hall and would outweigh the minor localised harm caused to the historic fabric of the building. The new uses would

also activate the building and the spaces to the rear and front and would enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The use and restoration would be therefore acceptable from a conservation point of view.

- 6.12.25 In order to achieve this outcome, the scheme has proposed a facilitating residential development to generate capital to achieve the refurbishment works and the enhancement of the public realm. Similar to the approved application, the current scheme proposes to demolish the Clinic building and introduce two new residential blocks to the rear of the Town Hall.
- 6.12.26 The delivery of the new residential block would necessitate the demolition of the Clinic building located at the northern corner. This building is considered to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such, its demolition would cause a modest degree of harm to the heritage assets. It is considered that this harm is inevitable in order to deliver the scheme and as such the harm is justified as per the requirement of NPPF paragraph 132. The heritage benefits of the wider regeneration of the site will outweigh this modest harm (less than substantial as per NPPF 134) and would be acceptable in the instance.
- 6.12.27 Unlike the approved scheme, however, the current scheme proposes a greater quantum of development leading to the higher blocks that are deemed to cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area as well as the setting of the listed buildings. As per the statutory duties and NPPF policies, this harm would need to be balanced against any heritage benefits.
- 6.12.28 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use. This should be read in conjunction with the first part of paragraph 132, which states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, “great weight” should be given to the asset’s conservation. This wording reflects the statutory duty in sections 16 (2), 66(1) and 72(1). Paragraph 132 also states that “Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.”
- 6.12.29 In the Barnwell Manor case, the Court of Appeal held that in enacting section 66(1) (and section 16 (2)), Parliament intended that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration but “considerable importance and weight” when carrying out the balancing exercise. This gives rise to a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for development which would cause harm to the settings of listed buildings. Even where the harm would be “less than substantial”

the balancing exercise cannot ignore the overarching statutory duty imposed by section 66(1) and section 16 (2).

6.12.30 There is no doubt that the refurbishment and conversion of the Town Hall, its increase community use and the enhancement to its setting is a considerable heritage benefit, and one that would enhance the significance of the listed building as well as the conservation area. The redevelopment of the rear and public realm improvements would further enhance the setting of the heritage assets including the grade II listed Haringey Library and the Crouch End Conservation Area. There are also no doubts that both Blocks A and B have been designed carefully with sensitive architectural detailing and high quality materials which would also improve the setting of the heritage assets to a certain degree. However, the scale and massing of the blocks are considered to be 'taller' and not in keeping with the character of the area and are considered to cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6.12.31 Having given "special regard to the desirability of preserving" the setting of the two listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area as per council's statutory duty under sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (as altered); it is concluded that the proposed massing of blocks A and B would not wholly preserve the special character of the heritage assets and would, as set out above, cause less than substantial harm. As per paragraph 132, the applicants have justified this harm on the basis of viability of the uses and the delivery of the whole scheme.

6.12.32 As per NPPF 134, officers have given great weight to the less than substantial harm caused, and assessed the harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use. The heritage benefits owing to the refurbishment of the Town Hall, its sustainable future use, improvement in public realm within the immediate setting and the high quality design of the new development would be considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused by the scale and massing of the development. Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable in heritage terms.

6.12.33 The delivery of the Town Hall is phased and closely tied in with the delivery of the residential development so that appropriate capital required to undertake the works to the Hall can be generated from the sale of the residential blocks. This is to be agreed legally as part of a Section 106 agreement.

#### *Heritage Conclusion*

10.4.64 The Conservation Officer has assessed that there is less substantial harm to designated heritage assets:

- Impact of the Demolition of the Weston Clinic and other curtilage buildings

- Impact of the development on the Town Hall, both the impact of the new build development, and on the re-use and refurbishment of the listed building.
- Impact on the Broadway Annex and on the re-use and refurbishment of the listed building.
- Impact on the setting of the Crouch End Conservation Area.

6.12.34 Subject to the conditions recommended for imposition, the heritage benefits therefore outweigh the less than substantial harm caused by the massing of Blocks A and B on the setting of the Town Hall and Hornsey Library as well as the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area. This view takes into account the views of the Conservation Officer, Historic England and other contributors. This view takes into account the setting of the Town Hall as the primary consideration as per the site allocation (SA48) requirements. The works to the listed building fabric (as set out in Appendix 16) are also acceptable and the listed building consent proposals are acceptable.

6.12.35 This view also considers the wider public benefits of the scheme as per NPPF Paragraph 134. The Conservation Officer notes the historic generation of an at-risk asset and its removal for the Historic England's register, allowing for public access to and greater appreciation of the Town Hall and its modern setting.

6.12.36 Additional public benefits beyond heritage conservation are judged to be substantial and include the provision of housing (including affordable housing) for which there is a need in the locality. The proposal will include economic benefits that will improve the vitality of the Crouch End District Centre and create employment beyond the meanwhile employment currently on site. The proposal secures transportation and public realm improvements and new open spaces.

6.12.37 The scheme therefore makes a significant contribution to the delivery of the Local Plan and the allocated site SA48, which seeks to meet Haringey's strategic aspirations and the wider regeneration of the borough. The heritage conservation impacts of the proposal are acceptable.

### 6.13 **Transportation and Highway Safety**

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 DM Policies DM31 and DM32. The applicant has submitted a Transportation Assessment prepared by TPHS dated July 2017. The Principal Transportation Officer has assessed the proposal.

### *Transport - Site Assessment*

- 6.13.1 The site is located in an area with a Medium Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL 3), the site is served by 6 bus routes (41,91, W3, W5 and W7) which provides good connectivity to Archway Underground and Finsbury Park, bus, rail and underground station.
- 6.13.2 The site has a number of vehicular and pedestrian accesses, with vehicular access via Haringey Park, Western Park and Hatherley Gardens, pedestrian access is also via the above roads and via Crouch End Broadway. The site falls within the Crouch End "A" controlled parking zone (CPZ), which operates Monday to Friday between 10:00am – 12:00 Noon and provides some on-street parking control.
- 6.13.3 The applicant has conducted car parking surveys on Wednesday 28th June and Thursday the 4th July 2017, the results of the surveys concluded that the on street car parking stress was approximately 93% in the surveyed area. The area surrounding the site has been identified as suffering from high car parking pressures.
- 6.13.4 Given the previous planning permission noted, the Council has considered the impacts of the additional trips and parking demand generated by the development proposal and the impact on the local highways and transportation network in relation to the current base situation (parking conditions and traffic on the local network and impact on the local bus routes).
- 6.13.5 In relation to the current scheme and the 8,003sqm of non-residential floor space proposed, the applicant is proposing that the floor spaces will be utilised by four different land uses, hotel, community, employment and café/restaurant use. These four uses and the 146 residential units will form the basis of assessment.

### *Trip Generation*

- 6.13.6 Using sites from the TRCIS trip forecast database, the applicant has generated a demand model that Transport Officers have reviewed. In summary the TA proposes that the development proposal will generate a total of 3,434 persons trips over a day 7am-7pm with 122 in/out persons trip during the Am peak periods and 479in/out persons trip during the PM peak periods.
- 6.13.7 The car mode share is assumed to be low give that car parking spaces will be restricted on site - the Transport Officer considers this to be a reasonable assumption. However, in order to achieve the proposed modal split changes will be required to the existing controlled parking zone, both in relation to the extent of coverage and the operational hours.

6.13.8 The Council therefore requires that applicant to contribute a sum of £60,000 (sixty thousand pounds) towards the consultation and implementation of parking control measure in the local area surrounding the site. This obligation is proposed to be secured by a S106 contribution.

#### *Public Transport Capacity*

6.13.9 The development proposal will result in a significant increase in the number of bus trips. Transport Officers have some concerns in relation to the cumulative impacts of the trip generation from the residential and commercial aspect of the development and the existing background demand during the evening peak, as the TA assumes that only 13.31% of trips will be by bus, given the proximity of the rail and underground station from the development the majority of the rail and underground trips will be use bus, hence the bus modal split could be up to 75.48%, give the potential overlap with the evening peak periods.

6.13.10 Following negotiation with the developer, Transport for London (TfL) is seeking a financial contribution (£150,000 phased over two years) towards providing additional capacity on the W7 bus route. Larger events will have to be supported by shuttle bus service. There will be sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional trips generated by the development. Officers note TfL is also seeking a contribution of £15,000 to address upgrades to the bus shelter in the vicinity of the site. Subject to these contributions, and conditions around travel planning, the impacts to the public transport network are acceptable.

#### *Car Parking*

6.13.11 The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 45 car parking spaces for the 146 residential units which equates to 0.31 car parking spaces per unit. Transport Officers have considered that given the residential development will be car capped the parking proposed is acceptable, The Council will require the car parking spaces to be allocated by way of a parking management plan which allocates parking in order of the following priority:

- 1) Parking for the disabled residential units - 10% of the total number of units proposed (15- wheel chair accessible car parking spaces)
- 2) Family sized units 3+ bed units
- 3) 2 bed 4 four person units
- 4) two bed units
- 5) one bed units and studios.

6.13.12 20% of the total number of car parking spaces must have active electric charging points, with a further 20% passive provision for future conversion, this must be secured by condition, details of which must be submitted for approval before the development is occupied. These requirements are proposed to be

secured by condition. Subject to condition, the level of car parking proposed is acceptable. Officers note TfL raises no objection to the level of car parking proposed. In coming to a view around car parking, officers have had regard to the views of adjoining occupiers, however the Council's policies and the London Plan support the level of capped on site car parking proposed.

### *Cycle Parking*

6.13.13 The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 243 secure shelter cycle parking spaces for the long-term residential cycle parking in Block A (129 cycle parking spaces and Block B (82 cycle parking spaces). The cycle parking will be distributed around the development, within the undercroft of Block A and within the basement of Block B. The number of cycle parking spaces proposed for Block A is compliant.

6.13.14 The cycle parking for the Annex building and the Mews development will be located in the ground floor of the Annex Building and provides a total of 32 cycle parking spaces, the cycle parking provision for the Annex and mew residential developments are in line with the London Plan.

6.13.15 The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 27 long stay commercial cycle parking spaced to the rear of the Town Hall for all the commercial activities, and 63 short stay cycle parking spaces dispersed in and around the new public square. We have considered that subject to detailed design and the above condition the cycle parking provision is acceptable.

### *Alterations to Highways Layout*

6.13.16 The applicant is proposing changes to the highways layout which includes changes to the highways network on Haringey Park including the removal of the crossover, reconstruction of the footways and construction of new vehicular access to the development, new entry treatment on Weston Park, these works will have to be secured by way of the S.278 agreement, the cost of these works have been estimated at £161,731. A breakdown of these works is at the head of this report.

6.13.17 Transport Officers note the design of the scheme on The Broadway will need further input from the Council's engineering team the interface between the private and public highways needs to be clearly defined and the bus stop accessibility measure proposed by TfL incorporated into the final scheme. In addition, currently the space to the front of the Town Hall is accessible to the public and is currently the responsibility of the Council as the Corporate Landlord. The future maintenance and management of the space, as it provides public access 24 hours a day is proposed to be secured by S106 agreement.

### *Taxi Access*

6.13.18 TfL taxi, has requested that a dedicated taxi rank be provide as part of the development proposal, officers have considered that given the constraints of the site and residential nature of the roads surrounding the site, the implementation of a dedicated taxi drop off/ pick up bay is not possible, as it would impact on the bus stop on the Broadway and Hetherley Gardens access should be restricted to disabled car parking access and essential servicing only, given the residential nature of the road. Transport Officers also consider that taxis can drop off and pick up can occur from the Broadway. In coming to this view, officers have considered the views of adjoining occupiers and Transport for London.

### *Transportation – Summary*

6.13.19 The vehicular trip demand generated by the proposal can be accommodated subject to conditions and a contribution to address parking control measures. The impacts of the scheme on the public transportation network are acceptable subject to a contribution to Transport for London for increased bus capacity and updated bus shelter infrastructure. The applicant is required to submit a parking management plan, however the car parking provision of 45 spaces, yielding a ratio of 0.31 spaces per unit is policy compliant. The level of cycle parking and the proposed alternations to the public highway are acceptable. No taxi rank is proposed in the vicinity of the site. Future shuttle bus provision will be address by way of a travel planning condition. The transportation impacts of the development are acceptable.

### **Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage**

6.14 Development proposals must comply with the NPPF and its associated technical guidance around flood risk management. London Plan Policy 5.12 continues this requirement. London Plan Policy 5.13 and Local Policy SP5 expects development to utilize Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). Policy 5.14 requires proposals to ensure adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is available.

6.14.1 DM Policy DM24, 25, and 29 continue the NPPF and London Plan approach to flood risk management and SUDS to ensure that all proposals do not increase the risk of flooding. DM27 seeks to protect and improve the quality of groundwater.

6.14.2 The applicant has submitted an Outline Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Bradbrook dated July 2017. The applicant has also prepared a Wastewater Drainage and SuDS statement also prepared by Bradbrook dated 2017.

6.14.3 The site is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 and within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). The applicant's FRA concludes the site to be at low to medium risk from surface water flooding and the site has a low to negligible risk of flooding from all

other sources. The flood risk assessment and drainage impact assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will not be unduly at risk from flooding. The applicant notes the site comprises permeable surfaces where possible.

- 6.14.4 A condition to secure flood risk mitigation is recommended in Section 8. The Council's Senior Drainage Engineer has assessed the scheme and provides no objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions and additional information. The development is acceptable in Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage terms. The flood risk of basement development is assessed in the section below.

### **Energy and Sustainability**

- 6.15 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).

- 6.15.1 The London Plan sets a target of 25% of the heat and power used in London to be generated through the use of localised decentralised energy systems by 2025. Where an identified future decentralised energy network exists proximate to a site it will be expected that the site is designed so that it can easily be connected to the future network when it is delivered.

- 6.15.2 The applicant has submitted a revised *Energy Strategy and Sustainability Statement* prepared by Sweco dated July 2017. The Council's Carbon Management Team has assessed the proposal. The statement following the London Plan approach and sets out the sustainability approach as per Lean, Clean and Green Energy.

#### *Be Lean*

- 6.15.3 The applicant notes energy efficient servicing strategies and equipment will be used throughout the development to reduce energy demand. Technologies employed include the use of passive and active design features. The applicant notes a comprehensive Building Energy Management System (BMS) will be installed to monitor and report on the overall energy consumption of the building. An efficient heat recovery system and low energy lighting will also be installed at the site. The Carbon Management Team has assessed the carbon reduction and concludes the development will deliver CO2 emissions reductions of the following: Block A: 0.3%, Block B: 3.2%, and the Mews: -0.4%, beyond Building

Regulations (2013). This is across the dwellings, and commercial areas to be constructed.

### *Be Clean*

6.15.4 The energy statement notes that in the absence of an ability to connect to an existing district heating network, it is proposed that a central community heating system with an onsite high efficiency CHP unit with low NOx emissions be installed on the site to serve the base space heating and domestic water demand.

6.15.5 The Carbon Management Team has assessed the carbon reduction and concludes the development will deliver CO2 emissions reductions of the following: Block A: 30.2%, Block B: 32.4%, and the Mews: 32.4%, beyond Building Regulations (2013). This is across the dwellings, and commercial areas to be constructed.

### *Be Green*

6.15.6 The applicant has also made an assessment of various green technologies for installation at the site and concludes that roof mounted photovoltaic (PV) panels are suitable, subject to the provision of additional details. The Carbon Management Team notes the Council has a policy (SP:04) that requires a minimum of 20% reduction in carbon emissions through the use of renewable energy. The London Plan policy 5.7 states “major development proposals should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions through the use of on-site renewable energy generation, where feasible.”

6.15.7 The applicant’s energy statement notes This renewable technology will deliver 61,570 kWh per year of electricity output to the development site, 1.60m<sup>2</sup> area per panel and a total of 258 roof mounted panels for the main building with a panel efficiency of at least 19%.

### *Overheating*

6.15.8 The Carbon Management Team note that with respect to overheating, the current design does not fully meet with the TM49 criteria required in DM21. While the applicant has not provided a mitigation strategy for future weather patterns, it is considered this issue may be addressed by the imposition of a planning condition requiring a dynamic thermal model. Such a condition is included in the section below.

6.15.9 The applicant’s energy statement confirms the development will achieve BREEAM 2014 Refurbishment (Non-Domestic): Hotel & Community Hall targeting Good rating; (Part 1 & 2), and Home Quality Mark (HQM) for Residential Apartments achieving 3 stars.

## *Energy and Sustainability – Summary*

- 6.15.10 The applicant has followed the approach set out in London Plan policy and the proposal incorporates energy efficiency measures and sustainability measures that will allow for regulated carbon dioxide savings as noted above. A carbon offset payment of £211,221 will be secured by way of a S106 agreement, in accordance with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. Subject to the conditions securing the sustainability features noted above, the development is considered to meet a high standard of sustainable design in accordance with the policy cited above.

### **Basement Development**

- 6.16 Policy DM18 sets out that basement development must be carried out in a way that does not harm the amenity of neighbours, compromise the structural stability of adjoining properties, increase flood risk or damage the character of the area or natural environments. DM 18 states that proposals for basements must not include habitable rooms or other sensitive uses in areas prone to flooding, where there is no reasonable means of escape. This approach is reflected in the London Plan Policy 5.3 and the SPG Sustainable Design and Construction.
- 6.16.1 The development proposal includes the construction of basements to both Blocks A and Block B. Block A involves excavation up to 4.4m below existing site levels at the south end of the site. Block B involves a double basement excavation up to 7.2m below existing site levels. The development proposal also includes for the lowering of the existing lower ground slab to the West Wing of the Town Hall by 1 metre and the provision of basement hotel rooms. The impacts of the basement alterations on the historic character of Town Hall are discussed in Listed Building Consent section of this report.
- 6.16.2 The applicant has prepared a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) both prepared by Bradbrook dated July 2017. Officers concur with the applicant's consultant engineer that has assessed the proposal and conclude that no significant potential adverse impacts or effects have been identified and the proposed basement development within Blocks A and B is highly unlikely to result in any significant changes to the existing groundwater regime beneath, or adjacent to the site or to neighbouring properties.
- 6.16.3 The applicant's FRA concludes there will be no change in Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification as a result of the development as the previous land use at the site was also considered 'More Vulnerable' and therefore appropriate within Flood Zone 1. Haringey's Local Lead Flood Authority have not raised an objection to the proposal on flood risk grounds. The habitable rooms below grade in Blocks A and B and the Town Hall have a reasonable means of escape in accordance with Policy DM18.

6.16.4 The proposed basement development is therefore considered to preserve the amenity and structural stability of adjoining properties. The development would not increase flood risk and is designed to ensure a reasonable means of escape from habitable rooms. The basement development is therefore in accordance with the policy and guidance above.

### **Waste and Servicing**

6.17 London Plan Policy 5.16 indicates the Mayor is committed to reducing waste and facilitating a step change in the way in which waste is managed. Local Plan Policy SP6 “Waste and Recycling” and require development proposals make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection. The approach is reflected in DPD Policy DM4. The applicant has submitted a draft Deliveries & Servicing Management Plan (DSMP) which incorporates Site Waste Management prepared by TPHS dated July 2017.

6.17.1 The site is currently serviced by an open yard area leading into an undercroft at the rear of the Town Hall accessed via Weston Park. This arrangement is proposed to continue, but would be accessed solely via Haringey Park. The Broadway Annex and mews area are currently serviced on-street via a number of permitted locations. This arrangement is also proposed to continue for the residential units and A3/A4 floorspace proposed.

6.17.2 In terms of waste storage provision, within Blocks A and B there would be 37 x 1,100L Eurobins provided within the lower ground floor areas of each residential block. Provision would be split between receptacles for general waste receptacles for recyclables and receptacles for food waste. Collection is proposed to be less-than fortnightly, with details to be secured by condition. The remaining residential units on this site are proposed to have storage of 8 x 1100 Eurobins provided located at the ground floor level to the rear of the Broadway Annex building. Collection arrangements are to be secured by condition.

6.17.3 The applicant’s draft DSMP states that the on-site storage capacity for the non-residential floorspace has been calculated in accordance with BS 5906:2005 (Waste Management in Buildings – Code of practice’). The applicant proposes 16 x 1,100 Eurobins split equally between waste and recyclables. These would be located close to the undercroft area adjacent to the loading / unloading area in the Town Hall next to the collection point.

6.17.4 The Council’s Waste Management Team has assessed the proposal. While there is no in principle objection, comments note several waste management issues are still outstanding, including a clear separation of residential and commercial waste onsite, separation of commercial and residential collection times, and receptacle sizing for commercial food waste. It is considered these

items may be addressed by the imposition of a planning condition. Such a condition is suggested below.

6.17.5 The Council's Transportation Officer has assessed the proposal in relation to refuse collection. The applicant has provided a vehicle swept path analysis which demonstrates that a refuse vehicle can enter and leave the site in forward gear via Haringey Park. The applicant will be required to produce a Delivery and Servicing Plan in consultation with the Councils refuse contractor. This is to be secured by condition.

6.17.6 While the comments of objectors concerning waste are noted, it is not considered the residential or commercial waste servicing would cause amenity impacts so detrimental that planning permission should be refused. The details of vehicle access and servicing are contained in the transportation section of this report.

6.17.7 Subject to acceptable condition details, the development proposal is considered to make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection and is in accordance with the relevant policy cited above.

### **Water and Waste Water Supply Capacity**

6.18 SA48 indicates a site requirement that applicants must consult with Thames Water regarding both wastewater and water supply capacity upon the preparation of a planning application. The applicant has provided details of consultation with Thames Water as per the applications made for new and existing water connections to the development site, as outlined in the Water Strategy. Thames Water has been consulted on the proposal at the pre-application and applications phases, and raises no objection subject to suitable conditions. The applicant has therefore met site requirements and the water and waste water supply capacity of the site are capable of supporting the proposed development.

### **Land Contamination**

6.19 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. The applicant has submitted a Phase I desktop study prepared by Capita dated June 2017 and a Conceptual Model.

6.19.1 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (Pollution) has assessed the proposal and raises no objections subject to the imposition of standard conditions around land remediation on any grant of planning permission. These standard conditions are recommended for imposition and require further assessment of site conditions and remediation where required.

### **Archaeology**

6.20 London Policy 7.8 states that “development should incorporate measures that identify record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, preserve the site’s archaeology. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF says that applicants should submit desk-based assessments, and where appropriate undertake field evaluation, to describe the significance of heritage assets and how they would be affected by the proposed development. This approach is reflected at the local level.

6.20.1 The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has responded to consultation and indicates the need for field evaluation to determine appropriate mitigation. This position is unchanged from the 2010 position and may be addressed by the imposition of a planning condition. Subject to the conditions and informative in the section below, the archaeological impacts of the proposal are acceptable.

## **6.21 Conclusion**

6.21.1 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission and Listed Building Consent should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

## **7 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

7.1 Based on the information given on the plans (and incorporating 11 units of affordable housing), the Mayoral CIL charge will be **£676,648.25** (15,288 sqm x £35 x 1.26) and the Haringey CIL charge will be **£2,560,206** (7,389.80 sqm x £265 x 1.17).

7.2 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 RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions contained in **Appendix 1** and subject to a S106 Legal Agreement and S278 Legal Agreement

8.2 GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT subject to the conditions contained in **Appendix 1**



