

Planning Sub Committee

## **REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

### **1.0. APPLICATION DETAILS**

**Application:** HGY/2019/1490

**Ward:** Tottenham Green

**Address:** 19 Bernard Road, Tottenham, London N15 4NX

**Proposal:** Demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a mixed-use building providing: 3 commercial units; 45 residential units (comprising of 14 affordable and 31 private tenure) and part basement plant room

**Applicant:** Daydome Ltd.

**Agent:** Alvin Ormonde, Planning and Project Management Services

**Ownership:** Private

**Case Officer:** Martin Cowie

**Date received:** 3 June 2019 **Last amended date:** 16 August 2019.

1.1 This application is before the Planning Sub-Committee because it is major development and is required to be reported under the Council's Constitution.

### **SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- The proposal is a well-designed, mixed-use scheme providing a range of residential accommodation and commercial space.
- The proposed development complements the recently approved scheme on the adjacent site at Bernard Works and reflects the policy requirements of Site Allocation (TH12 Herbert Road) and its designation within a Local Employment Area (Regeneration Area).
- The scheme delivers family and smaller sized residential units including 14 units of affordable housing (9 Discount Market Rent at London Living Rent levels (no option to buy) and 5 Social Rent) representing a 31% provision by unit number and 37% provision by habitable room.

- The layout and design of the development optimise the potential of the site and respect the scale and character of the surrounding mixed-use area.

## **2.0. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1. That the Committee resolve to **GRANT** planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to referral to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 2.2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
- 2.3. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 14 September 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
- 2.4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

**Conditions Summary** (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of this report)

- 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) Landscaping – Replacement of Trees and Plants (LBH Development Management)
- 6) Lighting Strategy (LBH Development Management)
- 7) Secure by Design Certificate (Metropolitan Police Service)
- 8) Waste Management (LBH Development Management)
- 9) Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics

- Plan (CLP) (LBH Transportation)
- 10) Service and Delivery Plan (DSP) (LBH Transportation)
- 11) Wheelchair Dwellings (LBH Development Management)
- 12) Accessible & Adaptable Dwellings (LBH Development Management)
- 13) Internal Noise Levels within Residential Units – Design (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 14) Internal Noise Levels within Residential Units – Maximum Noise (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 15) Plant Noise (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 16) Scheme of Sound Insulation (LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 17) Construction and Demolition Noise LBH Environmental Health – Noise)
- 18) Site Wide Energy Network (LBH Carbon Management)
- 19) Surface Water Drainage (Thames Water)
- 20) Public Sewer Crossings (Thames Water)
- 24) Piling Method Statement (Thames Water)
- 25) Existing Water Supply Impact study - (Thames Water)
- 26) Details of Flood Risk Attenuation Measures (LBH Drainage)
- 27) Drainage Details – (LBH Drainage)
- 28) Confirmation of Energy Standards (LBH Carbon Management)
- 29) Post Construction Certification BREEAM and Home Quality Mark (LBH Carbon Management) (LBH Carbon Management)
- 30) Remedial Works Plan BREEAM Very Good and Home Quality Mark (LBH Carbon Management)
- 31) Site Investigation (LBH Environmental Health)
- 32) Site Remediation (LBH Environmental Health)
- 33) Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (LBH Environmental Health)
- 34) Machinery Emissions (LBH Environmental Health)
- 35) NRMM Registration (LBH Environmental Health)
- 36) Machinery Inventory (LBH Environmental Health)

**Informatives Summary** (The full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.)

- 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) Disposal of Commercial Waste (LBH Waste Management)
- 8) Piling Method Statement Contact Details (Thames Water)
- 9) Minimum Water Pressure (Thames Water)
- 10) Main Water Crossing (Thames Water)
- 11) Installation of Non-Return Valve (Thames Water)
- 12) Paid Garden Waste Collection Service (LBH Development Management)
- 13) Designing out Crime Officer Services (Metropolitan Police Service)

**Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

- 1) **Affordable Housing** –
  - 37.1% affordable by habitable room
  - 36% Social rent (with no sale) and 64% intermediate rent (Discount Market Rent at London Living Rent levels with no option to buy)
  - Occupier no option to buy Affordable / Intermediate rented
  - LBH first option to purchase social rented affordable purchase
  
- 2) **Viability Review Mechanism** should the proposal not be implemented within 18 months of the date of the decision.
  
- 3) **Car Capping**
  - a) 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 save for disabled residents.
  - b) £4000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order for this purpose.
  
- 4) **Parking Control Measures** - £15,000 towards the consultation and implementation of parking control measure in the local area surrounding the site including amendments to relevant traffic management orders.
  
- 5) **Car Club** - 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.

6) **Travel Plan** (as part of the detailed travel plan) comprising:

- a) Residential and commercial elements;
- b) Appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator;
- c) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and timetables, to every new resident and commercial occupier;
- d) Travel Information packs to be given to all residents and commercial occupiers and information available through a website.
- e) £3000 (three thousand pounds) for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives.

7) **Energy Plan** and a developer financial contribution of £97,732 **addressing the unachieved carbon reduction targets**. Subject to a review mechanism if the energy efficiency can be improved. Further contribution in the event sustainability measures do not achieve carbon savings.

8) **Employment Initiatives – Local Training and Employment Plan**

- Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator
- Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies
- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents
- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees
- Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff)
- Support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship for recruitment

9) **Monitoring Contribution**

- 5% of total value of contributions
- £500 per non-financial contribution
- Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000

10) **Considerate Constructor** - Development to be constructed in accordance with Considerate Constructor's scheme.

11) **S278 Works** – Applicant obligated to enter into a S278 agreement for relevant highway works on adopted highways.

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 (2.3) 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 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 TH12.
- ii. In the absence of the legal agreement securing an Open Space Management and Access Plan the proposal would fail to secure publicly accessible and well-maintained open space. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.5, 7.9, Policy SP12, Policy DM20 and Policy TH12.
- iii. In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) residential and commercial Travel Plans, and Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments 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 TH12.
- iv. In the absence of a legal agreement securing an energy plan 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.
- v. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme, the development would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies 5.3, 7.15, Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director

Planning (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:

- i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
- ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
- iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

## **CONTENTS**

- 3.0. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS
- 4.0. CONSULTATION RESPONSE
- 5.0. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
- 6.0. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
- 7.0. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
- 8.0. RECOMMENDATIONS

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1 Planning Conditions and Informatives
- Appendix 2 Plans and Images
- Appendix 3 Consultation Responses - Internal and External  
Consultees
- Appendix 4 Representations
- Appendix 5 DM Forum Summary
- Appendix 6 QRP Reports



### **3.0. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **3.1. Proposed development**

- 3.1.1 This is a full planning application for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a part 2, 4 and 6 storey building to accommodate 45 residential units and commercial floorspace. A small basement is incorporated for plant/equipment.
- 3.1.2 The proposed building would extend across the entire length of the site, presenting its main frontage onto Bernard Road and a secondary return frontage onto Ashby Road. A communal amenity area including play space to serve the residential accommodation, and an external space for the commercial uses would be provided to the rear of the building.
- 3.1.3 The development incorporates a range of residential unit sizes from 1 to 3 bedrooms and 5 wheelchair accessible homes across both affordable and private tenures. All units would meet the required space standards, incorporate a balcony/terrace with defensible space for ground floor units and feature full height glazing. The scheme does not contain any north or south facing single aspect flats and only 6, 1-bedroom private units would have a single east facing aspect.
- 3.1.4 The proposed development would secure 14 affordable homes (31% by unit/37% by habitable room), split 9 Discount Market Rent at London Living Rent levels with no option to buy (58%) and 5 Social Rented (42%) units, reflecting policy guidance.
- 3.1.5 The proposed commercial accommodation would be located at the eastern end of the development fronting Bernard Road, adjacent existing office/light industrial uses. Split into 3 similar sized units, the commercial floorspace would provide modern, fit for purpose workspace for local business opportunities.
- 3.1.6 The scheme proposes 4 wheelchair accessible residential car parking spaces, on-street along Herbert Road and Ashby Road and secure on-site and covered residential and commercial cycle parking.
- 3.1.7 The scheme has been designed to respond to the development requirements and guidance set out in the Site Allocation, existing site conditions and the consented scheme at Bernard Works.

#### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.2.1 The site is approximately 0.18 hectares in area and rectangular in shape on an east-west alignment fronting Bernard Road on its northern side. The plot is currently occupied by a double pitched roof former industrial building damaged by fire and partly lacking the roof structure. The building comprises a series of units of mostly informal employment spaces.
- 3.2.2 The site is surrounded by a mix of existing commercial development along Norman Road and Herbert Road to the north and Enterprise Row to the south and west. Two-storey residential terraces are located to the north on Herbert Road and along Ashby Road to the east.
- 3.2.3 The site has a PTAL Rating of 6a with excellent access to Seven Sisters Underground and Overground Station and may benefit from future access to Crossrail 2. The site lies within the Seven Sisters Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 3.2.4 Located close to West Green/Seven Sisters District Centre to the west and Markfield Park and Walthamstow Reservoirs to the east the site is well served by local facilities and amenities.

#### *Local Designations*

- 3.2.5 The site lies within a designated Local Employment Area – Regeneration Area (Rangemoor/Herbert Roads) and within the Tottenham Hale Growth Area. Part of the site (excluding the open space in the northeast corner) is allocated in the Tottenham Area Action Plan (TH12 Herbert Road). The site allocation indicates the site is suitable for mixed used employment-led redevelopment. The site is within the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area.
- 3.2.4 The South Tottenham area has been identified by the Greater London Authority (GLA) as a potential Creative Enterprise Zone (CEZ), due to its expanding cluster of creative industries which provide jobs and give character and identity to the area. Survey information indicates that it is an increasingly attractive choice of location for artists, creators and makers.
- 3.2.5 The Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation area lies to the north-east. The site does not contain any Listed or Locally Listed Buildings. Earlsmead Primary School, a prominent landmark within the Conservation Area is located to the north of the site.

### **3.3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

- 3.3.1. There are no relevant planning applications concerning the site, however a major proposal relating to the site opposite known as Bernard Works was granted planning consent last year (9 July 2018) for the following

development (Ref: HGY/2017/3584). The application is currently subject to a Judicial Review.

*Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 1,3,4,5,6,7 storey mixed use development comprising 25 Commercial Units (B1/B2), music rehearsal space (Sui Generis), café (A3), exhibition space (Sui Generis) (commercial spaces totalling 2446.9m<sup>2</sup> gross), and 99 Residential Units (C3) including 12 apartments tethered to the commercial space, plus site access, replacement open space, landscaping, plant and other associated development.*

- 3.3.2 The scheme is set out in several blocks, of varying scale and height generally fronting the roads around the site including Bernard Road, Herbert Road and Ashby Road, with an interior courtyard. A basement would contain commercial units and a music rehearsal space. The ground floor would provide an A3 café use and commercial units, with residential dwellings facing existing development along Ashby Road and Herbert Road.
- 3.3.3 The heights of proposed buildings would increase across the site terminating with the highest structures of 7 storeys in its southeast corner. A new publicly accessible park is proposed along the southern boundary of the site to replace the existing greenspace at the north of the site. The proposed greenspace would have seating, open lawn and soft and hard landscaping and an east-west pedestrian connection.
- 3.3.4. The proposal involves rationalising the existing dual road layout running in parallel north to south and removing part of Herbert Road while retaining the pedestrian link with Ashby Road and access for emergency and refuse vehicles and commercial servicing.

#### **3.4 Quality Review Panel**

- 3.4.1 The scheme has been presented to Haringey's Quality Review Panel on three occasions, twice at the pre-application stage for full reviews and once following submission for a Chair's Review. A summary of the most recent QRP Chair's Review (on 3 July 2019) is set out in the design section below.
- 3.4.2 The Panel and the Chair have offered their support for the scheme subject to a reduction in the number of south facing single-aspect units within the scheme. As previously noted in paragraph 3.1, the amended proposals do not now contain any south (or north) facing single-aspect units.

#### **3.5. Development Management Forum**

- 3.5.1 The proposals were presented to a Development Management Forum on 4 March 2019. Key concerns were raised in relation to the height and design of the building; overshadowing of neighbouring houses and park; air quality;

parking; lack of affordable housing; children's play space and impact on social infrastructure and crime.

3.5.2 The notes from the Forum are set out in Appendix 5.

### **3.6. Pre-Planning Committee Briefing**

3.6.1 Prior to submission the emerging proposals were presented to a Pre-Planning Committee Briefing on 8 April 2019. The minutes of the Briefing are as follows:

'The Planning Officer and representatives for the applicant gave a short presentation on early plans for the scheme. The site was currently occupied by a one storey unit with a double pitched roof. The use of the building was ad-hoc and fell within the policy area which encouraged mixed-use development. The consented scheme 'Bernard Works' was located at the north of the site, and this had largely influenced the plans for 19 Bernard Road.

Officers and the Applicant responded to questions from the Committee:

- The applicant accepted the position of the Committee in relation to the use of separate entrances for the affordable units, however providers have indicated that it was their preference to separate the units in order to manage service charge and maintenance.
- The applicant had instructed BNP Paribas to carry out an independent viability assessment.
- The amenity space would be located on both sides of the building if the schemes were built as consented.'

## **4.0. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal

- LBH Head of Carbon Management
- LBH Design Officer
- LBH Housing
- LBH Tree Officer
- LBH Economic Development
- LBH Regeneration
- LBH Cleansing
- LBH Parks
- LBH EHS - Pollution Air Quality Contaminated Land
- LBH Policy

- LBH Conservation Officer
- LBH Property Services
- LBH Emergency Planning and Business Continuity
- LBH Drainage
- LBH Transportation Group
- LBH EHS - Noise

#### External

- London Fire Brigade
- Designing Out Crime Officer - Metropolitan Police
- Transport for London
- Environment Agency
- National Grid
- Thames Water Utilities
- Page Green Residents Association
- Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 4.1. The full text of comments from internal and external consultees that responded to consultation is contained in Appendix 1. A summary of the consultation responses received is provided below:

#### Internal:

- LBH Conservation Officer

No objection. There are no heritage assets on or adjacent to this site. The closest is the Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area to the north east of the site. The scale of the proposed development is such that it won't be visible from the Conservation Area and the design is appropriate for the context and would complement the surrounding pattern of development.

No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Waste Management

No objection to proposal. The above planning application has been given a RAG traffic light status of GREEN for waste storage and collection. Standard Conditions and Informatives required.

No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Housing

No objection to proposals. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Transportation

No objection subject to conditions and contributions via S106 agreement. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Environmental Health

No objection subject to conditions. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Environmental Health Noise

No objection to proposal. Environmental Noise Survey Report has been reviewed. Conditions recommended including noise insulation scheme.

- LBH Local Lead Flood Authority

No objection to proposal. Satisfied with the Flood Risk Assessment submitted. There is no significant flood risk in this location and sustainable urban drainage strategy proposed is acceptable.

No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- LBH Carbon Management

No objection to proposal subject to Energy Plan with Carbon Offset. Proposed measures, alongside the site wide energy network, makes the scheme policy compliant and should be secured with an updated energy plan and carbon offset payment through conditions and legal agreement.

- LBH Tottenham Regeneration Team

No objections.

External:

- Thames Water

No objection subject to conditions. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- Metropolitan Police – Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)

No objection subject to conditions. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- Transport for London

As the site is not on or is not in close proximity to the Transport for London Road Network or the Strategic Road Network, TfL has no comments to make on the application. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- Environment Agency

No objection but recommend that relevant national policy and guidance around land contamination and ground water infiltration is followed. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

- London Fire Brigade

No objection but strongly recommend that sprinklers are considered. No further comment in respect to the amended plans.

## **5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 The following were consulted in relation to the original and amended plans:

- 471 Neighbouring properties consulted by letter
- Resident's Association consulted by letter
- 6 planning site notices were erected in the vicinity of the site.

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

- No of individual responses: 20
- Objecting: 19
- Supporting: 0
- Comment: 1 (amended plans)
- Petitions: 0

### *Issues raised in respect to original plans*

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

Principle of Development

- The development represents an overdevelopment having regard to other developments locally.
- The number of units proposed exceeds the strategic allocation in the Tottenham Area Action Plan taking account of the Bernard Works development.
- Policy requires development to be commercially led not residential led.
- The owners of this site and Bernard Works have allowed businesses to fall into disrepair.
- The area accommodates business and industry. There needs to be more commercial space in the area.
- The scheme will result in the loss of local businesses existing jobs on the site.
- The Bernard Works scheme [adjacent] set a poor precedent and does not comply with policy.

#### Development Design

- The proposed development is too tall, dominant and overbearing.
- The height and bulk of the new build blocks are out of keeping with area.
- This development at 6 storeys and Bernard Works at 7 storeys are out of place with area which comprises 2/3 storeys buildings.
- The density of the scheme is excessive.
- The new open space to be provided as part of the Bernard Works scheme will be overshadowed, adversely affecting green landscaping and become dark and unwelcoming.
- The Council's Conservation officers comments show no regard to the design of the surrounding area.
- The proposed building should be redesigned so that it is smaller. Less intrusive in relation to existing properties and more sensitive to the character of the area.

#### Local Amenity

- Neighbouring properties are only two storeys high and will be overshadowed by the proposed development.
- The development will reduce levels of daylight/sunlight for neighbouring properties and cause loss of privacy, compounding those in relation to the consented Bernard Works scheme.
- The sunlight/daylight study does not take into account of the Bernard Works development.
- The proposal will result in additional air pollution locally from traffic and construction work.
- The proposed rooftop gardens will cause overlooking and disturbance.
- There is insufficient waste collection and servicing proposed, which will lead to local fly tipping.



- Pressure on local services and infrastructure including health services, schools and public transport.
- New open space will attract anti-social behaviour.
- People's quality of life and health will be adversely affected.

#### Transport

- Increased vehicular (cars and heavy goods traffic) and pedestrian movement will be dangerous, particularly with Earls mead Primary School nearby.
- The proposal doesn't provide sufficient parking and will add to parking pressure in the local area.
- Permit Free development will be insufficient to prevent parking on local roads (after CPZ hours)
- Local road layout isn't suitable, and proposal only considers road change associated with Bernard Works scheme.
- Air quality concerns arising from additional vehicle movements.
- Changes to the road layouts will cause congestion and lead to highway safety issues.
- Air quality concerns arising from additional vehicle movements.

#### *Issues raised in respect to amended plan*

5.4 The only new comment received in relation to the amended plans, at the time of writing was a query concerning how one could register an interest in the proposed new commercial units.

5.5 Any further representations received following the publication of the Committee report will be included and reported to Committee in an addendum.

## 6.0 **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 6.1 **Principle of the Development**

#### *National Policy*

6.1.1. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (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 support 'development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay'. The NPPF also expresses a 'presumption in favour of

sustainable Planning Sub-Committee Report development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.’

- 6.1.2. The NPPF encourages the ‘effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed’. In respect of applications that include provision of housing, the NPPF highlights that delivery of housing is best achieved through larger scale development.

#### *The Development Plan*

- 6.1.1 For the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the Development Plan includes the London Plan (2016), the draft London Plan; Haringey’s Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013 with alterations 2017); Development Management DPD (2017); Site Allocations (2017); and Tottenham Area Action Plan (2017).

#### *The London Plan*

- 6.1.2 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 out several 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.
- 6.1.3 The draft London Plan carries some weight given its progression in the plan making process and is a material planning consideration. The draft London Plan sets an annualised target for Haringey of 1,958 homes, and 10-year target of 19,580 homes.

#### *Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017)*

- 6.1.4 In 2017 Haringey’s Local Plan Strategic Policies document was updated to reflect the increasingly challenging borough-wide housing and affordable housing targets of 19,802 and 7,920 homes respectively. It also sets out that the Council will secure a strong local economy through the reconfiguration and reuse of surplus employment designated land in B2 and B8 Use Classes and the intensification of the use of existing employment sites (where possible), including the provision of B1a/b floorspace as part of mixed-use developments on suitable sites.

*Haringey Development Management Policies (2017)*

- 6.1.5 The Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 (DMDPD) supports proposals that contribute to the delivery of the planning policies referenced above and sets out its own specific criteria-based policies against which planning applications will be assessed.

*Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP)*

- 6.1.6 The document provides site specific and area-based policy to underpin the delivery of the spatial vision for growth set out in the adopted alterations to the Strategic Policies DPD and the DPDs. The site allocation TH12 – Herbert Road which covers the application site in addition to Bernard Works, envisages the redevelopment of the sites for mixed-use employment-led mixed-use development.
- 6.1.7. The site allocation describes the area as having a number of buildings that produce unsuitable neighbours for the residential uses, parallel access roads which do not provide an appropriate street layout, and several disused and derelict buildings in need of redevelopment. It states that by introducing new employment floorspace and homes into the area, the site can make a positive contribution to meeting the Borough's housing and employment needs.
- 6.1.7 The policy allocation sets out a series of specific Site Requirements and Development Guidelines as follows:

*Site Requirements*

- The site is within a Designated Employment Area – Regeneration Area and proposals for mixed-use employment-led development will be supported, where appropriate, to create a mix of uses through the re-introduction of creative employment uses.
- The quantum of dedicated employment floorspace on the site should be maximised through any development. Residential uses will be permitted to optimise the delivery of new employment stock and should be located adjacent to the existing residential uses adjoining the site.
- Proposals should make provision for an element of affordable workspace in line with Policy DM38.

## *Development Guidelines*

- Rationalisation of the “parallel access roads” on Ashby/Bernard/Herbert Roads.
- Reintroducing employment-generating uses is the key aim of this policy.
- Improved streetscape with the existing homes on Ashby Road is required.
- This site is identified as being in an area with potential for being part of a Decentralised Energy (DE) network. Development proposals should be designed for connection to a DE network, and seek to prioritise/secure connection to existing or planned future DE networks, in line with Policy DM22.
- Studies should be undertaken to understand what potential contamination there is on this site prior to any development taking place. Mitigation of and improvement to local air quality and noise pollution should be made on this site.
- Pedestrian access from the site to Page Green Road should be retained.

### **6.2. Principle of Development – Assessment**

#### *Principle of Demolition*

- 6.2.1 The scheme proposes the demolition of the existing building on the site which is in poor condition and deemed not fit for modern commercial/industrial purposes. It comprises 21 units, totalling approximately 1100sqm of mostly informal employment spaces and is of limited architectural value and not locally nor statutorily listed. The demolition of the existing building is acceptable in principle.

#### *Principle of Masterplanned Development*

- 6.2.2 Local policy advises proposed development within allocated sites to come forward as part of a masterplan or to demonstrate that it would not prejudice other development opportunities.
- 6.2.3 The proposed scheme occupies the southern side of the TH12 policy Site Allocation. While the application is not accompanied by a masterplan, it has been prepared having regard to the consented scheme at Bernard Works, which would occupy the remainder and larger part of the Site Allocation. The applicant’s proposal demonstrates that it would not affect the quality and delivery of the Bernard Works development nor prejudice the Council’s wider strategic planning objectives for the area.

6.2.4 The current development is considered to complement that proposed at Bernard Works and act as a significant catalyst for comprehensive change providing new commercial and residential accommodation within an enhanced urban setting, in line with the Site Allocation and other planning objectives.

*Redevelopment within a Local Employment Area – Regeneration Area*

6.2.5 The London Plan and Haringey's Strategic Policies require that more intensive land uses are directed to highly accessible locations. Local Plan Policy SP8 indicates there is a presumption to support local employment and small sized businesses that require employment land and space. Draft London Plan Policy E3 – Affordable Workspace notes that in defined circumstances, planning obligations may be used to secure affordable workspace at rents maintained below the market rate for that space for a specific social, cultural or economic development purpose.

6.2.6 Policy DM38 indicates support for mixed use, employment-led development within a Local Employment Area – Regeneration Areas (LEA-RA) where this is necessary to facilitate the renewal and regeneration (including intensification) of existing employment land and floorspace. DM38 sets a number of criteria for redevelopment within LEA-RA's which are considered below.

6.2.7 The proposed redevelopment involves the provision of a new mixed-use building which would accommodate 352sqm of new commercial/business floorspace in addition to 75sqm of associated external space (total 427sqm). As currently shown on the plan, this space is split into 3 units but could be adapted and more flexibly used, if necessary. While the proposal will effectively lead to a net loss of approximately 660sqm employment floorspace, the new provision will provide modern, fit for purpose workspace accommodation and increase potential employment densities. This provision also accords with the requirement of the Site Allocation, having regard to the accommodation secured at the Bernard Works scheme.

6.2.8 The Site Allocation specified an indicative capacity of 2300sqm of employment site-wide. The Bernard Works development, which encompasses most of the land area allocation, would provide approximately 1908sqm of employment floorspace including affordable workspace. Together therefore, the two developments achieve the indicative capacity set out in Site Allocation Policy TH12.

6.2.9 The proposal is therefore also considered to meet the criteria set out in Policy DM38 for redevelopment within a LEA-RA. The provision of both new affordable and market-based employment space across the Site Allocation would facilitate long-term investment and local economic growth.

### *Principle of Housing Provision*

- 6.2.7 London Plan Policy 3.3 provides explicit strategic support for the provision of housing within London and sets a target for the Council to deliver a minimum of 15,019 homes in the Plan period 2015-2025. This target is set to increase with the adoption of the draft London Plan. Draft London Plan Policy H1 sets a target of 19,580 net completions of homes in the draft Plan period of 2019/20-2028/29. This yields an annualised target for Haringey of 1,958 homes.
- 6.2.8 Given the site's context within the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area and considering the Council's local policy designations, the principle of the redevelopment for of this site for mixed-use including provision of 45 new market and affordable homes is supported and in line with both London Plan and local planning policy. The AAP Site Allocation TH12 sets out that residential will be permitted to optimise new employment stock and should be located adjacent to the existing residential uses adjoining the site.

### *Principle of Development – Summary*

- 6.2.9 The proposed development complies with the requirements of the Site Allocation and will complement the consented scheme at Bernard Works, assisting in securing the delivery of a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of the area. The proposed mixed-use scheme will act as a catalyst for new investment, housing and job growth in addition to significant environmental improvement within a designated Local Employment Area (Regeneration Area).

## **6.3 Affordable Housing**

- 6.3.1 The NPPF states that where it is identified that affordable housing is needed, planning policies should expect this, in the first instance, to be provided on site.
- 6.3.2 London Plan 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.
- 6.3.3 Local Plan Policy SP2 requires developments of more than 10 units to provide a proportion of affordable housing to meet an overall borough-wide target of 40%, (by habitable room), with tenures split at 60:40 for affordable (social) rent and intermediate housing respectively. This approach is reflected in Policy

DM13 of the DM DPD, which also states that the preferred affordable housing mix is as set out in the Council's Housing Strategy.

6.3.4 The Mayor of London's Affordable Housing and Viability (AHV) SPG provides detailed guidance to ensure that existing affordable housing policy is as effective

as possible. The SPG requires all developments not meeting a 35% affordable housing threshold (by habitable room) to be assessed for financial viability through the assessment of an appropriate financial appraisal, with early and late stage viability reviews required where appropriate.

6.3.5 The proposed development secures **14 affordable homes (31.1% by unit and**

**37.1% by habitable room), split 9 Discount Market Rent units at London Living Rent levels with no option to buy (58%) and 5 Social Rent (42%) Rented units**, which reflects the preferred balance in Tottenham in accordance with Haringey's Housing Strategy.

6.3.6 The affordable housing provision has been secured having regard to the Borough's Housing Strategy Appendix C. Social Rented housing should be owned by local or private registered providers, for which guideline target rents are determined through the National Rent Regime.

*Social Rented housing breakdown*

Unit type	No. units	%	Average unit size (sqm)
1 bed	1	20	51
2 bed	1	20	70
3 bed	3	60	101
Total	5		

6.3.7 The London Living Rent type of housing proposed for the site represents a localised form of LLR accommodation, whereby there is no future purchasing option for occupants. This form of housing, referred to as Discounted Market Rent would be available for rent at London Living Rent levels in perpetuity as set out in the Housing Strategy.

6.3.8 LLR is one of three types of 'genuinely affordable' homes funded by the Mayor. This is normally part-buy, part-rent accommodation for those taking their first

step onto the property ladder. The low rental costs encourage tenants to save but in taking away the option to buy these types of homes remain available for future low rent occupation. The homes are offered on tenancies of a minimum of 3 years and tenants will be supported to save and given the option to buy a home elsewhere on a shared ownership basis and given priority for other shared ownership homes across the capital.

*Discount Market Rent (London Living Rent levels) housing breakdown*

Unit type	No. units	%	Average unit size (sqm)
1 bed	3	33.3	51
2 bed	3	33.3	70
3 bed	3	33.3	89
Total	9	100	

6.3.9 In Tottenham Green the rent levels for 2019/20 are as follows:

Unit type	LLR (Tottenham Green Ward)	Market Median Rent
<i>One Bed</i>	£231.49	£300
<i>Two Beds</i>	£257.21	£364
<i>Three Beds</i>	£282.93	£461
<i>Four Beds</i>	£308.65	£634

6.3.10 The proposed mix of affordable units provides 43% of affordable dwellings as family-sized accommodation, comprising of three or more bedrooms. The proposed provision would comply with local and regional requirements.

6.3.11 In addition, the affordable housing accords with the revised Appendix C of the Housing strategy which prioritises social rented housing and Discount Market Rented Housing at London Living Rent levels. The Council’s Housing team supports the proposed level, tenure and mix of affordable housing in this application.

6.3.10 Given that a satisfactory level of affordable housing would be provided, with a high proportion of family-sized units and available at genuinely affordable rents, it is considered that the amount of affordable housing proposed is fully compliant



with current local, Mayoral and national housing policy.

- 6.3.11 Following discussions with the applicant, the Council would have the first option to purchase these units, secured via the s106 agreement and thereby being able to more effectively deliver and manage for local needs. This builds in potential for all 14 units to be Council homes.

#### *Viability Review*

- 6.3.7 The application is supported by a Viability Assessment (VA). The VA was produced in respect of the development of 53 units plus the ground floor commercial space and then updated for the amended scheme of 45 units. The VA was independently assessed by GL Hearn (on behalf of the Council) and the Council's viability consultant GL Hearn has independently assessed the proposed affordable housing provision. The consultant's conclusion is that the scheme's offer of 14 units of affordable housing is the maximum that can be delivered subject to viability and in light of the other planning objectives required as per the site allocation, including maximising employment floorspace.

- 6.3.8 Officers agree with the conclusions of the consultant that the scheme provides the maximum amount of affordable housing subject to viability.

#### **6.4 Tenure and Mix**

- 6.4.1 Policy 3.8 of the London Plan 2016 states that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford. Policy 3.4 mentions prioritising higher density provision for smaller households in areas with good transport accessibility. Draft London Plan Policy H12C notes that Boroughs should not set prescriptive dwelling size mix requirements (in terms of numbers of bedrooms) for market and intermediate homes.

- 6.4.2 Strategic Policy SP2 (Housing) and DPD Policy DM11 Policy maintain the London Plan approach. Policy DM11 requires proposals for new residential development to provide a mix of housing having regard to site circumstances, the need to optimise output and in order to achieve mixed and balanced communities.

6.4.3 The proposed development incorporates a range of dwelling sizes including one,

two and three-bedroom family units across all tenures. Provision is also made for 6 wheelchair user dwellings (11%), which exceeds London Plan requirements.

6.4.4 The overall mix of housing within the proposed development is presented in the

table below:

Tenure	Unit no.	% Unit	Hab Rms	% Hab Rm	Wheelchair user
<b>Affordable</b>	14	<b>31.1%</b>	49	<b>37.1%</b>	2
- SR	5	11.1%	19	14.4%	0
1 bed	1	2.2%	2	1.5%	0
2 bed	1	2.2%	3	2.3%	0
3 bed	3	6.7%	14	10.6%	2
- LLR	9	20%	30	22.7%	0
1 bed	3	6.7%	6	4.5%	0
2 bed	3	6.7%	9	6.8%	0
3 bed	3	6.7%	15	11.4%	0
<b>Private</b>	31	<b>68.9%</b>	83	<b>62.9%</b>	3
1 bed	10	22.2%	20	15.2%	0
2 bed	19	42.2%	55	41.7%	1
3 bed	2	4.4%	8	6.1%	2
<b>Total</b>	45	<b>100%</b>	132	<b>100%</b>	5

- SR – Social Rent
- LLR – Discount Market Rent at London Living Rent levels

6.4.5 The proposed dwelling mix is considered reasonable and appropriate having regard to policy provisions and the location and nature of the development. In keeping with the Council's in the Tottenham Area Action Plan, the proposal would safeguard existing family homes in the area and promote mixed and balanced communities.

## 6.5 Design and Appearance

### *Planning Policy*

6.5.1 The NPPF should be considered alongside London Plan Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan Policy SP11 and 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.

### *Density*

- 6.5.2 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. This approach to density is reflected in the Tottenham AAP. While the draft London Plan proposes to remove the London Plan's density matrix, the current adopted London Plan remains part of the Development Plan for the site.
- 6.5.3 The supporting text of London Plan Policy 3.4 indicates that it is not appropriate to apply the London Plan Density Matrix and its thresholds mechanistically. Its density ranges for particular types of locations are broad, enabling account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential including local context, design and transport capacity which are particularly important, as well as the availability of social infrastructure.
- 6.5.4 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan states that developments that fail to comply with the density standards may still be acceptable where they are of high-quality design. This standpoint is supported by the Mayor's Housing SPG.
- 6.5.5 The application site is within an 'urban' setting (terraced housing, mix of uses, close to a town centre - West Green/Seven Sisters District Centre) and has an excellent access to public transport, with a PTAL of 6a, including underground stations and a range of bus routes close-by. The Mayor's density matrix (Table 3.2 of the London Plan 2016) sets an indicative maximum threshold of 260 dwellings per hectare and 700 habitable rooms per hectare for residential developments in this type of location.
- 6.5.6 Given the mixed-use nature of the proposed scheme, density has been calculated in line with GLA guidance and the size of the site has been reduced

by an amount that is equivalent to the proportion of total floorspace allocated to non-residential uses for the purposes of calculating residential density.

6.5.7 The applicant proposes the provision of 45 residential units with a total of 132 habitable rooms on a site measuring 0.18 hectares. This equates to a density of 250 units and 733 habitable rooms per hectare. Whilst the level of habitable rooms proposed is marginally higher than the London Plan density guidance, this reflects in part the provision of 3-bedroom family units.

6.5.8 Having regard to the proposed mix, the location and accessibility of the site, its constraints and emerging new urban context; the density is considered acceptable in seeking to optimise the use of existing brownfield land without compromising the character of the surrounding area.

#### *Site Layout and Access*

6.5.9 The proposals seek to deliver a mixed-use development on a constrained site, having regard to the requirements of the Site Allocation and the consented scheme at Bernard Works, opposite. These include the need to optimise employment and residential floorspace; the shape, orientation and confined nature of the site, surrounded predominantly by commercial uses; and the consented scheme at Bernard Works which incorporates a new public park across including a shared surface pedestrian route most of the frontage of the application site.

6.5.10 The proposed development utilises the full extent of the relatively narrow rectangular site and attempts to strike a balance between employment and residential floorspace quantum and location, considering the constraints and opportunities presented by the site and viability.

6.5.11 The proposed ground floor comprises 3 elements:

- the commercial floorspace located at the western end of the site, adjacent and opposite existing commercial premises;
- the residential accommodation occupying the central and eastern part of the site fronting and opposite existing commercial uses (or the potential park associated with the Bernard Works scheme) and Ashby Road respectively.

- the external amenity areas and play space located across the back of the site.

6.5.12 The new commercial space would have an active street presence and cover a regular shaped floor plate, which as indicated on the submitted plans could be subdivided into 3 separate units with individual entrances, providing flexibility for potential users. A refuse store is discreetly positioned on the corner away from the residential use.

6.5.13 The residential accommodation is clearly separated from the commercial use on plan and its layout is based around 2 main entrances and 3 lift/stair cores – two for the private units and one for the affordable tenure. Three cores are provided to ensure the layout and amenity of the accommodation is optimised for residents and to assist in future management arrangements.

6.5.14 The main entrances (and cores) are tenure blind, located prominently on the Bernard Road frontage with entrance doors being equally legible. Each has its designated refuse and secure cycle store designed to be accessible by all residents. They both allow direct access and views through to the shared external amenity space to the rear of the building.

6.5.15 The ground floor would accommodate 4 residential units including 3 out of the 5 wheelchair accessible units which will benefit from level access private entrances, 2 onto Bernard Road and 2 onto Ashby Road. Private amenity space for these units would be provided by terraces, recessed and enclosed with metal balustrading. Planted defensible areas are proposed across most north and east facing elevations to further aid privacy and enhance the appearance of these important frontages.

6.5.16 It is worth noting as highlighted in the relevant section below, that the QRP considers that the scheme has broadly responded well to comments around the layout and configuration; supports the approach that locates active frontages at ground floor level and the provision of defensible space where bedrooms look onto the public realm and; acknowledge the importance of the careful siting of refuse and cycle stores.

### *Height and Massing*

6.5.20 DM6 states the Council expects building heights to be of an appropriate scale that 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 the development does contain Taller Buildings' in centre of the site, 'defined as those that are two to three storeys higher than the prevailing surrounding building heights.

6.5.21 There is a tall building near the site, Cordell House, a post-war 13-storey tower block to the northeast of the application site however the prevailing building height in the area is 2 - 4 storeys.

6.5.22 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).

6.5.23 The development proposes a building of up to 6 storeys from ground level stepping down to 4 and 2 storeys. This variation in height and massing seeks to respond to the surrounding context including the existing houses on Ashby Road and the consented scheme at Bernard Works. It also aims to create the appearance of a series of buildings rather than a larger single building form and contribute to a more interesting streetscene and townscape.

6.5.24 The plan form has a set-back in the centre 'block', reinforcing the idea of a composition of buildings rather than a single mass. This set-back also creates variety in terms of light and shadow which would not occur on a flat façade. The lower 2 storey elements also importantly serve to maximise the number of dual-aspect units and to allow light through to the street and the potential new park as part of the consented scheme at Bernard Works.

6.5.25 The height and massing of the proposed development, together with its high-quality elevational treatment is considered to represent an appropriate approach in this location, designated in local policy for comprehensive redevelopment. It should be noted that the QRP confirmed that the three-dimensional scale and massing of the proposal is at an acceptable maximum.

6.5.26 As per the assessment below and the comments of the Principal Conservation Officer, the development site is in close proximity to a Conservation Area but will not impact its setting or character and makes a modest but positive contribution to the wider character of Tottenham as a historic area.

6.5.27 The site falls within a Local View Corridor. View 26 notes an assessment point from the junction of Quernmore Road and Stapleton Hall Road looking east bound toward Tottenham Hale. As per the Townscape assessment in the section below, the impact of the development on the view corridor will be negligible and the applicant is considered to have met the policy tests set in Policy DM 15.

6.5.28 The applicant has therefore met the policy tests set for taller buildings. The height and massing of the taller buildings on the site are 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.

#### *Townscape and View Management*

6.5.29 Haringey's Strategic Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM5 set out how the Council will protect the Strategic and Local View Corridors. The site does not intersect with a London Plan Strategic View but does lie within a Local View Corridor.

View 26 notes an assessment point from the junction of Quernmore Road and Stapleton Hall Road looking east toward Tottenham Hale. From the assessment point, the development would not obstruct the linear view given the proposed heights and the development would be subservient to other tall buildings in the vicinity of site.

#### *Appearance and Materials*

6.5.30 In a similar way that the height and massing of the proposed development seeks to serve as a transition between the scale of the existing and emerging built form locally, its appearance and materiality seeks to transition between the architecture of the surrounding industrial and residential areas. In line with Local Plan Policy DM1 – Delivering High Quality Design, the architectural approach relates to the surrounding context, where brick is the dominant material. The appearance of the building has been informed by a desire to respond to the industrial heritage of the site and wider area.

6.5.31 The proposed elevations adopt a simple, legible appearance of large rectangular openings on a grid pattern incorporating inset balconies and metalwork.

6.5.32 The industrial/warehouse references are subtly carried through in the detailing with the use of header courses, curved brickwork to window reveals and recessed brickwork panels between the large window openings in a contrasting darker shade of brick.

6.5.33 Whilst individual openings are horizontal/linear in overall proportion, their grouping and subdivision create a degree of verticality and bring an overall architectural coherence to the substantive facades of the building.

6.5.34 Officers consider that the detailed design and appearance of the proposed development represents a very high-quality approach which would respect and enhance the character of the surrounding industrial and residential area. The architectural detailing and materials promoted will be subject to planning conditions to ensure that the approach set-out is followed through on-site.

#### *Landscaping and amenity space*

6.5.35 The proposed development seeks to maximise the benefit of landscaping and amenity space for residents and the appearance and environmental quality of the area.

6.5.36 The space to the north of the application site, currently public highway is consented to become a public landscaped space. Whilst this is outside the control of the applicant, it would provide a benefit to the area and to the approach and outlook from the proposed development. Of course, officers have considered the situation at present and the proposed development must be acceptable in the event the new public open space does not come forward.

6.5.37 Perimeter boundary planting proposed along the Bernard Road and Ashby Road frontages aims to contribute to the wider landscape strategy and

enhance

the public realm and the appearance of the development and to provide.

Defensible space/screening between ground floor accommodation and the

streetscape. It should be noted that the opportunity to improve the

streetscape



with the existing homes on Ashby Road is a requirement of the Site Allocation.

6.5.38 In addition to private terraces and balconies serving every unit within the proposed development, a number of external communal areas would be provided for the benefit of residents and commercial occupiers. These include:

- An accessible and secure south facing communal residential amenity space to the rear of the proposed building providing informal recreation and play space/equipment for use by all residents. This space would measure 204m<sup>2</sup>, be accessible and visible from all cores (private and affordable homes) and incorporate hard/soft landscaping, seating and the required children's play space provision (153m<sup>2</sup>). It is protected from the adjoining commercial uses by a substantial 2.4m high brick wall along the rear boundary of the site;
- A shared south facing commercial amenity space measuring 75m<sup>2</sup> which could be split according to commercial needs;
- A communal roof terrace above the western two storey element of the development measuring 87m<sup>2</sup> accessed off the affordable housing core.
- A communal roof terrace above the eastern four storey element of the development measuring 103m<sup>2</sup> and accessed off the private tenure core.

6.5.39 In total, the proposed development would provide approximately 394m<sup>2</sup> of good quality external communal residential amenity space, readily accessible by residents. Subject to appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment conditions, officers consider that this provision is acceptable having regard to the constraints of the site and the availability of public open space in the local area.

### **Secured by Design**

6.5.40 The applicant has worked with the Secured by Design officer to address several issues raised earlier in the process. Subject to condition, the Metropolitan Police raise no objection to the proposal in relation to security. A planning condition will also be imposed requiring compliance with the principles and practices of the Secured by Design Award Scheme and liaison

with relevant officers will continue through into the condition stage if permission is granted.

## 6.6 Quality Review Panel (QRP)

6.6.1 As noted above, the proposal has been assessed by Haringey's QRP at pre-application and application stages. The summary of the Chair's Review on 3 July 2019 stated:

*'As at the previous reviews in December 2018, the Quality Review Panel considers that the site at 19 Bernard Road presents many challenges for development. It is at the transition point between the consented proposals for new development at the Bernard Works and the industrial area immediately adjacent to the west and south. **It also notes that the orientation and shape of the site present significant challenges for configuring the residential accommodation.***

*The design team has broadly responded well to previous comments around the location of ancillary functions (for example the bin and cycle stores), and the architectural expression and materiality of the proposals. The commercial accommodation and the amenity space are also much improved. Some scope for improvement remains in the design of the circulation cores, to enable a direct view through to the amenity space at the rear of the development.*

*While it generally supports the approach to scale and massing, the panel feels that some important work remains to be done to reduce the number of single-aspect apartments, particularly those on the southern elevation. **The panel feels that subject to a reduction in the number of south-facing single aspect units it would be able to offer support for the proposals, and the current planning application.**' [Officer note: the level of single aspect units were then addressed].*

6.6.2 The Panel also noted that it is confident that the project team will be able to address the matters raised in consultation with officers.

6.6.3 The key points of this Review are highlighted in the table below, in addition to officer comments.

Quality Review Panel Chair's Comment	Officer Response
<b>Massing and development density</b>	
As outlined at the previous review, the panel considers that the three-dimensional scale and massing of the proposal is at an acceptable maximum.	Comment welcomed.  The scheme has sought to optimise the provision of residential and employment

	accommodation having regard to the constraints of the site, the character and amenity of the surrounding area and viability.
<b>Scheme layout, public realm, access and integration</b>	
The panel feels that, while the design team has broadly responded well to comments around the layout and configuration, some important work remains to be done to reduce the number of single-aspect apartments, particularly those on the southern elevation.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As recommended by the QRP, the amended proposals reduce the number of single-aspect units from 24 to 6, representing 13% of the total number of dwellings.</p> <p>All north and south facing single- aspect units have been designed out and those 6 remaining are east facing.</p>
The north-facing single-aspect units will have an open outlook over the landscaped space immediately to the north. This will go some way towards mitigating the perceived impact of reduced sunlight.	As above.
However, the single-aspect south-facing units will have significant issues from overheating, problems with natural ventilation, and potential nuisance from the adjacent railway. The panel would encourage the design team to explore alternative means of designing or reconfiguring the accommodation to minimise these issues on the south side of the development.	As above.
If a reduction of south-facing single-aspect units were to be achieved, it would represent the best route to resolving an extremely challenging brief and would potentially create a successful high-density neighbourhood.	As above and agreed.

<p>One option to achieve this reduction would be to provide a third core, to enable a greater number of through units. This would have the added benefit of reducing the length of the corridors.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As recommended by the QRP, the amended proposals introduce a third core to assist in significantly reducing the number of single-aspect units and enhancing the layout and quality of accommodation.</p>
<p>The panel would also encourage the design team to explore re-locating the circulation cores to the southern face of the building, which may also help to reduce south-facing single-aspect units.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>In addition, further work to rethink the design of the circulation cores to allow direct views (through glazed elements) through to the shared amenity space at the rear of the development would be welcomed. This would significantly improve the visibility and usage of the amenity space and would also serve to indicate the standard of quality and thoughtfulness underpinning the design process.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As recommended by the QRP, the amended proposals allow direct views from the cores through to the shared amenity space. This has been achieved by reconfiguring the ground floor layout and introducing appropriately glazing.</p> <p>The revised layout improves the quality of the accommodation and usability of the amenity area and play space.</p>
<p>Subject to the proposals being adjusted to reduce the numbers of south facing single-aspect units, the panel would be able to offer support for the proposal, and the current planning application.</p>	<p>Comment welcomed.</p> <p>The amended proposals eliminate all south facing single-aspect units, as noted previously.</p>
<p>The panel supports the approach that locates active frontages at ground floor level next to landscaped open space and fronting onto Ashby Road.</p>	<p>Comment welcomed.</p>
<p>Regarding the interface between the building and the public realm at ground floor level, the panel considers that</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As recommended by the QRP,</p>

<p>provision of defensible space is most important for where bedrooms look onto the public realm.</p>	<p>the amended proposals incorporate defensible space as recommended by the QRP to safeguard the residential amenity of future occupants and improve the appearance of the frontage at ground floor.</p>
<p>It welcomes the adjustments to the plan that enable the ancillary accommodation (bin stores and cycle stores) to be located away from the primary residential entrances.</p>	<p>Comment welcomed.</p>
<p><b>Architectural expression</b></p>	
<p>The panel highlights the scheme's challenging brief, especially with regard to how the architecture of the corner (at the east of the site) will respond to the transition between Ashby Road, the Square, and the industrial buildings immediately to the south.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The amended proposals present a building which addresses both Bernard Road and Ashby Road at the eastern end of the site and the commercial uses to the rear.</p> <p>The development would be 4 storeys on this side of the site respecting the scale of the existing houses on Ashby Road, whilst active frontages including residential entrances and accommodation would face onto both roads, enhancing their character and appearance.</p> <p>The proposed building is simple and legible in its form and scale reflecting the domestic architecture nearby and the industrial heritage of the site and locality.</p> <p>This end of building would present a blank wall against the commercial uses to the rear, thereby protecting future residential amenity.</p>

<p>While it regrets the loss of the gabled roofline (incorporated within a previous iteration of the design), the panel is generally happy with the architectural expression of the scheme, subject to high quality materials and construction details.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Officers are similarly content with the architectural approach and appearance of the proposed building subject to high quality detailing.</p> <p>Materials and detailed design matters will be conditioned appropriately.</p>

6.6.4 Officers consider that in engaging with the QRP appropriately, the applicant has brought forward a more considered design that responds effectively to the local context and amenities of existing and future residents and users.

## 6.7 Design and Appearance – Summary

6.7.1 The proposed development is designed to deliver a mixed-use scheme, having regard to the need to optimise employment space and residential accommodation on a constrained site, in accordance policy requirements.

6.7.2 Officers consider that the density and design of the scheme, as amended represents a high quality and considered approach. The layout and access to the site is logical, providing a high-quality living environment and safeguarding neighbouring residential amenity.

6.7.3 The height, massing and elevational treatment are considered appropriate and respond positively to the existing and emerging character of the surrounding area.

6.7.4 The amended proposals address the key concerns raised by the Quality Review Panel, namely in relation to the number of single aspect units, particularly those south facing.

## 6.8 Development Impacts to Heritage Assets

- 6.8.1 The legal position with respect to heritage assets is pursuant to Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and as per relevant planning case law.
- 6.8.2 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given 'considerable importance and weight' in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
- 6.8.3 Policy 7.8 of the London Plan requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets.

#### *Impacts to Heritage Assets*

- 6.8.4 The site is not located in a Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings. The Principal Conservation Officer has assessed the proposal and concludes the development would not have an impact on the Page Green/Seven Sisters Conservation area (located to the northwest of the site) or the listed Old Bank or Markfield Beam Engine nearby.
- 6.8.5 The Principal Conservation Officer considers the amended proposal is of high quality and has been sensitively designed to transition between the terraced streetscape and taller elements. The proposal, in the view of the Conservation Officer, would enhance the townscape of this part of Tottenham and would enhance the setting of the heritage assets within the wider area.

### **6.9 Quality of Residential Accommodation**

- 6.9.1 London Plan policy 3.5 requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwellings to be of sufficient size and quality. The draft London Plan incorporates this approach in Policy D4.
- 6.9.2 Strategic Policy SP2 and Policy DM12 of the Council's Development

Management DPD 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.

6.9.3 As indicated above, officers consider that the amended scheme will provide for a high-quality residential environment. The development would present prominent and attractive entrances with views through to the amenity space at the rear of the building and feature 3 cores limiting corridor length and the number of units served off one internal access. Secure and convenient cycle parking and refuse/recycling facilities would be provided close to cores.

6.9 All units meet and, in many cases, exceed the required space standards and most are dual-aspect with the development now incorporating only 6 east facing single-aspect homes, representing 13% of the total. All units are designed to be adaptable and 5 units are wheelchair accessible, exceeding policy requirement.

6.9.4 Each unit would have use of a private terrace or balcony and access to communal amenity areas including play space.

*Children’s Play Space*

6.9.5 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.

6.9.6 Based on the maximum quantum of residential units proposed the development’s potential child yield and play space requirements have been calculated as follows:

Age	Number of Children	%
Under 5	5	46%
5 to 11	4	34%
12 +	2	21%
Total	11	100%
Play Space Required	112m2	



6.9.7 In total 11 children are predicted to live in the development, of which 5 would be under the age of 5. The development incorporates the required play space within the 204m<sup>2</sup> ground floor residential amenity area to the rear of the site.

6.9.8 It is noted that a new version of GLA calculator for play space has been created (however greater weight is given to the adopted calculator above), which considers density of the development and classifies intermediate housing within market for the purposes of play space. On that basis, the site would provide a total child yield of 15.3 children and a total play space requirement of 946.1sqm. The breakdown of total number of anticipated residents and their age groupings is given below:

GLA Population Yield Calculator

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Market and Intermediate Units	13	22	5	0
Social Units	1	1	3	0

Total Units	49
-------------	----

Geographic Aggregation	London
------------------------	--------

PTAL	PTAL 5-6
------	----------

#### Notes

Sample size of 27 sites

Shaded cells require user input

Select both geography and PTAL

For developments in Outer London with PTAL 5-6 use [London/PTAL 5-6] or [Outer London/3-4] to calculate yield

#### Yield from Development

(persons)

	Market & Intermediate	Social	Total
0-3	3.4	2.3	5.7
4-10	3.3	2.6	5.9
11-15	0.8	1.8	2.6
16-17	0.3	0.8	1.1
18-64	70.2	8.7	78.9
65+	1.7	0.2	1.9
Total Yield	79.7	16.4	96.1

#### Play Space Calculator

Total Children	15.3
----------------	------

	Benchmark (m <sup>2</sup> )	Total play space (m <sup>2</sup> )
Play space requirement	10	153.3

6.9.8 It should be noted the site is also near other areas of open space and amenity providing play facilities or the opportunity for play for older children. Markfield Park for instance, is a Borough SINC and Metropolitan Open Land, providing significant areas of open space and play facilities, approximately 800m away and readily accessible on foot. Other local amenity areas include open spaces in Stamford Road Park which is approximately 220m away and Rangemoor Road Open Space, which is 140m from the application site and incorporates Play space.

6.9.9 Overall, the development provides a satisfactory and policy compliant level of play space which would be complemented by a range of local areas of landscaped amenity and play space within easy walking distance from the site.

*Inclusive Access*

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

6.9.11 The development will provide 5 wheelchair accessible homes of varying unit sizes which will exceed the 10% requirement in planning policy. The development will also provide accessible Blue Badge parking spaces along Ashby Road for existing disabled residents and future occupiers that are Blue Badge holders. Level access will also be provided through the common areas and lobbies etc. Level access will also be provided from the street to commercial premises.

6.9.12 The relevant Building Regulations requirements will be secured by condition. The accessibility of the scheme is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the London and local policy, the Mayor's Housing SPG and the Mayor's Accessible London SPG. The scheme's accessibility is judged to be acceptable and in accordance with the London and local policy, the Mayor's Housing SPG and the Mayor's Accessible London SPG.

*Daylight/Sunlight Provision - Proposed Units*

6.9.13 The Mayor's SPG Housing 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 accessible locations, where BRE advice suggests considering the use of alternative targets. This should take into account local circumstances and the need to optimise housing capacity.

6.9.14 The application includes daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessments setting out the daylight and sunlight provision to future occupiers of the development. The daylight and sunlight light impact to adjoining occupiers is set out in the Amenity section below.

6.9.15 Daylight and sunlight levels to the proposed residential accommodation within this proposal showed an exceptionally high level of achievement of the BRE standard for a higher density scheme. In particular, all applicable rooms in the proposed development would meet the Average Daylight Factor (ADF), Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WPSH) standards recommended in the BRE Guide.

6.9.16 Officers agree with the applicant's conclusion that the levels of daylight and sunlight to the proposed units are considered acceptable. The proposed new development is acceptable from a daylight/sunlight perspective.

#### *Air Quality and Noise - Future Occupiers*

6.9.20 The applicant has submitted an environmental noise report. This assessment concludes the site is suitable for new mixed-use residential development given prevailing noise conditions. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has assessed the new residential units in relation to noise and concludes that subject to conditions (including a condition to install noise insulation between commercial uses and residential occupiers) the units will be of a suitable quality with respect to noise transmission.

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

6.10.1 The proposed residential units meet with London Plan standards and the majority are now dual-aspect. The development incorporates only 6 east facing single-aspect units facing onto Ashby Road, a residential street. The proposal would provide high quality private and communal external amenity spaces and an acceptable, policy compliant number of dwellings per core. The scheme also incorporates a policy compliant level of accessible and adaptable dwellings. The new residential units will receive good levels of daylight and sunlight and will be protected from the noise impacts of commercial uses. The scheme does not require mitigation in relation to overheating.

6.10.2 The scheme is therefore considered to deliver high quality residential accommodation for future occupiers in accordance with London Plan and local policy.

#### **6.11 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

6.11.1 The London Plan Policy 7.6 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Draft London Plan D13 seeks to manage noise and the draft London Plan Policy D12 seeks to put the onus on new development design to co-exist with existing noise. Policy DM1 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 and noise.

#### *Noise and Disturbance*

6.11.2 While the introduction of mixed-use development will give rise to additional noise and comings and goings generated from future occupiers, it is not considered that the potential noise emanating from the scheme would cause any noticeable disturbance over and above the existing use of the site in this mixed-use urban location.

6.11.3 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has assessed the proposal and the potential impacts to adjoining occupiers from the proposed development in noise terms. The EHO raises no objection to the scheme in relation to any overspill noise impacts subject to appropriate safeguarding conditions.

6.11.4 Given that noise intensive uses have the potential to currently operate from the existing commercial uses on site, its redevelopment entailing predominantly residential accommodation is considered to represent an improvement in this regard. The noise and disturbance impacts generated by future occupiers of the development are therefore considered acceptable in planning terms. impacts generated by future occupiers of the development are therefore considered acceptable in planning

6.11.5 The impacts are of construction noise are temporary and are proposed to be controlled by condition. The applicant will be required to submit a Construction Logistics Plan and a Demolition Logistics Plan. The applicant will also be required to join the Considerate Contractors scheme (as per the S106 agreement), with proof of registration provided to the Local Authority.

6.11.6 The temporary noise impacts during the construction are, subject to condition, considered acceptable. The operational noise impacts introduced by the development are acceptable given the existing uses on the site and the nature of the scheme.

### *Privacy and Outlook*

6.11.7 The proposed development has been designed to maximise the use of the land while respecting surrounding uses, particularly those houses on Ashby Road. The scheme has been limited to 4 storeys at its eastern end facing Ashby Road and its elevation treated appropriately to safeguard neighbouring outlook and privacy.

6.11.8 Specifically, the scheme incorporates inset balconies creating a sheltered private amenity area for residents while retaining maximum distances between the windows of the building and existing houses. This facing elevation would be 16.6m from the front of 4 of the houses opposite on Ashby Road which, in privacy terms would be comparable to a conventional urban street London.

6.11.9 The separation distance is considered acceptable and the proposed Development would not unduly constrain the outlook to any property along Ashby Road. Any negligible planning harm arising from overlooking between existing proposed properties along Ashby Road is significantly outweighed by improvements to the streetscape and other planning objectives achieved by development.

6.11.10 The nature of urban London is such that some impacts to amenity may arise from development, but the planning harm arising in this instance is negligible and when weighed against other planning benefits of the scheme significantly outweighed. The privacy impacts to adjoining occupiers are acceptable and in accordance with the policy noted above.

### *Daylight and Sunlight*

6.11.11 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).

6.11.12 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 Daylight/Sunlight assessment.

- 6.11.13 This assessment found four existing properties in Ashby Road and ten properties in the as yet unbuilt consented neighbouring Bernard Works scheme would fall below the daylight levels recommended in the BRE Guide. However, the amount of daylight lost would be minor. This is considered overall to be a very good impact on daylight to neighbours of this application proposal, better than the typical effect of developments on neighbours in higher density urban locations.
- 6.11.14 The assessment found five neighbouring existing properties in Ashby Road and two neighbouring permitted proposed properties in Bernard Works would receive less sunlight to applicable living rooms. Again, the loss would be minor. As above it should also be noted that all of the affected properties on Ashby Road also benefit from an unaffected eastern aspect onto their back gardens, so the impact, whilst noticeable, should not be severe on those residents.

## 6.12 **Transportation, Parking and Highway Safety**

- 6.12.1 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.
- 6.12.2 The site is located in an area with a high public transport accessibility level where development plan policies support developments with low levels of car parking provision. The development site is highly accessible with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6A (with 0 being the worst and 6b being the best).

### *Trip Generation and Impacts*

- 6.12.3 The principles and methodologies for assessment of the residual highway and transportation impacts of the development were discussed at the pre-application stage and are acceptable. The TRICS sites used to derive the trips rates for calculating the trip generation are suitable comparator sites and therefore, the trip rates are accepted.
- 6.12.4 The forecasted trip generation for the residential part of the development is 35 two-way person trips in the AM peak period and 31 two-way person trips on the PM peak period. The proposed residential use is not expected to

generate any vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak periods and as such, no impacts on the adjoining road network will be created.

6.12.5 The anticipated person trip generation for the commercial use is 8 two-way movements in the AM and PM peak periods. The vehicle trip generation is predicted to be 3 two-way trips for both peak traffic periods.

6.12.6 Overall (residential and commercial combined), the public transport trips are expected to be 25 and 22 two-way trips during the AM and PM peaks respectively. These additional trips by public transport is not expected to affect the capacity of the existing network.

6.12.7 In summary, the trip generation analysis has demonstrated to the Transport Officer's satisfaction that the additional trips generated by the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the local public transport services and no material impacts on the highway impacts will be created.

#### *Car Parking*

6.12.8 The proposal does not include any on-site car parking. Given that the site is well-connected by public transport, car parking is not a priority. This accords with London Plan Policy 6:13 and draft London Plan Policy T6; and Haringey Policy DM32, which promotes car-free developments as a starting point for development sites in well-connected locations.

6.12.9 Policy T6.1 requires the provision of disabled parking space for 3 per cent of the residential units from the outset. This equates to two (2) spaces. The policy also requires development proposals to demonstrate how the remaining disabled parking spaces, up to ten percent of dwellings can be provided when requested. This would amount to 5 no. disabled spaces in total. The applicant proposes 4 on-street disabled parking spaces. 3 spaces are located on Ashby Road and 1 space on the frontage of the site in Bernard Road. The principle of on-street disabled parking is acceptable, and it is noted that the proposed disabled parking in Bernard Works and Ashby Road does not result in the loss of standard parking capacity.

#### *Cycle Parking*

6.12.10 There are 83 long stay secure cycle parking spaces which accords with the required London Plan standards. Details of the cycle parking arrangements are conditioned.

#### *Delivery and Servicing*



6.12.11 The commercial and residential accommodation would be serviced from Bernard

Road. Subject to acceptable details, the development proposal is considered to make adequate provision for waste recycling, storage and collection. The arrangements for delivery and servicing will need to be set out in the final Deliver and Servicing Plan (DSP) to be approved via condition prior to occupation of the development.

6.12.12 Based on the scale and nature of the development, the number and frequency

of

these trips are not expected to create any undue traffic impacts. Nevertheless, the final DSP must include the trip generation figures for delivery and servicing.

### 6.13 **Transportation - summary**

6.13.1 A car-free development as proposed accords with policy (London Plan Policy 6:13,

Draft London Plan Policy T6 and LBH Policy DM32) proving that occupiers can be prevented from accessing permits to park in the adjoining CPZ. No significant impacts on the public transport and highway networks are envisaged. Cycle parking is adequate in terms of quantum, but details of cycle parking will be conditioned. A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) detailing the arrangements for mitigating the impacts of construction traffic will need to be secured in addition to

a

Delivery and Service Plan (DSP). The applicant will be required to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the Council, to pay for any necessary highway improvements works.

### 6.14 **Environment, Energy and Climate Change**

6.14.1 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 zero carbon target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations.

#### *Air Quality*

6.14.2 The NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) is consistent with the local air quality action plan. London Plan Policy 7.14 sets out the Mayor's commitment to improving air quality and public health and states that development proposals should minimise increased exposure to poor air

quality.

6.14.3 At the Local level, Policy SP7 states that in order to control air pollution developers must carry out relevant assessments and set out mitigating measures in line with national guidance. This approach is reflected in Policy DM23 which states that air quality assessments will be required for all major development and other development proposals, where appropriate.

6.14.4 The site falls within the LBH Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) which is a borough-wide designation due to measured exceedances of the air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (as PM<sub>10</sub>). The primary source of emissions of these pollutants in the Borough is road traffic.

6.14.5 The Council's Environmental Officer has assessed the application. Based on the results of the applicant's Air Quality Assessment, it is concluded that redevelopment of the site would not cause a significant impact on local air quality.

6.14.6 The EHO has recommend the imposition of standard conditions to control air quality during the operational and construction phases of development. Subject to the imposition of these conditions, the air quality impacts of the development are acceptable.

#### *Land Contamination*

6.14.7 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 1 Desk-top Study.

6.14.8 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.

#### *Flood Risk and Drainage*

6.14.9 London Plan (2011) Policy 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) and Local Plan (2013) Policy SP5 (Water Management and Flooding) require developments to utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) unless there are practical reasons for not doing so, and aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as

possible in line with the drainage hierarchy.

6.14.10 Policy also requires drainage to be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation. Further guidance on implementing Policy 5.13 is provided in the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014) including the design of a suitable SUDS scheme.

6.14.11 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered to have a Low probability of flooding. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The FRA concludes that the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 and is at a low risk from fluvial and tidal flooding. Given the

existing

Developed nature of the site and surrounding area it is also considered that

the

site is at low risk from surface water flooding, groundwater, sewer flooding and also as a result of artificial sources.

6.14.12 The Council's Local Lead Flood Authority has assessed the scheme and requires the imposition of planning conditions to secure drainage details including the design features noted above. A planning condition will also seek to secure the SUDS features and attenuations targets proposed by the applicant. The Environment Agency and Thames Water do not raise an objection to the scheme subject to conditions noted in Appendix 1. The development is acceptable in Flood Risk and drainage terms.

#### *Energy and Carbon Reduction*

6.14.13 The London Plan also 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 near 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.

6.14.14 New development is expected to achieve the necessary energy and CO2 requirements within the London Plan and Haringey Council's Local Plan or pay an off-set payment. The applicant has submitted an Energy Strategy with the application. The Council's Carbon Management Team has assessed the proposal in energy and sustainability terms.

and

6.14.15 While the scheme was initially envisaged to include a micro-Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Unit, following discussions between the applicant and the Council's

Carbon Management Team, it was agreed CHP would not be appropriate for this development due the scale and connectively, and that allowance should be made to connect this development to a future district heat network which is likely to be provided on another site within a masterplan for the existing employment area. The sustainability features agreed are therefore:

- A single heating and hot water system, powered by a single energy centre and serving all units (residential and non-domestic) on the site;
- A Photo-Voltaic (PV) system covering the flat roof areas of the proposed building.

6.14.16 The development gives an overall saving of 16% against Building Regulations 2013 on regulated energy and the applicant has agreed off-set the remaining emissions. The Carbon Management Team accept the building design and

mixed

used element indicates a higher off-set payment suitable in this instance. The developer has agreed to off-setting the remaining emissions at a cost of

£96,361.

6.14.17 The Carbon Management Team considers these measures, alongside the site wide energy network, makes the scheme policy compliant and should be secured through conditions. Subject to the carbon off-set amount, noted above and the securing the sustainability features, the scheme is considered acceptable in sustainability terms in accordance with the policy above.

#### *Overheating*

6.14.18 London Plan Policy 5.9 seeks to reduce the impact of the urban heat island effect in London and encourages the design of places and spaces to avoid overheating and excessive heat generation. Major development proposals are expected to demonstrate how the design, materials, construction and operation of the development would minimise overheating and also meet its cooling needs. New development in London should also be designed to avoid the need for energy intensive air conditioning systems as much as possible.

6.14.19 The applicant had submitted a report assessing the potential for overheating in respect to the single-aspect south facing units, as originally proposed and considered to be most at risk to overheating. The report concluded that subject to the provision of appropriate blinds, excessive heat levels could be avoided.

Given

that the amended proposals have removed all single-aspect south facing units, officers consider that potential overheating can be satisfactorily controlled

through

the submission of an appropriate mitigation strategy and management plan.

## **6.15 Fire Safety and Security**

- 6.15.1 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, the following information around fire safety and security is provided.
- 6.15.2 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 processes, 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.
- 6.15.3 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.
- 6.15.4 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.
- 6.15.5 It should be noted that the Fire Brigade was consulted on the planning application and they raised no objections subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and informatives. As such, it is considered that the suite of measures proposed for the development and required by the relevant regulations is sufficient for the application to be acceptable in relation to fire safety measures.

## **6.16 Conclusion**

- 6.16.1 The proposal is a well-designed mixed-use scheme providing a range of residential accommodation and commercial space. The proposed development complements the recently approved scheme on the adjacent site at Bernard Works and reflects the policy requirements of Site Allocation (TH12 Herbert Road) and its designation within a Local Employment Area (Regeneration Area).

6.16.2 The scheme delivers family and smaller sized residential units including 14 units of affordable housing (9 Discount Market Rent at London Living Rent levels and 5 social rent) representing 31% provision by unit number and 37% provision by habitable room.

6.16.3 The layout and design of the development optimise the potential of the site and respect the scale and character of the surrounding mixed-use area.

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

## **7.0 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**

7.1 Based on the information given on the plans (and incorporating 12 units of affordable housing), the Mayoral CIL charge will be £83,760 and the Haringey CIL charge will be £20,940. This secures a total CIL contribution of £104,700.

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.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions in Appendix 1 and subject to a Section 106 legal Agreement.

8.2 Approved Drawing No.s:

- P0005 Existing Site Location Plan; P0006 Existing Site Location Plan.
- 0010 Series - P0010 Existing Survey Plan; P0011 Demolition Plan; P0070 Existing North Elevation; P0071 Existing East Elevation; P0072 Existing South Elevation; P0073 Existing West Elevation; P0080 Existing North Elevation with demolition; P0081 Existing East Elevation with demolition; P0082 Existing South Elevation with demolition; P0083 Existing West Elevation with demolition.
- 0100 Series - P0105 Proposed Site Plan; P0106 Proposed Site Plan with Consented Scheme; P0109 Proposed Basement Floor Plan; P0110 Proposed Ground Floor Plan with Extg Context; P0110.1 Proposed Ground Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0111 Proposed First Floor Plan; P0111.1 Proposed First Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0112 Proposed Second

Floor Plan; P0112.1 Proposed Second Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0113 Proposed Third Floor Plan; P0113.1 Proposed Third Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0114 Proposed Fourth Floor Plan; P0114.1 Proposed Fourth Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0115 Proposed Fifth Floor Plan; P0115.1 Proposed Fifth Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0116 Proposed Sixth Floor Plan; P0116.1 Proposed Sixth Floor Plan with Consented Scheme; P0117 Proposed Roof Plan; P0140 Proposed Section AA; P0170 Proposed North Elevation; P0171 Proposed East Elevation; P0172 Proposed South Elevation 1; P0173 Proposed West Elevation; P0174 Proposed South Elevation 2; P0180 Proposed North Elevation; P0180\_COLOUR Proposed North Elevation; P0181 Proposed South Elevation; P0181\_COLOUR Proposed South Elevation; P0182 Proposed East Elevation; P0182\_COLOUR Proposed East Elevation.

- 0200 Series - P0270 Proposed North Elevation Bay Study; P0271 Proposed South Elevation Bay Study.
- SK Series - SK001 Sketch view 1; SK002 Sketch view 2; SK003 Sketch view 3; SK004 Sketch view 4; SK005 Sketch view 5; SK006 Sketch view 6; SK007 Sketch view 7; SK008 Sketch view 8.

### 8.3 Approved Supporting Documents:

- Design and Access Statement – MSMR Architects, August 2019;
- Sustainability and Energy Statement - Stinton Jones Consulting Engineers IIP, August 2019;
- Analysis of Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight, Third Revision, Stinton Jones Consulting Engineers IIP, 16th August 2019;
- Air Quality Assessment - XCO2, April 2019;
- Overheating Report - Stinton Jones Consulting Engineers IIP, July 2019;
- Preliminary Investigation Report – Soils Limited, March 2019;
- Transport Statement – i-Transport, 8 March 2019;
- Travel Plan Statement, Technical Note – i-Transport, 8 March 2019;
- Draft Waste and Servicing Plan, Technical Note – i-Transport. 8 March 2019;
- Flood Risk Assessment – Michael Barclay Partnership, 20 February 2019;
- Planning Noise Report - Stinton Jones Consulting Engineers IIP, June 2019;
- SuDS and Drainage Strategy Report - Michael Barclay Partnership, 14 June 2019.

