

# Public Document Pack



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 23rd June, 2020 at 7.30 pm

Contact: Jane Creer / Metin Halil  
Committee Administrator  
Direct : 020-8132-1211 / 1296  
Tel: 020-8379-1000  
Ext: 1211 / 1296

## **PLEASE NOTE : VIRTUAL MEETING**

Please click [Here](#) to view the meeting or copy and paste the below link into your web browser:

E-mail: [jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk)  
[metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk)  
Council website: [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk)

[https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting\\_YmNiNDU1ODktZDZmMC00ZDQ2LThiZDQtYzE2MWNmMzU0N2Jm%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%22cc18b91d-1bb2-4d9b-ac76-7a4447488d49%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22de181320-9e9a-429c-a8db-b37ae5b5ded1%22%2c%22IsBroadcastMeeting%22%3atrue%7d](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_YmNiNDU1ODktZDZmMC00ZDQ2LThiZDQtYzE2MWNmMzU0N2Jm%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%22cc18b91d-1bb2-4d9b-ac76-7a4447488d49%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22de181320-9e9a-429c-a8db-b37ae5b5ded1%22%2c%22IsBroadcastMeeting%22%3atrue%7d)

## MEMBERS

Councillors : Maria Alexandrou, Mahmut Aksanoglu (Chair), Sinan Boztas (Vice-Chair), Mahym Bedekova, Chris Bond, Elif Erbil, Ahmet Hasan, Tim Leaver, Hass Yusuf, Michael Rye OBE and Jim Steven

**N.B. Involved parties may request to make a deputation to the Committee by contacting [Democracy@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Democracy@enfield.gov.uk) before 12:00 noon on 22/06/20**

## AGENDA – PART 1

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST
3. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 21 MAY 2020 AND TUESDAY 2 JUNE 2020 (Pages 1 - 4)

To receive the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21 May 2020.

To receive the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 2 June 2020.

**(TO FOLLOW)**

**4. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING (REPORT NO.263) (Pages 5 - 6)**

To receive the covering report of the Head of Planning.

**5. 19/01941/FUL - SOUTHGATE OFFICE VILLAGE, 286 CHASE ROAD, LONDON, N14 6HF (Pages 7 - 112)**

RECOMMENDATION: That subject to the completion of a S106 to secure the matters covered in this report and referral of the application to the Mayor of London and no objection being raised, the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.

WARD: Southgate

**6. FUTURE MEETING DATES**

Meeting dates for the 2020/21 municipal year will be approved at Annual Council on 1 July.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2020

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 21 MAY 2020****COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Maria Alexandrou, Mahmut Aksanoglu, Sinan Boztas, Mahym Bedekova, Chris Bond, Elif Erbil, Ahmet Hasan, Tim Leaver, Hass Yusuf, Michael Rye OBE and Jim Steven

**ABSENT**

**OFFICERS:** Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Claire Williams (Planning Decisions Manager) and Catriona McFarlane (Legal Representative) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Danny Hammond, Principal Engineer, on behalf of LBE Parks Service (for Item 5 only)  
Karen Maguire, on behalf of LBE Strategic Property Services (for Item 7 only)  
Members of the public, applicant and agent representatives were able to observe the meeting live online.

**558****WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

## NOTED

1. Councillor Aksanoglu, Chair, welcomed all attendees to the meeting, which was being broadcast live online. Committee members confirmed their presence and that they were able to hear and see the proceedings.
2. Apologies for absence were received from Dennis Stacey (Chair, Conservation Advisory Group), and from Dominic Millen (Group Leader Transport Planning and Policy) due to broadband outage.
3. Apologies for slight lateness were received from Councillors Boztas and Leaver.
4. Due to IT difficulties, Councillor Erbil was unable to fully participate in the meeting.
5. Council officers involved in the meeting introduced themselves.

**559****DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

NOTED that Councillor Bedekova declared a pecuniary interest in application ref 20/00022/HOU – 22 Lancing Gardens, London N9, as she was the applicant. She would leave the meeting when the item was discussed and take no part in the debate or decision on the application.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2020**

**560**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 21 APRIL 2020**

NOTED

1. The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21 April 2020 were agreed as a correct record.
2. The provision of a publicly-available audio recording of the meeting would be prioritised.

**561**

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING (REPORT NO.253)**

RECEIVED the report of the Head of Planning.

**562**

**19/04345/RE4 - TENNIS COURTS, BROOMFIELD PARK, BROOMFIELD LANE, LONDON N13 4HE**

NOTED

1. Councillors Boztas and Leaver joined the meeting at this point, and would therefore be able to discuss and vote on the item.
2. An update report for Members had been published and circulated by email.
3. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and highlighting the key issues.
4. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers on behalf of Planning and of Parks Services.
5. A brief adjournment of the meeting at 8:00pm to allow attendees to join in the national clap for carers, key workers and NHS staff.
6. Members' concern that evidence was not available in respect of existing or projected usage and need for tennis and netball at the sports courts.
7. Councillor Rye's proposal, seconded by Councillor Leaver, that a decision on the application be deferred until information was provided to demonstrate the need for the sports and the hours of operation to support an exceptional case for the floodlighting in this Metropolitan Open Land and historic park.
8. The support of a majority of the Committee for the application to be deferred: 7 votes for and 3 votes against.

**AGREED** that the application be deferred.

**563**

**20/00022/HOU - 22 LANCING GARDENS, LONDON N9 9EU**

NOTED

1. Councillor Bedekova left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on the application.



**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2020**

2. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**564**

**20/00578/RE4 - 12 NORTH WAY, LONDON N9 0AD**

NOTED

1. It was confirmed that Councillor Bedekova had re-joined the meeting.
2. An update report for Members had been published and circulated by email.
3. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
4. Members' debate, and questions responded to by officers on behalf of Planning and of Strategic Property Services.
5. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Head of Development Management / the Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant deemed consent subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**565**

**FUTURE MEETING DATES**

NOTED

1. The dates of future meetings of the Planning Committee on Tuesday 2 June 2020 and Tuesday 23 June 2020.
2. An additional meeting date was proposed for Tuesday 7 July 2020.
3. The Southgate Office Village application (application ref 19/01941/FUL) was proposed for determination by Planning Committee on 23 June. Members had previously indicated they would like to make a site visit. The options for a virtual tour or a visit in a small group of representatives to accommodate social distancing were discussed.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/2020 - REPORT NO 263**

**COMMITTEE:**  
 PLANNING COMMITTEE  
 23.06.2020

AGENDA - PART 1	ITEM 4
-----------------	--------

SUBJECT -
-----------

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS
-----------------------

**REPORT OF:**  
 Head of Planning

**Contact Officer:**  
 Planning Decisions Manager  
 David Gittens Tel: 020 8379 8074  
 Claire Williams Tel: 020 8379 4372

#### **4.1 APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS** INF

4.1.1 In accordance with delegated powers, 290 applications were determined between 12/05/2020 and 12/06/2020, of which 220 were granted and 70 refused.

4.1.2 A Schedule of Decisions is available in the Members' Library.

##### Background Papers

To be found on files indicated in Schedule.

#### **4.2 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS TO DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS** DEC

On the Schedules attached to this report I set out my recommendations in respect of planning applications and applications to display advertisements. I also set out in respect of each application a summary of any representations received and any later observations will be reported verbally at your meeting.


##### Background Papers

- (1) Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Section 54A of that Act, as inserted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, states that where in making any determination under the Planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the London Borough of Enfield is the London Plan (March 2015), the Core Strategy (2010) and the Development Management Document (2014) together with other supplementary documents identified in the individual reports.
- (2) Other background papers are those contained within the file, the reference number of which is given in the heading to each application.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD</b>		
<b>PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>Date:</b> 23 June 2020
<b>Report of</b> Head of Planning	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Andy Higham Kevin Tohill Evie Learman Tel: 0208 132 0873	<b>Ward:</b> Southgate
<b>Application Number:</b> 19/01941/FUL		<b>Category:</b> Major
<b>LOCATION:</b> Southgate Office Village 286 Chase Road London N14 6HF		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b> Demolition of existing office buildings and erection of buildings between 2 to 17 storeys high comprising offices (use class B1), 216 residential units (use class C3) and dual use cafe (use class A3 / B1) together with access, basement car park and Energy Centre, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.		
<b>Applicant Name &amp; Address:</b> Viewpoint Estates C/O Agent		<b>Agent Name &amp; Address:</b> Holly Mitchell Simply Planning Lower Ground Floor 25 Charlotte Street London W1T 2ND
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>  That subject to the completion of a S106 to secure the matters covered in this report and referral of the application to the Mayor of London and no objection being raised, the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions..		

Ref: 19/01941/FUL LOCATION: Southgate Office Village , 286 Chase Road, London, N14 6HF



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. ©Crown Copyright and database right 2013. All Rights Reserved. Ordnance Survey License number 100019820

Scale 1:1250

North



## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The site currently has an existing prior approval for the conversion of offices to residential which would result in the complete loss of the existing office floorspace and associated jobs. Furthermore, due to the nature of permitted development rights (PDR), the change of use is not subject to planning policy requirements and therefore can proceed without providing any affordable housing, minimise floorspace standards or parking. There would also be no gain from a Section 106 agreement and limited regeneration benefits.
- 1.2 The current planning application represents an opportunity to control the future of this site and aims to optimise the potential of the site by providing a good quality, mixed-use development which maintains office floorspace on the site whilst introducing residential and a wider retail / commercial offer. The scheme would take advantage of its town centre location and public transport accessibility, while balancing the prevailing character of the surrounding area to provide substantial regeneration benefits.
- 1.3 The provision of with much needed new homes and quality residential accommodation, would contribute to the Borough's housing needs. In addition, new modern office floorspace will also be re-provided along with a publicly accessible office hub/café area. The flexible office hub/cafe floorspace has the potential to add to the vitality and vibrancy of this section of Chase Road, as would the openly accessible public realm area, which is considered an improvement on the existing situation.
- 1.4 The development therefore provides for new employment opportunities and these are considered to support the objectives within the Corporate Plan, the emerging new Local Plan and economic development strategy, contributing positively to local economic impact. Local labour and training obligations will also contribute positively to the regeneration objectives for the area.
- 1.5 There would be 35% affordable units based on habitable rooms (31% based on unit numbers) which an independent viability assessment has shown to be more than the site can support. Nevertheless, the developer is taking a longer-term view and accepts the importance of delivering more affordable housing which is a Council priority, and therefore have put forward an offer reflective of this.
- 1.6 Notwithstanding, while the proposed affordable offer of 35% is considered significant for the Borough it is not policy compliant. With that in mind the Section 106 legal agreement contains early and late stage review mechanisms to ensure any uplift in value would be captured by the Council. The public benefits that would come forward with the scheme are considered on balance, to support the acceptability of the 35% affordable housing offer.
- 1.7 Housing need continues to rise in the Borough and the actual delivery of homes to meet the needs of residents has not kept a pace. Over the last 5-years, approximately 550 new residential units per year have been delivered significantly below the 798 units that are required by the adopted London Plan. Housing delivery therefore continues to be a priority as well as a challenge, with our housing target likely to be revised to 1,246 in the new London Plan (Intend to Publish), although this is lower than the Governments standard model which requires 3,500 homes being delivered each and every year in Enfield.

- 1.8 The principle of this mixed use development in land use terms is supported by both adopted national and local policy as well as emerging local and regional policy which promotes directing housing growth towards suitable brownfield sites and the densification of town centres around good transport hubs thereby maximising mixed-used schemes, especially if this would help to meet identified housing need where land supply is constrained This is consistent with Para. 118 of the NPPF which refers to making efficient use of existing land to ensure housing increases are delivered.
- 1.9 It is acknowledged that the Development will be visible within the existing surrounding townscape but it has been designed to be appropriately respectful of and responsive to context in terms of scale, mass and design. There are differing heights and massing across the development, with the tallest element rising to 17-storeys. While it is acknowledged that the development is higher than Southgate's current townscape and significantly taller than the surrounding buildings, it is also positively designed to act as a landmark, helping to define the town centre. The introduction of taller buildings into this Southgate town centre location is considered in the context of the overall design approach to the scheme recognising the emphasis on optimising development in town centre locations with good access to public transport and the contribution to deliver public benefits.
- 1.10 Historic England initially objected to a higher scheme during the pre-application phase due to the impact on Groveland's Park, however following a reduction to 17-storeys and a further reduction of 4m to the height (whilst remaining at 17-storeys) during the application submission, this objection was withdrawn. Historic England have also raised no objection to the potential impact on the listed underground station although they have stated that they consider the proposals to create a degree of harm to the setting of the station, however this is less than substantial.
- 1.11 Whilst less than substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets can be contrary to Section 66(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Core Policy 31, DMD 44 and DMD 43 Tall Buildings, Local Plan Policy 7.7, and guidance in NPPF at Para 132 and Historic England guidance The Setting of Heritage Assets [2015], having regard to Paragraph 196 of the NPPF, it is considered that the less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the wider public benefits of the scheme such as the delivery of good quality homes, affordable housing, meaningful regeneration of the area and the creation of high-quality public realm . Furthermore, it is considered the less than substantial harm has been minimised and mitigated by the high-quality of the design, to result in a scheme which on balance, is acceptable.
- 1.12 The proposed mix and size of units is considered appropriate for a high-density residential scheme in a town centre and transport-hub location. Further, it would meet required London Plan Standards, in terms of providing residential units of an appropriate size with individual amenity space while also providing good quality public realm including shared amenity space on site.
- 1.13 Given the scale and proximity of the Development, it is acknowledged some impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties will ensue, however the scheme has evolved to minimise this potential harm by pulling away heights from the nearest residential properties. Notwithstanding



changes / revisions to minimise harm, there will still be some level of adverse impact which is discussed in further detail in the main body of the report.

- 1.14 There will be a reduction in on-site parking from 140 to 23 including 6 wheelchair accessible spaces together with parking management measures. This will result in a reduction in the number of vehicles within the Southgate area overall. Traffic and transportation issues are discussed in further detail below (Para. 8.7 onwards).
- 1.15 Overall, the scheme has been carefully designed to address its heritage context and its contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Extensive pre-application engagement, an independent design review process, and public consultation, including a Planning Panel meeting have resulted in high-quality design development and placemaking. There are clear benefits arising from the scheme, such as the supply of much needed good quality homes, including affordable housing. Modern office floorspace would result in significant regeneration benefits and could act as a catalyst for further revitalisation of the town centre.

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That subject to the completion of a S106 to secure the matters covered in this report and referral of the application to the Mayor of London (Stage 2) and no objection being raised, the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions
- 2.2 That the Section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 30/09/2020 or within such extended time as agreed by the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management ; and
- 2.3 That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning or the Head of Development Management to finalise the wording of the S106 obligations and the recommended conditions as set out in this report.

### **Conditions**

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

- 20) Drainage compliance
- 21) Contamination - Verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy
- 22) Surface water drainage
- 23) Piling impact method statement
- 24) Underground storage tanks
- 25) Water supply infrastructure
- 26) Groundwater
- 27) Details of cycle parking
- 28) Delivery and Servicing Plan
- 29) Construction Logistics Plan
- 30) Excavations/Earthworks
- 31) Vibro-impact Machinery
- 32) Lighting
- 33) Method Statements/Fail Safe/Possessions
- 34) Noise/Soundproofing
- 35) Detailed playspace design
- 36) Secured by design
- 37) Communal aerial
- 38) Building lighting
- 39) Details of any rooftop plant, extract ducts, fans etc.

### **3.0 Site and Surroundings**

- 3.1 The 0.57-hectare application site is adjacent to Southgate District Town Centre. The site is bounded by residential properties fronting Park Road to the north east, Chase Road to the north west and the White Hart Public House, which is a non-designated heritage asset, to the south.
- 3.2 The existing complex comprises seven, three storey high office buildings, comprising a total of 4,433 sq.m. of office floorspace (identified as Blocks A, B/C, D, E, F, G/H and Solar House) and a two storey, 140-space car park. They existing buildings are typical of late 20<sup>th</sup> century architecture and are of no particular architectural merit.
- 3.3 The site is adjacent to and falls within the setting of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area. It is also within the proximity of listed buildings, including the Grade II\* Southgate Underground station which is approximately 150-metres south of the site. Other nearby heritage assets include Station Pylons to the north and south of Southgate Underground station and the Grade II Gloucester Place Cottages. The Grade I listed Grovelands Park Hospital (original block) and Grade II Granary to the west of Grovelands are over 550 metres south east of the site, and the Grade II\* Grovelands Park (Park and Garden) and Grade II Lodge to Grovelands Park and Pair of Gun Posts are approximately 300 metres distance.
- 3.4 Southgate Station is approximately 150-metres south of the site for London Underground (LU) Piccadilly Line services. The closest bus stop is Southgate Station stop, which serves 8 routes connecting Southgate to Central London and other transport hubs including Enfield Town. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 4, on a scale of 1 (poor) to 6 (excellent); and, therefore, has a good level of accessibility to public transport.
- 3.5 The buildings within the immediate locality and those abutting the site are

generally residential, comprising Victorian terraces two to three-storeys in height fronting Chase Road and Park Road and larger commercial style buildings progressively south of between three and six storeys in height. The office buildings are generally of a plain utilitarian design.

- 3.6 The site slopes down from north to south and from west to east with a 4-metre level change from Chase Road to Park Road. Due to the local topography therefore, Southgate Circus itself is one of the highest points within the Borough.
- 3.7 The following policy designations / characteristics apply to the site:
- a) It is a brownfield site in a sustainable location on the edge of Southgate District Centre and within 150m of Southgate Underground Station;
  - b) The site is closely linked to Southgate District Centre and the current offices provide high levels of employment which support the District Centre shops and service providers. The District Centre also provides shopping and employment for current and future employees and future residents of the scheme.
  - c) The site is located within the setting of Southgate Circus Conservation Area which includes the listed Southgate Underground station, situated approximately 150m to the south of the site. The underground station provides access to the Piccadilly Line, linking the site to most areas within the City;
  - d) The site / Southgate District Centre is served by a large number of bus services, with 7 bus routes providing a total of 33 services per hour;
  - e) The site has a PTAL rating of 4 which demonstrates a good level of public transport accessibility within an overall rating of 0 to 6 with 0 indicating very poor public transport accessibility and 6 (a or b) indicating very good / excellent public transport accessibility;
  - f) Chase Road consists of a variety of uses: close to Southgate District Centre the street is more commercial in nature and contains a mixture of offices, mixed commercial and residential uses. As the road moves away from the District Centre it becomes predominantly residential. To the rear of the site is Park Road, a residential street with predominantly two storey terrace housing.
  - g) A variety of open spaces are located within the surrounding area. These range from open spaces within the residential neighbourhood such as Ivy Road Recreation Ground and larger parks such as Oakwood Park to the north and more formal spaces such as Grovelands Park to the south east.

#### **4.0 Proposal**

- 4.1 This is a full application for planning permission which proposes the demolition of the existing office buildings and the erection of buildings between 2 to 17 storeys high comprising offices (Class B1), 216 residential units (Class C3) and dual use cafe (Class A3 / B1) together with access,

basement car park and Energy Centre, cycle parking, landscaping and associated works. The three proposed tall buildings on the site would be 8, 13 and 17-storeys in height.

- 4.2 The tallest of these 3 buildings (17 storeys) will be located towards the eastern side of the site nearest to the railway line with the lowest building (8 storeys) being located towards Chase Road to the west. All three tall buildings (eight, thirteen and seventeen storeys) are located towards the southern part of the site, furthest away from residential properties in Park Road and Hillside Grove.
- 4.3 The design of the scheme is the result of substantial pre-application engagement to produce high-quality buildings and public realm which incorporates routes-through and a pocket park. The articulation and materiality of the buildings have been carefully considered to provide a contemporary interpretation of the nearby heritage assets and existing townscape. The emphasis of the proposed buildings' fenestration is on the vertical but using proportions found in the surrounding townscape especially within the Southgate Circus Conservation Area.
- 4.4 Parking for the proposed development will be underground in a basement. At ground floor the buildings will provide offices together with access lobbies to the residential units on the higher floors. A cafe will be created on the site's southwestern corner with access from Chase Road. The cafe and office units have been designed so as to help create an active frontage onto the public realm and where the activities within the building can be seen from outside.
- 4.5 The scheme has been revised to provide an improved affordable housing offer which is now 35% on a habitable room basis, with a breakdown of 49% Affordable Rent and 51% Shared Ownership.
- 4.6 As well as an increase in affordable housing the revised scheme also includes the following:
  - An additional 16 residential units taking the total to 216;
  - A reduction in commercial floorspace in order to provide the additional residential units with the commercial element now comprising 1,720 sq.m of offices including office hub/café. The scheme will still provide a good level of commercial floorspace and facilitate a good level of commercial activity in this location;
  - A reduction in the size of the basement car park which will now provide 23 car parking spaces including 6 accessible spaces, 445 cycle spaces including 19 large cycle spaces and an Energy Centre; and
  - A reduction in building height of 4 metres to address Historic England concerns.
- 4.7 As per the initial submission a new public realm and a pocket park will still be part of the scheme providing a new pedestrian through-route which will in turn enhance the pedestrian movement network.
- 4.8 The changes to the building height have resulted in elevational changes at ground floor level; these changes along with other aspects of the design and materiality will be discussed further in the main body of the report.

## 5.0 Relevant Planning Decisions

### 5.1 P14-00512PLA

In May 2015 planning permission was granted on appeal for a mixed use scheme over the car park to provide one floor of office floorspace and two storeys of residential development to provide eight additional flats.

*Redevelopment of site to provide residential units and offices involving a part 3-storey, part 4-storey block to provide 504sqm of office space at first floor level, 6 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed self-contained flats at second and third floor level and car parking to basement and ground floor.*

### 5.2 17/00174/PRJ

In March 2017 approval was granted for conversion of the office floorspace to provide 74 self-contained flats (25 x 1-beds, 47x 2-beds and 2 x 3-beds).

Parking was retained at 146 car parking spaces.

*Change of use of a building from office use (Class B1(a)) to 74 self-contained units comprising 25 x 1-bed, 47 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed (Class C3).*

### 5.3

In May 2019 an EIA Screening Opinion request was made to the council to establish whether the proposed works would constitute EIA development as assessed against Regulation 6(1) of the EIA Regulations. The council agreed that the Development did not constitute EIA development.

*Pre-application and changes post submission*

### 5.4

The scheme has been the subject of an extensive pre-application process in line with best practice and as recommended in the NPPF. This process included meetings and workshops with officers, independent design review by the Enfield Design Review Panel, presentation to Planning Committee at pre-application stage, stakeholder engagement and public consultation and engagement. The scheme proposals have evolved during the course of negotiations with the applicants in response to comments that have been made.

## 6.0 Consultations

### 6.1

In November 2015, the Council adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which sets out policy for involving the community in the preparation, alteration and review of planning policy documents and in deciding planning applications.

### 6.2

Paragraph 3.1.1 of the adopted version sets out the expectation of the Council:

*“The Council aims to involve the community as a whole: to extend an open invitation to participate but at the same time ensure that consultation is representative of the population. To achieve this, a variety of community involvement methods will need to be used. Targeted consultation of stakeholders and interest groups, depending upon their expertise and interest and the nature and content of the Local Plan documents, or type of planning application, will be undertaken.”*

Paragraph 5.3.6 goes on to state:

*“In the case of ‘significant applications’, additional consultation will be carried out depending upon the proposal and site circumstances:*

*Developers will be encouraged to provide the community with information and updates on large scale or phased developments using websites, public exhibitions and newsletters”*

*Applicant consultation*

- 6.3 Communications company Newington, on behalf of the applicant, have submitted a SCI as part of the application to demonstrate how they engaged with the local community. The SCI states that the applicant undertook a public consultation process with local businesses, political stakeholders and the wider public in January / February 2019.
- 6.4 The applicants have made significant efforts to engage with local residents, businesses and stakeholders throughout the application process (pre and post-submission) to try and address questions, queries and concerns in relation to the proposal, including attendance at a planning panel meeting as detailed below.

*Planning Panel*

- 6.5 A Planning Panel meeting was held at Highlands School in January 2020 and was well attended by members of the public, local resident groups and ward councillors. Some of the concerns raised at the meeting are similar to those raised in response to public consultation of the planning application and not every concern can be considered in the remit of a planning assessment. However, the concerns raised included the following:
- Development is too high and too large;
  - Increased pressure on parking in the local area;
  - Loss of light and outlook to internal and external areas
  - Poor consultation by developers;
  - Harm to heritage assets;
  - Increased pressure on schools and GP surgeries;
  - Homes will be unaffordable to local people;
  - Development will result in an increase in crime;
  - Development will impact health and wellbeing of local residents;
  - Development will put pressure on public transport;
  - Cannot understand why the developers wish to develop here;
  - Large scale development inappropriate for Enfield;
  - Development in this location would be catastrophic;
  - Concerns about building safety;
  - Do not understand the pre-application process (why aren't residents included in this?);
  - Concern that the development is a 'done deal'/lack of transparency;
  - Do not feel local people have been properly engaged in the process; and
  - Development will ruin the character and appearance of Southgate.
- 6.6 Objections were also raised by Dennis Stacey of the Conservation Area Group (CAG), Southgate District Civic Voice, Councillor Levy and Councillor Ioannou.
- 6.7 Minutes of the Planning Panel are attached to this report at Appendix A

- 6.8 Following the panel meeting, at the request of residents, a council officer visited four properties in close vicinity to the site. Photos\* from these visits can be found in Appendix 1.

\*Residents have given consent for photos to be included in the report.

### **Public**

- 6.9 In total 1,876 neighbouring properties were consulted. The initial consultation period ran for 21-days from the 19 June 2019 and the re-consultation period ran for a further 21-days from the 22 October 2019. In addition, eight site notices were displayed in close proximity to the site and a press advert was placed in the Enfield Independent on the 26 June 2019.

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

- Number of representations objecting received: 1012 (some of these were duplicate/triplicate representations)
- Number of representations objecting minus duplicate/triplicate submissions: 451
- Number of representations in received in support : 52 (some of these were duplicate/triplicate representations)
- Number of representations received in support minus duplicate/triplicate submissions: 22
- Number of neutral representations received: 0

- 6.11 Material concerns are listed below with the relevant section of the report sign-posted in brackets:

#### 6.11.1 *Objections*

- Too high (*Para.8.4.20*)
- Out of character of the area (*Para.8.4.3 onwards*)
- Overpopulated (density) (*Para.8.2.6 onwards*)
- Increased traffic (*Para.8.7.6 onwards*)
- Increased pressure on parking (*Para.8.7.6 onwards*)
- Increased pressure on local facilities e.g. schools (*Para. 8.15.1*)
- Does not align with Council policy (*Para.7.1 onwards*)
- Inadequate access (*Para.8.3.28 onwards*)
- Inadequate parking provision (*Para.8.7.6 onwards*)
- Affect local ecology (*Para.8.10.13 onwards*)
- Not in tune with the character of the area (*Para. 8.4 onwards*)
- Loss of privacy (*Para.8.6.32 onwards*)
- Loss of light (*Para.8.6.18*)
- Light pollution (*Para.8.6.40*)
- Noise pollution (*Para.8.6.35*)
- Overshadowing (*Para.8.6.28*)
- Close to adjoining properties (*Para.8.6.32 onwards*)
- Close to a conservation area (*Para.8.5.18 onwards*)
- Fire Safety (*Para.8.3.33*)
- Adversely impact health and wellbeing (*Para.8.14.3*)
- Obstruct views (*Para.8.6.32 onwards*)
- Issue with bins (*Para.8.11.13*)

- Increase risk of flooding (*Para.8.9.1*)
- Not enough publicity and consultation (*Para.6.1 onwards*)
- More offices not needed (*Para. 8.2.17 onwards*)
- Potentially contaminated land (*Para. 8.12.1 onwards*)
- Would not be affordable (*Para. 8.3.7 onwards*)
- Would become a wind tunnel and (be) unpleasant in winter (*Para.8.10.21*)

#### 6.11.2 *Support*

- Will help regenerate the area
- Would benefit high street
- Would benefit employment
- Would benefit housing
- Will help local businesses.
- Great to have additional cycle parking
- Very close to the underground network and bus routes
- Will increase job development
- Modern business premises vital to growth
- Should bring social, economic and environmental benefits
- Eco friendly, green and leisure facilities
- Adding valuable public amenity space

#### 6.12 Consultation responses that fall outside of the remit of Planning (i.e. are non-material are given below:

- Negative effect on prices of property
- Strain on emergency services
- Fear of civil unrest as people struggle to obtain the services to which they are entitled
- Will destabilise the local community
- Negatively impact on ambience and the immediate neighbourhood
- Anti-bribery concerns on the project
- Development would result in more crime

#### 6.13 The following local groups/societies made representations:

##### 6.13.1 *Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) (comments summarised):*

- Object to the proposal
- Footprint is not commensurate with the volume of build
- Towers would be prominent and were in the immediate location of the listed station
- Concern about the lack of strategic vision about high rise buildings
- Concern about the lack of parking
- Concern about the lack of amenity space
- Development would only make a small dent in the number of homes required in Enfield
- Development needed to be considered in terms of the wider Southgate area
- Concern that residents would still have to walk around to access the tube station. There would be no direct access
- Difficult balance to make between the harm to the conservation area and the public benefits from the development



- Concern that allowing the scheme could be a catalyst for further development
- Scale and height of the blocks would have a harmful impact on the conservation area

6.13.2 *Friends of Groveland's Park (comments summarised)*

- Object to the application
- Development of such high density would be intrusive and oppressive
- Tower blocks would be visible from other areas of the park particularly in the winter months and detrimental to Nash house and Repton landscape
- Would be detrimental to Grade II listed park.

6.13.3 *Pickard Close Residents Group (comments summarised)*

- Oppose the planning application:
- The original plans were for a brutal 17 floor high building
- The building is too tall and is not in keeping with other buildings in Southgate
- The plans do not reflect the local traditional heritage of low rise buildings
- The plans have recently undergone a revision with a proposed reduction of 4m.
- It will overshadow local buildings
- It will be an eye sore that is visible both locally & for miles
- It will make parking even more difficult than it currently is, and hence more dangerous for pedestrians & children
- The extra 189 flats are too dense & will swamp the area
- There is no planning for additional schooling
- The demolition won't remove the existing eye sore & carbuncle that is across the road over Nichol Close, N14

6.13.4 *Southgate District Civic Voice (formerly Southgate District Civic Trust). (Summary of comments)*

The applicant and Enfield Council have failed to engage effectively with the local community about the proposal. This failure has led to anger, a feeling of disenfranchisement and discontent within the local community.

- The scale of the proposed development is greatly at odds with the surrounding area
- The site is an inappropriate location for tall buildings.
- The proposals would have a significant and detrimentally harmful impact on the Grade II listed Southgate Station complex and Southgate Circus Conservation Area
- Is not compliant with policy / guidance, specifically Policy DMD 43 Tall Buildings; Southgate Circus Conservation Area Management Proposals; and Southgate Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal

In relation to viability (also summarised):

- The site is overvalued at £13.03m
- We have calculated a site value of £6.25m

- Profitable residential scheme of 8 floors based on a site value of £6.25m
- Profitable residential scheme of 8 floors based on the original site acquisition price of £5.15m
- Since acquiring the site in June 2009 Viewpoint Estates would have benefitted from a return on equity of 10% per annum. All of the equity invested in the site would have been paid back.

6.13.5 *Southgate Green Conservation Area Study Group (summarised):*

- Proposal does not follow the ten principles of good design as outlined in the National Design Guidelines
- Proposal does not relate well to the site, its locality or wider context
- Design does not respond to the area's history or culture
- Design makes a negative impact on the locality in terms of its scale, form and appearance
- The excessive height of the building is alien to the area and would damage the character and appearance of the area
- This application is for a tall building which would change the skyline and nature of Southgate, it represents the first phase of tall building redevelopment at the heart of Southgate and it is a planning decision that should not be taken lightly or without the backing of the local community
- The nature of the proposal promoted as a landmark tall building designed to stick out like a sore thumb is obtrusive and disrespectful to the listed Holden station. Too much harm is being inflicted to views, and the conservation area setting to outweigh the amount of money and benefits tabled

6.14 In addition, Councillor Claire Stewart has also made a representation – objection (comments summarised):

- Proposed heights are inappropriate for the area and would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the surrounding area
- The scale of the heights proposed would have a heritage impact and adversely affect the character of the adjacent Southgate Circus Conservation Area and listed buildings
- The proposed heights, in no way relates to the character of the surrounding buildings
- Surrounding roads and most notably, Park Road, would suffer from overshadowing
- The area is typically suburban and therefore the proposed height far exceeds any surrounding buildings, and this is compounded by the fact that the site sits on the top of a hill
- The scale of the development would result in an excessive strain on local amenities and facilities and would increase traffic and pollution

**Statutory and Non- Statutory Consultees**

6.15 Environmental Protection: No objection raised.

6.16 Education: The Council has confirmed that there are sufficient primary places across the borough (currently 6% over demand rising to 10% in 2022/23). Published School Capacity and Planning data (SCAP18) supports this and

indicates there are surplus places at the borough level at present and for the next few years. (Para.8.15.4)

- 6.17 Highways: No objection raised.
- 6.18 Parks: No objection raised.
- 6.19 Property: No objection raised.
- 6.20 Regeneration: No objection raised.
- 6.21 SuDS/Flooding/Drainage: No objection subject to additional details being submitted via planning condition as outlined in report below.
- 6.22 Traffic and Transportation Team: No objection raised.
- 6.23 Trees: Both the Council's Tree Officer and the Council's Highways Tree team raise no objection.
- 6.24 Urban Design: The Urban Design team response is incorporated in the main body of the report below. (Para.8.4.1)
- 6.25 Waste Management: No objection raised.
- 6.26 Energetik: The Council setup energy company raise no objection – discussions are ongoing between applicant and Energetik with the view of the development linking up to the network.
- 6.27 Environment Agency: No objection raised.
- 6.28 Healthy Urban Development Unit / NHS (HUDU): Following consultations no specific scheme was identified to which any monies would have been attributed. Without this, it would have failed the planning test on developer contributions.
- 6.29 London Borough of Barnet: London Borough of Barnet raise no objection to the proposal.
- 6.30 London Fire Service: Raise no objections to the proposal noting that the Commissioner is satisfied with the proposals subject to requirements of Building Regs, Approved Document B B5 being met.
- 6.31 Metropolitan Police Service (Designing Out Crime): No objection subject to condition.
- 6.32 Thames Water: No objection raised.
- 6.33 Transport for London: No objection raised.
- 6.34 *Historic England*: Historic England raised no objection to the revised scheme on the basis that their initial concerns in relation to the initial height and impact towards Groveland's Park, had been resolved. A summary of Historic England's comments to the revised scheme is as follows:

*In relation to the setting of the grade II\* listed Southgate Underground Station,*

*the additional information provides a useful understanding of the impact of the proposed buildings on the setting of the station. We still consider the proposals to cause a degree of harm to the setting of the station due to the introduction of a large new feature into the wider setting area. We consider this harm to be less than substantial in policy terms and would recommend that the Council has regard for policy 197 of the National Planning Policy when making a decision on the proposals.*

*In relation to Groveland's Park, we welcome the reduction in overall height. The revised Accurate Visual Representations presented in the Heritage Statement Addendum appear to show the building being screened from views from Groveland's Park by existing trees. If this is the case, we no longer wish to object to the proposals on the basis of their impact on the setting of grade II\* Registered Groveland's Park and the grade I listed Groveland's House.*

6.35 Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service: GLAAS raise no objections to the proposal noting that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

6.36 *GLA (Stage 1 response) (summarised):*  
Principle of development is supported however resolution of issues needed.  
Points raised were as follows:

*Principle of development: The redevelopment of the site, which is adjacent to the town centre, to provide a residential-led mixed use development is strongly supported.*

*Affordable housing: The scheme would deliver 35% affordable housing (by habitable room), without public subsidy, and would qualify for the Fast Track Route subject to satisfying all other relevant borough and Mayoral policy requirements.*

*Heritage and urban design: This scheme should be considered as a primarily heritage led scheme, due to its proximity and associated views with the Grade II\* Listed heritage asset and positioning of the site on the boundary of the Conservation Area.*

*Many of the borough's principle town centres are located within these conservation areas and have similar heritage sensitivities.*

*Each of these town centres will be promoted as locations for growth and investment. Heritage and character will be proactively considered to influence the design and optimisation of new built forms.*

*The scheme has been considered in the context of potential harm to nearby heritage assets and impact of the existing conservation areas, on balance the harm would be less than substantial harm, which would be outweighed by the planning benefits of the scheme, namely the provision of a range of new homes, including affordable housing and modern office floorspace that collectively could be a catalyst for the revitalisation of the town centre.*

*Environment: Further information or clarifications relating to overheating, PV provision and passive design required; contribution to carbon off-set fund to be secured via the Section 106 agreement.*

*Transport: Travel plans and detailed design and method statements for all stages of the development are to be secured.*

6.37 Enfield's Design Review Panel:

The scheme was presented to Enfield's Design Review Panel in July 2018 and again in January 2019. The DRP meetings followed from a series of pre-application meetings where the Council's design and planning officers discussed the overall bulk, scale and massing with the applicant, as well as principles for materiality and relationship with the surrounding built context. In January 2019 the DRP acknowledged the progress in design and architectural detailing, which had been clearly influenced by the context of the Conservation Area (CA). The Panel believe the guiding principles underpinning the project will create something new in the area and have the potential to be transformative for Southgate.

The Panel understood that the three stepped building heights were created to indicate a visual 'stepping away' from the CA. However, this relationship was unclear when viewing the scheme from the station as the massing is aligned along the back of the CA.

The Panel recognised and welcomed the development of the residential towers with a focus on simplifying the structural form to help create a high percentage of dual aspect apartments, improve their proximity and reduce the overlooking issues. The panel noted concerns raised at the previous meeting over proximity between blocks and overlooking had not been addressed.

The Panel noted that communal amenity spaces identified on the podium in several locations, could benefit from further development and there was a lack of communal space in the north block.

The Panel also wanted to see much more detail on the ground floor detailing as it would be the part of the building which people experienced up close.

On the public realm, the panel noted a lack of the level of detail expected at application stage. The layout of the 'indented' courtyards, which would be heavily shaded without much active frontage to their edges, was also questioned and a clearer understanding of how these could be used would be welcome.

The location of trees within the scheme was questioned as it was felt that these were placed too close to the buildings in many cases, but that generally there was not enough greening and planting. Although the concept of the pocket park development at the end of Park Road was encouraged by the Panel and they felt that this would help embed the scheme in the area, the Panel wishes to see a more coherent public realm strategy throughout the site.

On commercial space, the Panel felt that re-providing office use was an important move, allowing the site to remain active throughout the day and keeping the office function in the town centre.

In conclusion, the Panel supported the genuine mixed-use development which is seen as positive in an urban context and the Panel support the development heading towards zero carbon. The provision of low car-parking

numbers and high numbers of cycle spaces is also supported by the Panel. However there remained concerns around the relationship with the locally listed pub, and the height. Although the density numbers are supported for the scheme, proposals of how to reduce the tallest tower through reconfiguration were encouraged.

Following the second review the Panel considered the revised scheme responded better architecturally however some concerns regarding height remained. The genre of a mixed-use development in the urban setting was still supported.

## **7.0 Policy**

### The London Plan – Existing and Intend to Publish

- 7.1 The scheme has been assessed against the policies in both the existing and London Plan (Intend to Publish) although the latter does not have full weight, it remains a significant consideration. However, it is noted that in the London Plan, as with all policy, there are often tensions between individual and over-arching policies. This would be the case in relation to tall buildings and density for example; whereby policies may be simultaneously advising against height whilst also requiring density to be delivered, and not every site will be able to comply with these requirements. As such in these instances the Local Planning Authority seeks to weigh up the overall wider benefits of a scheme whilst determining the key requirement that the scheme should deliver. Whilst the consistent aim across policy is the requirement to deliver housing at the required level, the tension in policy terms often lies with how that is delivered.

### The London Plan 2016

- 7.2 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 for the next 20-25 years. The following policies of the London Plan are considered particularly relevant:

- Policy 2.6: Outer London: vision and strategy
- Policy 2.7: Outer London: economy
- Policy 2.8: Outer London: transport
- Policy 2.14: Areas for regeneration
- Policy 3.1: Ensuring equal life chances for all
- Policy 3.2: Improving health and addressing health inequalities
- Policy 3.3: Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4: Optimising housing potential
- Policy 3.5: Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 3.6: Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
- Policy 3.7: Large residential developments
- Policy 3.8: Housing choice
- Policy 3.9: Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 3.10: Definition of Affordable Housing
- Policy 3.11: Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3.12: Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
- Policy 3.13: Affordable Housing thresholds.

- Policy 3.14: Existing housing
- Policy 3.15: Co-ordination of housing development and investment.
- Policy 3.16: Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
- Policy 3.17: Health and social care facilities
- Policy 3.18: Education facilities
- Policy 3.19: Sports facilities
- Policy 4.1: Developing London's economy
- Policy 4.12: Improving opportunities for all
- Policy 5.1: Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2: Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3: Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.5: Decentralised energy networks
- Policy 5.6: Decentralised energy in development proposals
- Policy 5.7: Renewable energy
- Policy 5.9: Overheating and cooling
- Policy 5.10: Urban greening
- Policy 5.11: Green roofs and development site environs
- Policy 5.12: Flood risk management
- Policy 5.13: Sustainable drainage
- Policy 5.15: Water use and supplies
- Policy 5.18: Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- Policy 5.21: Contaminated land
- Policy 6.9: Cycling
- Policy 6.10: Walking
- Policy 6.12: Road network capacity
- Policy 6.13: Parking
- Policy 7.1: Lifetime neighbourhoods
- Policy 7.2: An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3: Designing out crime
- Policy 7.4: Local character
- Policy 7.5: Public realm
- Policy 7.6: Architecture
- Policy 7.7: Location and design of tall and large buildings
- Policy 7.14: Improving air quality
- Policy 7.15: Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- Policy 7.18: Protecting local open space and addressing local deficiency
- Policy 7.19: Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy 7.21: Trees and woodlands

Intend to Publish London Plan 2020

- 7.3 The Examination in Public (EiP) on the new London Plan was held between 15th January and 22nd May 2019. On the 9th December 2019, the Mayor issued to the Secretary of State his intension to publish the London Plan. On 13 March 2020, the Secretary of State issued Directions to change a number of proposed policies – as identified by (\*) in the list below. In line with paragraph 48 of the NPPF, the weight attached to this Plan should reflect the stage of its preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging Plan to the NPPF.
- 7.4 Whilst the London Plan (2016) remains, given the advanced stage that the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan has reached, the emerging document holds significant weight in the determination of planning

applications (although there is greater uncertainty about those draft policies that are subject to the Secretary of State's Direction).

7.5 The following London Plan (Intend to Publish) policies are considered particularly relevant:

- D2: Infrastructure Requirements for Sustainable Densities
- D3: Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach:  
*Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach – sets out that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations;*
- D4: Delivering good design
- D5: Inclusive design
- D6: Housing Quality and Standards:  
*Introduces a stronger policy on housing standards including minimum space standards.*
- D7: Accessible Housing
- D8: Public Realm
- D9: Tall buildings:  
*Sets out that boroughs should identify locations (including identifying where tall buildings may be an appropriate form of development subject to meeting other requirements of the plan); impacts (visual, functional, environmental and cumulative); and incorporate free to enter publicly-accessible areas*
- D11: Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12: Fire Safety
- D14: Noise
- E3: Affordable workspace
- E11: Skills and opportunities for all
- H1: Increasing Housing Supply (\*):  
*Sets new ambitious targets for housing completions. Enfield's ten-year housing target will now be 18,760 (previous target 7,976 for the period 2015-2025).*
- H4: Delivering Affordable Housing
- H10: Housing Size Mix (\*)
- HC1: Heritage conservation and growth
- GG1: Building Strong and Inclusive Communities
- GG2: Making the Best Use of Land
- GG3: Creating a Healthy City
- GG4: Delivering the Homes Londoners Need
- G1: Green Infrastructure
- G5: Urban Greening
- G6: Biodiversity and access to nature
- G7: Trees and woodlands
- S4: Play and Informal Recreation
- SI1: Improving air quality
- SI2: Minimising Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- SI3: Energy Infrastructure
- SI5: Water infrastructure
- SI6: Digital connectivity infrastructure
- SI7: Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
- SI12: Flood risk management
- SI13: Sustainable drainage
- T1: Strategic approach to transport



- T2: Healthy Streets
- T3: Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
- T4: Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
- T5: Cycling
- T6: Car Parking
- T9: Funding transport infrastructure through planning

Local Plan - Overview

7.6 Enfield's Local Plan comprises the Core Strategy, Development Management Document, Policies Map and various Area Action Plans as well as other supporting policy documents. Together with the London Plan, it forms the statutory development plan for the borough and sets out planning policies to steer development according to the level it aligns with the NPPF. Whilst many of the policies do align with the NPPF, London Plan (2016) and London Plan (Intend to Publish), it is noted that these documents do in places supersede the Local Plan in terms of some detail and as such the proposal is reviewed against the most relevant and up-to-date policies within the Development Plan.

Local Plan – Core Strategy

7.7 The Core Strategy was adopted in November 2010 and sets out a spatial planning framework for the development of the Borough through to 2025. The document provides the broad strategy for the scale and distribution of development and supporting infrastructure, with the intention of guiding patterns of development and ensuring development within the borough is sustainable

7.8 The following local plan Core Strategy policies are considered particularly relevant:

- Core Policy 1: Strategic Growth Areas
- Core Policy 2: Housing Supply and Locations for New Homes
- Core Policy 3: Affordable Housing
- Core Policy 4: Housing Quality
- Core Policy 5: Housing Types
- Core Policy 6: Housing Need
- Core Policy 8: Education
- Core Policy 9: Supporting Community Cohesion
- Core Policy 20: Sustainable Energy Use and Energy Infrastructure
- Core Policy 21: Delivering Sustainable Water Supply, Drainage and Sewerage Infrastructure
- Core Policy 24: The Road Network
- Core Policy 25: Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Core Policy 26: Public Transport
- Core Policy 28: Managing Flood Risk Through Development
- Core Policy 29: Flood Management Infrastructure
- Core Policy 30: Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment
- Core Policy 31: Built and Landscape Heritage
- Core Policy 32: Pollution
- Core Policy 34: Parks, Playing Fields and Other Open Spaces
- Core Policy 36: Biodiversity

Biodiversity Action Plan  
S106 SPD

Local Plan - Development Management Document

7.9 The Council's Development Management Document (DMD) provides further detail and standard based policies by which planning applications should be determined. Policies in the DMD support the delivery of the Core Strategy.

7.10 The following local plan Development Management Document policies are considered particularly relevant:

DMD1:	Affordable Housing on Sites Capable of Providing 10 units or more
DMD3:	Providing a Mix of Different Sized Homes
DMD6:	Residential Character
DMD8:	General Standards for New Residential Development
DMD9:	Amenity Space
DMD10:	Distancing
DMD37:	Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development
DMD38:	Design Process
DMD42:	Design of Civic / Public Buildings and Institutions
DMD43:	Tall Buildings
DMD45:	Parking Standards and Layout
DMD47:	New Road, Access and Servicing
DMD48:	Transport Assessments
DMD49:	Sustainable Design and Construction Statements
DMD50:	Environmental Assessments Method
DMD51:	Energy Efficiency Standards
DMD52:	Decentralized Energy Networks
DMD53:	Low and Zero Carbon Technology
DMD55:	Use of Roofspace / Vertical Surfaces
DMD57:	Responsible Sourcing of Materials, Waste Minimisation and Green Procurement
DMD58:	Water Efficiency
DMD59:	Avoiding and Reducing Flood Risk
DMD60:	Assessing Flood Risk
DMD61:	Managing surface water
DMD62:	Flood Control and Mitigation Measures
DMD63:	Protection and Improvement of Watercourses and Flood Defences
DMD64:	Pollution Control and Assessment
DMD65:	Air Quality
DMD66:	Land Contamination and instability
DMD68:	Noise
DMD69:	Light Pollution
DMD70:	Water Quality
DMD71:	Protection and Enhancement of Open Space
DMD72:	Open Space Provision
DMD73:	Child Play Space
DMD76:	Wildlife Corridors
DMD77:	Green Chains
DMD78:	Nature Conservation
DMD79:	Ecological Enhancements

DMD80: Trees on Development Sites  
DMD81: Landscaping

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

7.11 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this respect, sustainable development is identified as having three dimensions - an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. For decision taking, this presumption in favour of sustainable development means:

a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) **an environmental objective** – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

7.12 The NPPF recognises that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

7.13 In relation to achieving appropriate densities, Paragraph 122 of the NPPF notes that planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, whilst taking into account:

- a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;
- b) local market conditions and viability;
- c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and

- e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

7.14 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF details when weight may be given to relevant emerging plans. This guidance states that the stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of relevant policies to the Framework are relevant.

#### National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

7.15 The Government's published NPPG sets out further detailed guidance on the application of policies set out in the NPPF. NPPG guidance covers matters such as decision making, planning conditions and obligations, EIA, the historic and natural environment and design.

#### Other Material Considerations

7.16 The following guidance is also considered particularly relevant:

- Decentralised Energy Network Technical Specification SPD (2015)
- S106 SPD (2016)
- Enfield Characterisation Study
- Manual for Streets 1 & 2, Inclusive Mobility 2005 (DfT)
- TfL London Cycle Design Standards (2014)
- GLA: Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012)
- GLA: London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014)
- GLA: Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG (2014)
- GLA: The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition SPG (2014)
- GLA: Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (2014)
- GLA: Social Infrastructure SPG (2015)
- GLA: Housing SPG (2016)
- GLA: Homes for Londoners: Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017)
- Healthy Streets for London (2017)
- Mayor's Transport Strategy (2018)

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the Proposed Development are considered to be:

1. Principle of Development (Land Use) (*Para.8.2*)
2. Housing Need and Delivery – (*Para.8.3*)
3. Design – (*Para 8.4*)
4. Heritage – (*Para.8.5*)
5. Neighbouring Amenity – (*Para.8.6*)
6. Transport – (*Para.8.7*)
8. Trees – (*Para.8.8*)
9. Water Resources, Flood Risk and Drainage – (*Para. 8.9*)
10. Environmental Considerations – (*Para.8.10*)
11. Waste Storage – (*Para.8.11*)

- 12. Contaminated Land – (Para.8.12)
- 13. Air Quality / Pollution – (Para.8.13)
- 14. Socio-economics and Health – (Para.8.14)
- 15. Education – (Para. 8.15)

## 8.2 Principle of Development (Land Use)

- 8.2.1 In terms of the overarching principle of development it is useful to note that the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 seek to establish that planning decisions are taken in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2.2 Running alongside this is the aim that planning should facilitate the delivery of sustainable development. This is achieved by ensuring that the right development is built on the right land; that development helps to support communities with sufficient homes, accessible services, and open spaces; and development protects and where appropriate, enhances the natural, built and historic environment.
- 8.2.3 With regards to the existing land use, it is noted that the NPPF (Para.118) advocates the promotion and support for the development of under-utilised land and buildings, particularly where this would help to meet identified needs for housing; where land supply is constrained; and where it is considered sites could be used more effectively.
- 8.2.4 Meanwhile Paragraph 1.2.5 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) notes that ‘all options for using the city’s land more effectively will need to be explored as London’s growth continues, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites and the intensification of existing places, including in outer London’. Furthermore, Policy GG2 requires development to prioritise sites that are well-connected by public transport, particularly for intensifying the use of brownfield land and delivering additional homes.

### *a) Comprehensive Redevelopment*

- 8.2.5 The scheme proposes the redevelopment of the site, including the demolition of the existing office buildings. The existing buildings that occupy the site have no architectural merit. Their loss would not detract from the appearance of the area. As such the principle of demolition is considered to be acceptable subject to an appropriate replacement development scheme and conditions to manage adverse impacts during demolition and construction work.

### *b) Residential Use*

- 8.2.6 With regards to the residential element of the proposal, it is noted that the NPPF (Para.59) sets out the government’s objective to boost the supply of homes. The NPPF also states an intention to ensure that supply meets the needs of different groups in the community, including an affordable housing need. Policy GG4 of the draft London Plan supports this intention, stating that planning and development must ‘ensure that more homes are delivered’. This is also consistent with the thrust of policies in the Core Strategy and the adopted London Plan (Policy 3.3)

- 8.2.7 Policy H1 of the draft London Plan notes the importance of encouraging residential development on appropriate windfall sites, especially where they have a high PTAL rating (ratings 3 to 6) or are located within 800m of a tube station. The Council's Core Strategy (4.1 Spatial Strategy) as well as Policy 3.3 of the adopted London Plan acknowledge that sustainable locations for development would be concentrated in town centres, on previously developed land and that new homes will be planned through the intensification of land uses.
- 8.2.8 The development site is in a highly accessible and sustainable location, within close proximity to an existing public transport network. The NPPF (Paragraphs 102 and 103) sets out objectives for considering transport issues in the planning process, including ensuring there are opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and requires development to be focused on locations which are sustainable and can offer a range of transport modalities to help reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.
- 8.2.9 The existing Office Village contains seven-office buildings all of which benefit from a prior approval permission for office to residential conversion. It should be noted that the fact that there is already a prior approval permission in place does not mean that there is no need for office accommodation in Southgate, which would have been a consideration if the change of use had been applied for via a change of use planning application. It is simply that current permitted development regulations allow this type of change of use to occur without the need for planning permission. The impact of permitted development office-to-residential conversions and resultant reduction of employees within Southgate could have contributed to the reduction in footfall for the local businesses and, may have contributed to the increase in vacant commercial units and rise of charity shops. It is also noted that this site currently houses 250-employees, and this employment would be lost from the site should the prior approval consent for office to residential be implemented.
- 8.2.10 The proposal is for 216-residential units and as noted above the principle of housing is supported. The Boroughs housing delivery targets have been set by the GLA and the Draft London Plan states that Enfield is required to provide a minimum of 12,460 homes over the next 10 years (1,246 per annum), in comparison to the previous target of 7,976 for the period 2015-2025 (798 per annum).
- 8.2.11 According to the Enfield Housing Trajectory Report 2019, during the previous 7-years the Borough has delivered a total of 3,710 homes which equates to around 530 homes per annum. However, given the new target of 1,246 per annum the borough needs to optimise all options in terms of housing delivery, particularly on existing brownfield sites, first principles in our town centres and transport hubs, as is the case here.
- 8.2.12 Enfield's emerging new Local Plan will be seeking to deliver at a minimum, the 1,246 homes. However, we know from previous local and national assessments of housing need, the figure has ranged from 2,400 - 3,000 homes per year. The Council needs to encourage a variety of housing development including market and affordable products to meet varied local demand.

- 8.2.13 The Council is currently updating its Local Plan and through publishing the Issues & Options (Regulation 18) last year has been transparent about the sheer scale of the growth challenge for Enfield. The published Regulation 18 document was clear about the need to plan differently to attain a significant step change in delivery and secure investment in our borough.
- 8.2.14 As things stand in terms of national policy, the provision of housing on underutilised brownfield sites in highly accessible locations involving an increase in densities, complies with the NPPF. This approach is also in line with the draft London Plan's direction of travel which is to optimise underutilised brownfield sites.
- 8.2.15 As the benefits of the delivery of housing on a previously developed site are a material consideration, they should be afforded substantial weight in the determination of the application.
- 8.2.16 In relation to sustainable development the proposal is considered to respond to the objectives of the NPPF by redeveloping a brownfield site; by providing homes that are highly accessible and in close proximity to existing public transport and easily accessible to local amenities; by providing a range of housing to support a mixed and balanced community; and by having due regard to the local natural, built and historic environment. It is also considered that the proposed number of residential units on the site would contribute to providing homes to assist in meeting the borough's housing target and help bridge the shortfall that has been the case in previous years.

*Partial Loss of Existing Office Accommodation*

- 8.2.17 The partial loss of the existing B Class floorspace is a key planning consideration. Core Strategy Policy 13 notes that the Council will both improve and protect Enfield's employment offer, helping to facilitate the creation of a minimum 6,000 new jobs from 2010 to 2026. Meanwhile Core Strategy Policy 17 states that the Council will strengthen the role of Enfield's town centres by focusing new commercial, retail, leisure, office, residential and other appropriate social infrastructure related uses within the centres. The policy further seeks to continue to support and strengthen District Centres such as Southgate.
- 8.2.18 Core Strategy Policy 19 is also of particular relevance noting that the Council will protect office uses in Southgate Town Centre, encouraging renewal and modernisation of existing premises and the development of new premises, where there is evidence for demand. However, in recent years, the council's updated employment land reviews concur with the London Plan's evidence, in that Enfield is not considered a major office location.
- 8.2.19 The existing Office Village provides approximately 4,433 sq.m of office floorspace and the scheme will re-provide 1,720 sq.m of that including a new office hub (39% of existing space). Whilst this represents a substantial loss of office floorspace as mentioned previously the site has an existing prior approval which would effectively enable the whole quantum of 4,433 sq.m of existing offices to be converted to residential use with no requirement to re-provide any of the office space at all.
- 8.2.20 The site is not a key site for new employment uses however given its location in Southgate District Centre and Southgate Station, Officers are satisfied that

the partial loss of employment generating floorspace has been robustly justified in land use planning policy terms and is in accordance with the above policies.

- 8.2.21 This partial re-provision is therefore considered to have significant weight in the assessment of this proposal

*Employment Floorspace Re-provision*

- 8.2.22 The scheme seeks to retain existing established businesses (who will have the option to decant to a nearby office building for the duration of construction) as well as attract local entrepreneurs and business start-ups for short to medium terms. Officers endorse the target market for this floorspace which may attract a more diverse range of businesses to the district including those relocating from more central areas.
- 8.2.23 The site lies within a highly accessible location, well served by public transport and would retain a substantial quantum of commercial floorspace in the form of up-to-date, modern attractive office space. Whilst the scheme would result in a significant visual change to the immediate area, the nature of the proposed uses – office and residential – would be in keeping with the existing use of the site and character of the locality.
- 8.2.24 Therefore, in consideration of the above, and in light of the existing prior approval on the site which would result in the complete loss of commercial floorspace, the partial loss of the existing employment floorspace is considered acceptable in this instance. The replacement floorspace will provide a valuable contribution to the employment floorspace stock in the Borough, where there is clearly an identifiable demand for this type of space proposed in this location, as can be demonstrated by the existing use of the offices.
- 8.2.25 The reduction in commercial floorspace from 4,433 sq.m to 1,720 sq.m including office hub area, would therefore be supported. A financial contribution for the loss of the existing employment floorspace is not considered necessary given the site allocation and the level of affordable housing provided, however a contribution towards local labour and training has been agreed by the applicants.

*Summary of Principle*

- 8.2.26 Given the above considerations, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to other detailed considerations as discussed below.

8.3 Housing Need and Delivery

- 8.3.1 The current London Plan sets a target for the provision of 49,000 new homes across London each year. This target is set to increase in the emerging London Plan (Intend to Publish) with Policy H1 stating an overall target for the provision of 52,287 new homes each year. Whilst Enfield's 2019 Housing Action Plan recognises that the construction of more affordable high-quality homes is a clear priority, only 51% of approvals in the Borough have been delivered over the previous 3-years.



- 8.3.2 While the current target is 798 homes a year, it is recognised the delivery of new homes needs to increase and the draft London Plan identifies a need for a minimum of 1,246 dwellings per year to be delivered over the next 10-years in the Borough, based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Furthermore, the Council's draft Housing and Growth Strategy sets out the ambition to deliver the draft London Plan targets.
- 8.3.3 The 2018 London Housing SPG also outlines a vision that delivers high quality homes and inclusive neighbourhoods by ensuring that appropriate development is prioritised. Meanwhile Policy H1 of the draft London Plan seeks housing delivery to be optimised on sites that have good public transport accessibility (with a PTAL 3-6 rating).
- 8.3.4 Enfield is a celebrated green borough with close to 40% of our Borough currently designated Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land, and a further 400 hectares provides the critical industrial land that serves the capital and wider south east growth corridors. The reality of these land designations means the need to optimise development on brownfield land is greater and brings to the fore complex development issues and a major shift in how the Borough's character will need to transform.
- 8.3.5 Taking into account both the housing needs and the record of planning permissions being implemented in terms of delivery against target, the local planning authority must seek to optimise development appropriately on brownfield sites, particularly those that are currently not being optimised.

*Affordable Housing*

- 8.3.6 Annex 2 of the NPPF (Feb. 2019) defines Affordable Housing as "housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers)"
- 8.3.7 In broad terms Affordable Housing can be described as a home that is not 'private market housing': in other words, a home that is not either bought privately or rented from a private landlord.
- 8.3.8 There are several products that can fall under the Affordable Housing umbrella, including the following:

Product	Description
Social Rent	Secure homes that are set at a lower rent, prioritised by need  Let by local authorities or registered providers  Available to people of housing waiting lists  Described as 'genuinely affordable'
Affordable Rent	Up to 80% of market rent, less secure than Social Rent, prioritised by need

	<p>Let by local authorities or registered providers</p> <p>Available to people of housing waiting lists</p> <p>Described as 'affordable'</p>
London Affordable Rent	<p>Generally offered at 50% or less of market rent</p> <p>Let by local authorities or registered providers</p> <p>Available to people of housing waiting lists</p> <p>Described as 'genuinely affordable'</p>
London Living Rent (Intermediate housing)	<p>Set at a third of average gross local earnings, for households with an income of up to £60,000 who wish to save for a deposit to buy their home</p> <p>Not available to people of housing waiting lists</p> <p>Described as 'genuinely affordable'</p>
Intermediate Rent (Intermediate housing)	<p>Offered at a lower rate (around 80%) of market rate</p> <p>Described as 'genuinely affordable'</p> <p>Not available to people of housing waiting lists</p>
Shared Ownership (Intermediate housing)	<p>Homes that are part-rent / part-buy, for households with an income of up to £90,000</p> <p>Described as 'genuinely affordable'</p>

Table.1

8.3.9 London Plan Policy H5 (Intend to Publish) sets out a strategic target for 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be affordable. Meanwhile the Council's draft 2020-2030 Housing and Growth Strategy clearly notes the Borough's ambition to 'develop more homes that are genuinely affordable to local people, so that more people can live in a home where they spend a more reasonable proportion of their household income on housing costs'.

8.3.10 The Council's own Policy DMD 1 requires development to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing with an appropriate mix of tenures to

meet local housing need . It also sets out an ambition to reflect a borough wide target of 70% Social Rent and Affordable Rent; and 30% Intermediate. These targets are within the context of a borough-wide affordable housing target of 40%, as set out by the Council's Core Strategy Policy 3. However, it is noted that the specific requirements within the Local Plan will effectively be superseded by the emerging London Plan at the point of adoption.

8.3.11 Meanwhile in terms of tenure mix, Policy H6 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) sets out the Mayor's expected housing tenure in relation to the proposed split of affordable products for residential developments. These are:

*Part A*

- 1) *a minimum of 30 per cent low cost rented homes, as either London Affordable Rent or Social Rent, allocated according to need and for Londoners on low incomes*
- 2) *a minimum of 30 per cent intermediate products which meet the definition of genuinely affordable housing, including London Living Rent and London Shared ownership*
- 3) *the remaining 40 per cent to be determined by the borough as low cost rented homes or intermediate products (defined in Part A1 and Part A2) based on identified need*

8.3.12 In terms of a wider overarching view of the recent affordable housing position within the Borough, in 2016/17, 30% of housing completions were affordable, whilst in 2017/18 this decreased further to 7% of housing completions being affordable, amounting to 37 units in total being delivered. These figures show that the target 40% affordable housing delivery is therefore not currently being met in the Borough through approved development being implemented.

8.3.13 A key focus for discussions therefore has been on the proposed development maximising the provision of affordable housing and as a result, the development now proposes an affordable housing offer of 35% based on habitable rooms. The revised affordable housing offer is shown in the table below:

<i>Tenure</i>	<i>1-bed units</i>	<i>2-bed units</i>	<i>3-bed units</i>	<i>Total by unit</i>	<i>Total by habitable rooms</i>
<i>Total Affordable</i>	17	36	14	67	198 (35%)
<i>Shared Ownership</i>	13	17	6	36	101 (51%)
<i>Affordable Rent</i>	4	19	8	31	97 (49%)
<i>Private</i>	88	56	5	149	364 (65%)
<i>Total Dwellings</i>	105 (48%)	92 (43%)	19 (9%)	216	
<i>Total Habitable Rooms</i>					562

*Table.2*

8.3.14 The proposed Affordable Housing offer of 35% is based on habitable rooms which equates to approximately 31% in terms of units. Whilst the proposed

tenure mix within this 35% is 51% Shared Ownership and 49% Affordable Rent is neither Enfield nor London Plan compliant, the independently assessed Viability Assessment confirms that the proposed development is not viable, and this is the optimal split to minimise any deficiency. As such even with a non-policy compliant Affordable Housing offer and tenure mix, the proposed development is in deficit.

8.3.15 However as the applicants both own the existing site and operate the existing offices, they would not incur the additional cost of acquiring the site. As such the applicants intend to continue operating the commercial element of the proposed development and are taking a longer-term view in relation to the value of the site to offset any overall financial deficit from the current development proposal.

8.3.16 Given the wider public benefits that will be delivered by the scheme and the under-delivery of affordable housing in recent years, a balanced and pragmatic stance has been taken in light of which, the offer as outlined here is considered acceptable in this instance. This is subject to a review mechanism secured in the Section 106 legal agreement, which will enable the Council to capture any uplift in value afforded to the site after planning permission has been granted.

#### *Density and Dwelling Mix*

8.3.17 The NPPF (Para.122) states that in respect of development density, consideration should be given to whether a place is well designed and ‘the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting...or of promoting regeneration and change’. Chapter 12 sets out the need for good design as the key to sustainable development and paragraph 127 states that development should be:

- visually attractive as a result of ‘good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); and
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks.

8.3.18 London Plan Policy 3.8 and London Plan Policy H10 (Intend to Publish) encourages a full range of housing choice and encourages a non-prescriptive approach to dwelling size mix requirements for market and intermediate homes.

8.3.19 London Plan Policy D3 (Intend to Publish) ‘Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach’, advocates developments making the best use of land following a design-led approach that optimises site capacity. This is a step change from the existing policy that uses a matrix approach to provide indicative densities for sites with different public transport accessibility and character. Given the advanced stage of the draft London Plan (Intend to Publish) and the subsequent weight it can be given, as well as the acknowledged need for new homes, it is considered the density of the development can also be assessed against the new approach.

- 8.3.20 Policy D3 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) requires development to make the best use of land, considering design, to determine the most appropriate form for the site's context and capacity. This is echoed by Policy DMD8 which requires proposals to be in an appropriate location and of a suitable scale, bulk and massing.
- 8.3.21 In this instance the Proposed Development is located in a highly accessible location with a PTAL rating of 4, close to Southgate Underground Station and close to the town centre. The total site area is 0.57 ha and the revised scheme density is calculated as 986 hr/ha or 378.0 u/ha which exceeds the indicative density threshold in the adopted London Plan for the Urban location. However, to put this in a wider context, emerging Policy D3 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) requires development to make the best use of land, considering design, to determine the most appropriate form for the site's context and capacity.
- 8.3.22 The emerging London Plan further explains that for London to accommodate identified growth requirements every new development needs to make the most efficient use of land. Optimising site capacity is explained as ensuring that the development takes the most appropriate form for the site. As such a design-led approach to optimisation should be based on an evaluation of the site's attributes, its surrounding context and its capacity for growth to determine the appropriate form of development for the site.
- 8.3.23 The scheme as amended would result in a high-quality design, and well considered architecture and approach to the public realm, providing 216 residential units across the site. Given this together with the site's "good" PTAL, town centre character, acceptable impact on residential amenity and sufficient social infrastructure, it is considered that the scheme does not constitute an overdevelopment on the site and the quantum of units proposed is acceptable in its local setting, subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable. It is therefore considered that in density terms the proposed development is in line with existing and emerging development plan policy.
- 8.3.24 The Council's Core Strategy Policy 5 and Development Management Document Policy DMD 3 set out housing mix need however, the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which post-dates these policies illustrates an annualised requirement, between 2016-2041, for new homes to be 55% 1-bedroom, 16% 2-bedroom and 14% 3-bedroom. The Council's current recommended dwelling mix ratios, as outlined in Core Strategy Policy 5 are as follows:
- Market housing – 20% 1 and 2 bed flats (1-3 persons), 15% 2 bed houses (4 persons), 45% 3 bed houses, (5-6 persons), 20% 4+ bed houses (6+ persons).
  - Social rented housing - 20% 1 bed and 2 bed units (1-3 persons), 20% 2 bed units (4 persons) 30% 3 bed units (5-6 persons), 30% 4+ bed units (6+ persons).
- 8.3.25 The development predominantly offers 1 and 2-bed units in order to optimise the number of units in its town centre location. The proposed 216-units is made up of the following dwelling mix:
- 1-bed units = 105 (48%)

- 2-bed units = 92 (43%)
- 3-bed units = 19 (9%)

8.3.26 The units will be located within the blocks as follows:

#### *NORTHERN BLOCK*

Block B1:

- Total storeys: 5-6
- Total residential storeys: 4-5

Unit type	Number of units	Number of habitable rooms
1-bed, 1-person	0	0
1-bed, 2-person	4	8
2-bed, 3-person	0	0
2-bed, 4-person	19	57
3-bed, 4-person	0	0
3-bed, 5-person	8	32
Total number of units	<b>31</b>	
Total number of habitable rooms		<b>97</b>

*Table.3*

Block B2:

- Total storeys: 3
- Total residential storeys: 3

Unit type	Number of units	Number of habitable rooms
1-bed, 1-person	0	0
1-bed, 2-person	2	4
2-bed, 3-person	0	0
2-bed, 4-person	1	3
3-bed, 4-person	0	0
3-bed, 5-person	2	8
Total number of units	<b>5</b>	
Total number of habitable rooms		<b>15</b>

*Table.4*

#### *SOUTHERN BLOCK*

Block A1:

- Total storeys: 8
- Total residential storeys: 6

Unit type	Number of units	Number of habitable rooms
1-bed, 1-person	1	2
1-bed, 2-person	14	28
2-bed, 3-person	6	18
2-bed, 4-person	14	42
3-bed, 4-person	0	0
3-bed, 5-person	7	28
Total number of units	<b>42</b>	

Total number of habitable rooms		<b>118</b>
---------------------------------	--	------------

Table.5

## Block A2:

- Total storeys: 13
- Total residential storeys: 11

Unit type	Number of units	Number of habitable rooms
1-bed, 1-person	1	2
1-bed, 2-person	35	70
2-bed, 3-person	12	36
2-bed, 4-person	10	30
3-bed, 4-person	1	4
3-bed, 5-person	0	0
Total number of units	<b>59</b>	
Total number of habitable rooms		<b>142</b>

Table.6

## Block A3:

- Total storeys: 17
- Total residential storeys: 15

Unit type	Number of units	Number of habitable rooms
1-bed, 1-person	1	2
1-bed, 2-person	47	94
2-bed, 3-person	16	48
2-bed, 4-person	14	42
3-bed, 4-person	1	4
3-bed, 5-person	0	0
Total number of units	<b>79</b>	
Total number of habitable rooms		<b>190</b>

Table.7

8.3.27 The proposed dwelling mix is mostly of 1 and 2-bedroom units. Whilst it would be preferable to have a mix containing more 3 and 4-bedroom units in principle and across development across the borough, it is recognised that developments in highly public transport accessible locations and close to facilities, are more suitable for smaller units where car ownership and use is lower. Furthermore, it is more difficult, although not impossible, to integrate well designed family sized (3 and 4-bedroom) units with the necessary access to larger private amenity spaces and other amenities.

8.3.28 As such although the proposed housing mix has a large number of 1 and 2-bedroom units and there is a shortage of family size units in comparison to 1 and 2-bed units, it is recognised that the housing needs of the borough are changing at a fast pace and as such it is considered reasonable to show some flexibility taking in to account the specifics of individual sites in light of this. Policy H10 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) promotes higher density development in locations with a good PTAL score and in close proximity to a local centre in order to ensure the most efficient use of land and to optimise the provision of housing. Given this context, in this instance the overall mix is considered appropriate in this specific location.

*Residential Quality and Amenity*

8.3.29 The NPPF (Para.12) identifies good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, stating that ‘the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve’. The guidance states that developments should seek to:

- Function well and add to the overall quality of the area for the lifetime of the development;
- Be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- Be sympathetic to local character and history;
- Establish a strong sense of place and welcoming and distinctive places; and
- Optimise the potential of the site to provide an appropriate mix and amount of development, green and public space, local facilities and transport networks; and
- Create safe, inclusive and accessible spaces with a high standard of amenity and where crime or fear of crime does not undermine community cohesion or quality of life.

8.3.30 Meanwhile Policy 3.5 of the adopted London Plan and Policy D6 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish), sets out housing quality and design standards that housing developments must take into account to ensure they provide adequate and functional spaces; sufficient daylight and sunlight; avoid overheating; and maximise the provision of outside space. The Policy notes that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments and Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

8.3.31 Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) set out that new developments are required to support mixed and inclusive communities, which includes provision for wheelchair accessible and wheelchair adaptable units, as well as an environment that is welcoming and accessible by all. This is consistent with Policy DMD 15.

*Fire Safety*

8.3.32 In terms of fire safety, London Plan Policy D12 (Intend to Publish) requires developments to be designed to incorporate appropriate features to reduce the risk to life and Policy D5 requires proposals to ensure safe and dignified emergency evacuation for all building users. London Fire Service have confirmed that details provided in relation to Fire Brigade Access to residential and commercial elements is satisfactory however in line with emerging London Plan Policy D12 a Fire Statement is required which can be provided via planning condition.

*Accessible Housing*

8.3.33 Policy D7 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) sets out that in order to provide suitable housing and genuine choice for London’s diverse population, including disabled people, older people and families with young children, residential development must ensure that: i) at least 10% of dwellings meet



Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', and ii) all other dwellings meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. In order to ensure the development meets and maintains these requirements a planning condition requiring the development to include 10% of units as wheelchair accessible (M4(3)) and 90% as wheelchair adaptable (M4(2)) as required by Policy D7 London Plan, is recommended. Again, this would be in line with the objectives of Policy DMD 15.

#### *Accommodation Standards*

- 8.3.34 The vast majority of the units either meet or exceed internal floorspace standards required by Table 3.1 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) and comply with the qualitative design aspects to be addressed in housing developments required by Table 3.2 (Intend to Publish). The units that do not meet internal floorspace size standards amount to less than 3% of the total quantum of units and are spread across affordable and private units. These units fall short on internal floors area by 0.4 sq.m which is considered minor so as to not result in any adverse impact to the quality of life of future occupiers of the units.
- 8.3.35 All units would have balconies and there are also a range of external amenity opportunities within the communal realm on site. The vast majority of units provide dual aspect with the exception of the northern block whereby approximately 13% or 4 of the 31 units are single aspect however these are 1-bed west facing units which exceed floorspace standards and provide large balconies. Overall, the expected level of amenity is considered acceptable.

#### *Child Playspace and Recreation Space*

- 8.3.36 Policy 3.6 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that development proposals include suitable provision for play and recreation noting the provision of play space should integrate with the public realm without compromising the amenity needs/enjoyment of other residents and encourage children to play.
- 8.3.37 The Mayor's 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation' SPG sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable children's playspace to be provided per child, with particular emphasis on playspace for children under five years old to be provided on-site. Emerging London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy S4 also recommends that at least 10 sq.m of playspace per child should be provided. The development is expected to accommodate approximately 38 children, of which 25 would be primary school age, 9 secondary school, and 4 further/higher education children. Based on these child yield projections play provision of 340 sq.m is required. In comparison, Policy DMD 73 does not specify a specific amount of space per child; it sets out that developments with an estimated child occupancy of ten or more children will be required to incorporate on-site play provision to meet the needs arising from the development.
- 8.3.38 The external spaces throughout the development provide three formal opportunities for play in accordance with the space standard including a 62 sq.m play area at ground floor level and 136 sq.m of communal garden space with play functions incorporated into the design at first floor level, divided across two gardens. This provides a total of approximately 198 sq.m of formal play space within the development. Whilst this is less than the SPG

requirement, the development is sited within close proximity to a variety of other open spaces within the surrounding area. These range from open spaces within the residential neighbourhood such as Ivy Road Recreation Ground and larger parks such as Oakwood Park to the north and more formal spaces such as Groveland's Park to the south east. In addition, there will be landscaped public realm throughout the Site with pockets of informal amenity space, providing opportunities to sit, play, relax, meet and dwell outside. A pocket park will also be provided. Given these factors and in consideration of the urban nature of the site, the development is considered to provide adequate play and recreation space for future occupiers.

### *Block Layout*

- 8.3.39 Built form is the three-dimensional pattern or arrangement of development blocks, streets, buildings and open spaces. It is the interrelationship between all these elements that creates an attractive place to live, work and visit, rather than their individual characteristics. Together they create the built environment and contribute to its character and sense of place. The National Design Guide at Para.63, recognises that 'compact forms of development bring people together to support local public transport, facilities and local services.' Para.64 further notes that 'Well-designed new development makes efficient use of land with an amount and mix of development and open space that optimises density': it can also "relates well to and enhance the existing character and context. The National Design Guide goes on to acknowledge that groupings of buildings, spaces, uses or activities create a sense of place, promoting inclusion and cohesion.
- 8.3.40 Blocks within the Proposed Development are well laid out with a high number of cores with each core serving five or six-units. This comfortably meets guidance contained in the Mayors Housing SPG which recommends a maximum of eight-units leading off a single core.
- 8.3.41 In response to the National Design Guide, the layout of the development has been designed with the intention of creating high quality, cohesive spaces in, around and between the buildings, which are linked by the high-quality public realm and enlivened with the creation of a new pedestrian link. Moreover, attention has been given to creating active frontages and well-defined building edges which further energises the space, bringing vitality and purpose to the site and wider locality. The development layout also enables the space to be accessible whilst also retaining a sense of containment. This in turn enables the Development to facilitate a strong sense of place and identity.
- 8.3.42 The development layout also utilises the orientation of individual buildings to help lessen the visual impact of the taller elements by creating angled views, resulting in the buildings being able to sit more comfortably within the context of the local area. The layout and orientation of the buildings also helps to maximise daylight and outlook for future occupiers, resulting in an improved level of accommodation especially in respect of the few units with single aspect.
- 8.3.43 In addition to the orientation of the physical buildings, the distribution of uses is such that ground floor office space enables a continuity of this use and will serve to activate the public realm area during the day. The office hub / café will also boost activity and energise the shared space. Lastly the provision of external amenity areas, including private amenity areas, publicly accessible

playspace and a pocket park will provide a different type of activity throughout whilst providing much needed green open space to the site and the immediate vicinity.

### *Summary of Housing*

8.3.44 The proposed residential element of the development would operate within a constrained urban site whereby the development has many demands to address in terms of maximising the floorspace, being sensitive to the existing environment and being sited so as to minimise potential impact to existing neighbouring occupiers. Minor exceptions to compliance with all adopted and emerging policies are outweighed by the number and quality of homes including affordable homes being delivered, having regard also to the inclusion of a good standard of accessibility and private / communal amenity space and playspace. Subject to the recommended conditions to secure these and other policy objectives, the proposed housing is considered acceptable.

## 8.4 Design

8.4.1 The NPPF (Para.122) states that in respect of development density, consideration should be given to whether a place is well designed and 'the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting...or of promoting regeneration and change'. Chapter 12 sets out the need for good design as the key to sustainable development and paragraph 127 states that development should be:

- visually attractive as a result of 'good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); and
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks.

8.4.2 Meanwhile current London Plan Policies 7.1 and 7.4 and London Plan Policies D1 and D2 (Intend to Publish) seek to ensure that new developments are well-designed and fit into the local character of an area. Current London Plan policies require developments to optimise housing output, taking into account local context and character, whilst London Plan Policy D3 (Intend to Publish), requires developments to optimise capacity through a design-led approach, by responding to a site's context, capacity for growth and supporting infrastructure capacity. This approach is also promoted in London Plan Policy GG2 (Intend to Publish) which notes that new buildings and spaces should respond to form, style and appearance to successfully integrate into the local character of an area, with a positive relationship with the natural environment and respect and enhancement of the historic environment.

8.4.3 In terms of providing higher density, the NPPF, London Plan and the Council's own policies are supportive of optimising sites provided that developments are of a high-quality design that are appropriate to the surrounding area. In relation to scale, National Design Guidance notes that a

stepped height approach can create a varied roof line, so that a development can sit sensitively in the wider (historical) context. The Guidance also notes that materiality can aid a tall building fit well into its historic surroundings and a texture that is human in scale and tactile where the building meets the ground, can also assist with integration into existing surroundings.

8.4.4 The scheme has undergone a number of iterations throughout the pre-application process and further revisions during the submission phase to address concerns in terms of form and the affordable housing offer. Revisions were also made to address concerns from Historic England in terms of the impact on the setting of Groveland's Park arising from the development being visible above tree-tops when viewed from the park. To address these concerns the scheme was revised in September/October 2019 to incorporate the following:

- Replacement of second floor commercial floorspace with residential units bringing the number of residential units up from 200 to 216 and resulting in a total commercial floor area of 1,720 sq.m (reduced from 3,500 sq.m);
- Reduction in commercial car parking spaces to correspond with the reduction in commercial floorspace;
- Reduction in basement area to correspond with the reduction in commercial car parking spaces; and
- Reduction in height of the tallest tower by 4.0 metres achieved by small reduction in floor to ceiling heights and reduction in void spaces between floors. The other buildings in south block are also reduced in height (number of floors remains the same).

#### *Townscape and Visual Impact*

8.4.5 Policy 3.5 of the adopted London Plan seeks to enhance the quality of local places taking into account local character and density. Meanwhile Core Strategy Policy 30 states that all developments and interventions in the public realm must be high quality and design-led, having special regard to their context. In addition to these policies, Policy DMD 37 notes that development should be suitable for its intended function, appropriate to its context and have regard to its surroundings.

8.4.6 According to the Enfield Characterisation Study the site is located within the Mixed Urban Areas – Centres – Metroland Centres typology. The Study states that with regards to 'Metrolands' these centres tend to be 'contemporary with their local area' as opposed to a centre that has evolved historically over time. The Study further outlines that in an area characterised with residential uses, such as the locality of the subject site, 'the layering of development and re-development has occurred throughout the borough's evolution and has resulted in a variety of urban types and styles across Enfield'.

8.4.7 The applicant has submitted a Townscape Visual Assessment (TVA) with its application which concludes that the character of the townscape surrounding the site within 1km is a 'fairly homogenous one', however differences in the character of the townscape are evident, especially in closer proximity to the site. The TVA further notes that with the exception of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area, the local townscape character of the wider area is assessed of being 'medium value'. This is because it is considered not to be

entirely unique in form or character and as such is considered to be able to absorb the form of the proposed development without undue consequences in townscape terms.

- 8.4.8 Furthermore, the TVA states that with the Proposed Development in situ, the key characteristics of the townscape surrounding the site, as outlined in the local character assessment and in published assessments, would not be changed to any substantial degree. However, there would be a perceptible change to the character of the site and its legibility and relationship to the wider townscape with the removal of the existing lower level office buildings, the step-change in the form, height, scale and massing. This is offset by the form of the new development which would introduce a stronger sense of place and would also introduce a well-designed, contemporary development that would have a stronger and more positive presence compared to the existing situation.
- 8.4.9 Overall, whilst the development does not respect the existing urban grain, it is considered to be of a scale whereby it can create its own distinctive place. Furthermore, the articulation and elevational treatment of the proposed development is considered to be of a high standard that will help make a positive contribution to the wider Southgate townscape, which offset concerns regarding its effect on the townscape of the surrounding area.

*Layout, Scale and Massing*

- 8.4.10 The Council's existing Core Strategy (2010) and London Plan Policy D3 (Intend to Publish) requires proposals to take a design-led approach to optimising capacity, having regard to local character and distinctiveness, moving away from the density matrix approach of the current London Plan. Enfield Issues and Options (Regulation 18) document (Para. 2.4.1), further acknowledges the need to 'exhaust all reasonable opportunities on brownfield land, making underused land work harder and optimising densities with this aim being a 'first principle' of the document.
- 8.4.11 In seeking to optimise development, it is important the layout and massing must have regard to the site's constraints including Grovelands Park and adjacent Southgate Circus Conservation Area, which is required to be protected and enhanced by national, London and local policies. Layout, scale and massing have been explored throughout a lengthy pre-application process, including discussions with Historic England and the Council, to ensure the optimisation of the site is achieved. The site constraints such as substantial ground level changes, proximity to railway and proximity to neighbouring properties were identified, considered and directly influenced the layout, scale and massing of the proposed development. The resulting layout seeks to minimise overlooking and preserve the amenity of local residents to an acceptable degree, given the constraints and opportunities of the site.
- 8.4.12 The existing site comprises 7 three-storey office blocks and a two-storey car park providing 126 allocated car parking spaces. The site sits on a slope with a 4-metre level change from Chase Road to Park Road. There is no public realm within the site between the existing blocks with the existing hardscape areas in the site being used as informal car parking for up to 14 cars.

- 8.4.13 The proposed development comprises two blocks; the north block and the south block with the three taller buildings of 8, 13 and 17 storey's set within the south block. Within the south block, the tallest 17-storey building will be located nearest to the railway line towards the rear of the site whilst the 13-storey building will be the middle / centre building, and the 8-storey building located nearest to Chase Road.
- 8.4.14 The proposal has undergone several significant design changes and the latest revision has incorporated feedback from Council's independent Design Review Panel including a more contemporary London vernacular. The overall massing of the tall buildings now has a vertical emphasis with a modern interpretation of the local vernacular. Whilst the taller buildings are clearly higher than anything in the surrounding area and as such has prompted significant debate as to the appropriate approach to be taken if the development is to deliver the outcomes required. The development will represent a significant alteration to the skyline and in accordance with adopted policy, this needs to be justified. In this regard, the design of the towers is considered to be of quality to support the height which enables the viability of the schemes to be sufficient to re-provide the office accommodation and deliver the housing and affordable housing identified. A reduction in height would reduce the quantum of development and reduce the level of affordable housing. It is also considered the building heights would create a positive landmark appropriate for a town centre.
- 8.4.15 The plan form together with the orientation of the buildings and the positioning and design of the public realm, is considered to lend an openness to the site which currently does not exist, and the introduction of a different type of built form to the area is considered to add character and interest to sit alongside the existing. In addition, the new public / pedestrian route through and improvements to local pedestrian network are considered to further enhance the openness and accessibility of the site, which is a vast improvement on the existing situation.
- 8.4.16 A sense of containment is created as a result of the height of the blocks, and active frontage is created by locating commercial units in the ground floor, some of which are accessed directly from Chase Road. The spaces between the blocks provide a varied silhouette to the street edge elevation, and views are created through from the hard-paved street to the newly created pocket park, whilst allowing sunlight penetration of the landscaped areas.
- 8.4.17 As mentioned above, the three buildings in the southern block step sequentially from higher to lower with the highest 17-storey building being located nearest to the railway line. Public realm spaces are located in-between the buildings and will also connect both sides of the site. The northern block, which is in closest proximity to existing residential properties, will comprise development that is lower in height, between three and seven-storey's high. The developments intention is to keep the tall buildings away from the more sensitive residential parts of the surrounding area, namely Hillside Grove and Park Road to the north.

*Height, Suitability of the Site for a Tall Building*

- 8.4.18 Policy D9 'Tall buildings' of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) advises that Boroughs should determine if there are locations where tall buildings may be appropriate and proposals should take account of, and avoid harm to, the

significance of London's heritage assets and their settings. Furthermore, the Policy notes that proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, demonstrating that alternatives have been explored and that there are clear public benefits that outweigh the harm.

- 8.4.19 Existing London Plan Policy 7.7 ('Location and design of tall and large buildings') sets out that such buildings should amongst other things, generally be limited to sites such as areas of intensification or town centres that have good access to public transport; should only be considered in areas whose character would not be affected adversely by the scale, mass or bulk of a tall or large building; should individually or as a group, improve the legibility of an area, by emphasising a point of civic or visual significance where appropriate, and enhance the skyline and image of London; should contribute to improving the permeability of the site and wider area, where possible; and should make a significant contribution to local regeneration. Policy 7.7 further notes that the impact of tall buildings proposed in sensitive locations, such as Conservation Areas, should be given particular consideration.
- 8.4.20 The site meets the criteria in DMD Policy 43 (Part 3) for being an appropriate location in that it will (a) have good access to public transport; and / or b) contain existing appropriate tall buildings; and/or (c) are within town centres, activity hubs or Regeneration Areas. Part 3 states that applications meeting more than one of the criteria can confirm appropriateness of location. In the case of the Site, a) and c) are relevant.
- 8.4.21 Nevertheless, having regard to DMD 43, the context of the site will always remain and details of the proposed buildings. In this regard, the proposed tall buildings will inevitably be visible from a wider area. However, the visibility of the proposed development can be justified in part in terms of townscape legibility, as providing a 'marker' for the nearby underground station and Southgate town centre. It is because of legibility that we would expect to see densification and height focused around existing town centres and existing transport nodes. Whilst Southgate underground station is a significant local transport node it may also be viewed as not readily visible unless in the immediate vicinity. This is in part because of the Station's low height and partly because the station is located in a part of Southgate that is subject to heavy vehicular activity, which dominates the visual landscape. As such taller buildings in this location would recognise the importance of the town centre in the legibility of the Borough's urban form hierarchy.
- 8.4.22 Whilst it is acknowledged that the scale, height and massing of the proposed development would represent a change when compared to the surrounding context and character of the area, and there will inevitably be some level of impact on the views from Southgate Circus Conservation Area and the Grade II\* Listed Heritage Asset of Southgate Underground Station, tall buildings can make a positive contribution to a townscape. Furthermore, the site is considered capable of being able to accommodate a design-led development that optimises height and density, and which responds positively to context especially when it is i) a Brownfield Site; ii) a location which provides good access to local amenities; and iii) in very close proximity to a variety of public transport methods.
- 8.4.23 Whilst it is also acknowledged that tall buildings are a significant sea-change for the area, the impact of the tall buildings is considered to be mitigated in part, by the differing heights of the blocks that results in a varied roof line .

Together with the slenderness of the taller buildings, it is considered this enables the development to respond sensitively to the surrounding area, in particular the near and adjacent heritage features.

- 8.4.24 The positioning of the tall blocks within the site results in 'views through to the sky' when viewed from north to south / south to north. In addition, the public realm area between the northern block and the southern block provides views running between west to east / east to west; all of these 'views through' the site assist with permeability and give some level of visual relief.
- 8.4.25 The development as proposed is considered to successfully provide two distinguishable blocks within the site, with the lower height block at the northern side nearest to residential properties contrasting with the southern block which sites the three taller buildings. The differentiation between the northern block and southern blocks provide visual interest when experienced from the human scale and is considered a successful approach to accommodating height and density on the site.

#### *Articulation and Materials*

- 8.4.26 As well as the importance of height differentiations and carefully varied massing in the Development, high-quality architectural articulation, materiality and elevational treatment is essential. The architectural approach can help integrate a development into its context through careful use of articulation, proportions and materials and the specific elevational treatment can help to mitigate any negative impacts of building height by giving human scale, pleasing proportions and helping give identity to the overall block appearance, as well as provide crucial distinctiveness to the highest points so that they 'meet the sky' appropriately. As such, this element of the proposal has been the subject of significant discussion, resulting in refinements to the design.
- 8.4.27 The proposal has gone through several iterations to test a variety of design responses in relation to architectural approach and the elevational treatment. The current proposal provides a robust, simple symmetry that gives some quantity of visual interest without becoming overly complicated or busy. The proposed appearance and materials seek to respect the rounded modernist 1930s design of the London Underground station and to this end, the development proposes features such as stone fluting; projecting balconies with ornamental railing (noting that a planning condition requiring details of balcony materials is recommended); black/green small tiling to mark entrances; and Art Deco inspired fenestrations for the commercial bays. The resulting asymmetry and variation across the site ensure the buildings do not dominate the registered park, station setting or Conservation Area
- 8.4.28 Overall the proposed articulation and elevational treatment is considered to be of a very high standard and, will help create a distinctive sense of place and will make a positive contribution to the wider Southgate townscape.

#### *Conclusion of Design*

- 8.4.29 The National Design Guidance sets out that well-designed places have ten key characteristics which work together to create its physical character and help to nurture and sustain a sense of community. The Guidance further states that these 10-characteristics contribute towards the cross-cutting



themes for good design set out in the NPPF. The ten characteristics are as follows:

1. Context – enhances the surroundings;
2. Identity – attractive and distinctive;
3. Built form – a coherent pattern of development;
4. Movement – accessible and easy to move around;
5. Nature – enhanced and optimised;
6. Public spaces – safe, social and inclusive;
7. Uses – mixed and integrated;
8. Homes and buildings – functional, healthy and sustainable;
9. Resources – efficient and resilient; and
10. Lifespan – made to last.

8.4.30 The proposed development is considered to meet all of these characteristics to a lesser or greater degree, and in doing so creates a unique and distinctive development which does not seek to compete with the existing townscape, but rather seeks to contrast and complement it. It achieves this by the use of thoughtfully designed and positioned buildings, generous quantities of public realm and relevant and required uses within the buildings.

8.4.31 It is considered the proposed development has been well conceived on the basis of a clear design vision, mindful of local character, history and landscape. This results in a development which provides a visually interesting and well-considered built intervention to the local area, as well as providing much needed homes, employment space and high-quality public realm for future occupiers of the development as well as local residents and businesses. The design has evolved in the context of a clear understanding of the site's opportunities and constraints, and the capacity of the site has been optimised to deliver as many units as possible, whilst respecting and responding positively to the local character, designations, natural and built infrastructure and heritage assets.

8.4.32 Objections have been received on the issue of height: how height will affect the visual appearance of the area and how the height may affect neighbouring amenity. It is also recognised there are competing views on the approach and whether this height is justified in light of the visual impact and benefit outcomes. However, whilst the concern around height is understood and the design has sought to respond to these concerns, it must also be acknowledged there are also other matters to consider:

- The site is within close proximity to a station (in this instance Southgate underground station) which is considered a priority location for intensification and potentially suitable for tall buildings;
- The site is brownfield land and as such is well suited to be more intensively developed including being able to absorb more height;
- The site is close to the listed Southgate station however is a far enough distance to have a meaningful degree of separation in terms of tall buildings impacting on the listed asset; and
- The site abuts the boundary of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area to the north however does not cross over into it and the

development could be viewed as delineation between the conservation area and non-conservation area.

- 8.4.33 Planning conditions to secure quality materials and robust detailing is recommended to ensure the development is delivered to an appropriately high level of materiality and design detail.
- 8.4.34 On the basis of the above, the proposed development is considered to result in a high-quality scheme that will represent a vast improvement in public realm provision for the locality, whilst delivering a significant number of homes in well-designed buildings in a sustainable location. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with relevant policies in relation to design and has been developed with cognisance of the relevant characteristics of the site and local area, particularly in relation to heritage. Planning conditions to secure quality materials and robust detailing is recommended to ensure the development is delivered to an appropriately high level of materiality and design detail.

## 8.5 Heritage Impact

### *Relevant Policy and Legislation*

- 8.5.1 Although the application site does not itself contain any heritage assets, its boundary abuts the Southgate Circus Conservation Area which contains listed buildings and structures, and there are a small number of listed buildings in the wider area. The proposed development would also be seen in longer views of and, from conservation areas local to the site. Consequently, it has a relationship to the setting of these heritage assets.
- 8.5.2 Chapter 16 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It also encourages LPAs to take account of a non-designated heritage asset in determining any application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm.
- 8.5.3 Given the sensitivity of the location, it is recognised that any proposal should be of the highest architectural quality and should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation areas.

### Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 8.5.4 Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, are of relevance to setting. Section 16(2) states: 'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest which it possesses.' In addition, Section 66(1) states: 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'.

- 8.5.5 Furthermore Section 72 states that, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Although the site is not in the conservation area, the relationship to its setting is a consideration.
- 8.5.6 The Act does not require the preservation of the setting of listed buildings *per se*, which is confirmed by the *South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment and another* (1992 House of Lords appeal), i.e. legislation “*does not in terms require that a development must perform a preserving or enhancing function.*” However, it places a statutory duty on decision makers to ensure that the special interest of a listed building is properly taken into account as a material consideration when determining an application affecting its special interest or setting.
- 8.5.7 Other heritage policy of relevance to the assessment of the application includes as follows:

London Plan

- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.7 Tall Buildings
- Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

London Plan (Intend to Publish)

- Policy D1 London’s form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth
- Policy HC3 Strategic and local views

Core Strategy

- CP30 Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment
- CP31 Heritage

Development Management Document

- DMD 37 Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development
- DMD 43 Tall Buildings
- DMD 44 Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets

Other Material Considerations

- Southgate Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal
- Southgate Circus Conservation Area Management Proposals
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets: *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition), (GPA 3) 2017, provides information on good practice in relation to assessing impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Of particular note in the GPA is the inclusion of the consideration of views and whether there would be any impact to the significance of the views on the heritage asset as a result of the development. However, it is of note that a distinction is made between views that contribute to heritage significance and those valued for other reasons.*
- National Planning Policy Guidance
- Making Enfield: Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019-2024

*Site and Immediate Setting - Heritage Context*

- 8.5.8 Southgate Office Village comprises a utilitarian complex of late 20<sup>th</sup> century, 4 storey brick built buildings situated in the setting of Southgate Circus Conservation Area and several listed buildings, including Southgate Underground Station, (Grade II\* listed), Station sign to north of Southgate Station (grade II\* listed), Station Parade, Nos. 1 to 8 (consecutive) including No 1 Chase Side (grade II listed). The White Hart Public House located on the adjacent site (circa 1866-1896) is also noted as a building making a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.5.9 In this case, the existing office buildings on the site are in a reasonable state of repair but are of no architectural value. Consequently, it is considered their demolition would not harm the significance of the heritage assets with their loss assessed as meeting the test of preserving and enhancing the setting of conservation areas local to the site and nearby listed buildings.
- 8.5.10 The focus of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area is the early 1930s Grade II\* listed Underground station and its surface buildings and associated pylons and lamp posts, which together are considered to comprise one of the finest examples of Charles Holden's modernist work commissioned by London Underground. The setting of the booking hall - the concourse, the curved traffic islands, the adjoining shops and office building, and the signs and shelters – were all designed by Holden in a carefully integrated urban design exercise, which translated the former Southgate village green into a modernist town centre to match its new status as a major commuter gateway. These structures and the layout remain largely intact. The location on rising ground serves to reinforce the Station as a focal point.
- 8.5.11 Sited at the convergence of five roads (Chase Side to the north-west, The Bourne and Bourne Hill to the south-east, High Street to the south, and Chase Road and Winchmore Hill Road to the north and north-east), the Station is a key node for the area. A key view is afforded down Chase Road at the junction of Winchmore Hill Road.
- 8.5.12 Stylistically the station building comprises a circular drum of a reinforced concrete frame clad in red and brown brick on Cornish granite plinth with high concrete cornices and oversailing flat roofs. The building is designed to be viewed in the round; set in the centre of an oval island surrounded by radial cut paving slabs, with high central booking hall surrounded by lower offices and kiosks. The exterior of the drum is complex in its detailing with cast-iron dado in geometric Greek key pattern around vent covers. Steel window frames in timber surrounds, a pair set either side of blind timber poster boards. Projecting illuminated sign band standing proud of narrow glazing band. Broad projecting eaves formed of a slim concrete slab; high clerestory with strongly horizontal pattern of steel glazing bars under shallow concrete slab roof topped by distinctively Scandinavian style finial of five swirling bands between opal light fittings (they slide to open) with a ball top. The letters to some shop units have contemporary bold signage. Many of the signs, particularly the roundels, are late-C20 replicas of 1930s originals.
- 8.5.13 Grade II\* buildings account for 5.5% of all listed buildings included on the National Heritage List. Southgate station is Grade II\* listed and as such is

deemed to have more than special architectural and historic interest for the following reasons:

1. Its bold massing demonstrated by low circular tiers of the station building with central finial and the effective counterpart of the soaring pylons with their integral circular seats and Underground logo. While characteristic of Holden's work, the station is also a unique design and the ball finial motif was adopted from the 1930 Stockholm Exhibition that would effectively influence British architecture for the next 20 years as a primary source of the Festival of Britain style;
2. Logical planning as an integrated bus and underground transport interchange in an effectively grouped ensemble further identified as a transport circus by the curved routes defined by the buildings and the landmark pylons with signage. It has group value with these other listed structures; Attention to detail and dramatic interiors with original features such as bronze shopfronts, the central passimeter that grows into the main finial, the bronze fluted uplighters (a feature of all these stations) and distinctive signage;
3. Position as one of the best of Charles Holden's fine London underground stations designed in partnership with Frank Pick of the London Transport Passenger Board. These are among the first and most widely celebrated examples of modern architecture in Britain; also highly significant as an example of the modernist approach to corporate identity which subsumed architecture, design and graphics to a common idiom.

#### *Wider Setting – Heritage Context*

8.5.14 The prevailing heights of buildings in the surrounding area are of a domestic scale (3-4 storeys), with the exception of Southpoint House; a 6 storey, mid-20<sup>th</sup> century office block. This latter building is however noted as making a negative contribution to the character of the Conservation Area due to its design and appearance. The Southpoint House building is though included within the boundaries of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area to enable appropriate planning and listed building controls to be exercised should any development come forward, in an attempt to improve the setting of the station complex. As such it is of key importance that any further taller buildings that are introduced into this context are of an exemplary design quality, and the planning benefits can clearly be demonstrated to outweigh any harm considered to arise.

8.5.15 Various heritage assets and conservation areas lie in the wider vicinity of the site, including the Lakes Estate, Meadway and Southgate Green Conservation Areas, in addition to Grade I listed Groveland's House and Grade II\* Registered Groveland's Park.

#### *Impact of proposed development on the setting of listed buildings, designated and non-designated heritage assets*

8.5.16 As has been identified, the local planning authority has a duty under S72 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) to pay 'special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance' of a conservation area. In addition, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings

and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 requires that 'in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'.

- 8.5.17 In line with the NPPF, when any harm is identified to a heritage asset as a result of proposed development, great weight must be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether the potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. In addition, any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

*When assessing the impact of proposed development, the NPPF advises Local Planning Authorities that great weight should be given to the assets conservation, noting that assets of greater importance should be assigned proportionately more weight. The NPPF also notes that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.*

However, Paragraph 200 of the NPPF also acknowledges that Local Planning Authorities should seek opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance, noting also that proposals that preserve elements that make a positive contribution to and / or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

- 8.5.18 In consultation with the Conservation Officers, it is acknowledged there is concern in relation to the potential harm of the proposed development on Southgate Underground Station (Grade II\* listed); views along key approach roads into the Conservation Area, particularly views looking north out of the conservation area from Southgate Circus and the High Street, in addition to views from within Groveland's Park (Grade II\* Listed Park and Garden) and this needs to be carefully balanced against the heritage tests and the regeneration benefits.

*Impact on the Setting of Groveland's House and Park*

- 8.5.19 The reduction in the overall height of the scheme (including post-submission) was undertaken in direct response to Historic England's concerns. As a result of the 4m height reduction while noting the storey level remained at 17, Historic England are now satisfied that there will be no impact on Groveland's Park as a result of the proposals, based on the submitted revised Accurate Visual Representations.

*Impact on Southgate Circus Underground Station and Southgate Circus Conservation Area*

- 8.5.20 Although efforts to step the buildings down towards the station are noted, in heritage terms it is acknowledged that the proposals introduce a contrasting form of development relative to the surrounding domestic scale buildings which are predominantly of 3 and 4-storeys. As such there would be a clear step change in height notably at the street frontage including The White Hart Public House. However, it is considered that a development of a different

scale, does not automatically mean it results in harm to the significance of heritage assets.

- 8.5.21 From within the Conservation Area, it is the views north from Southgate Circus and the High Street which are considered to be most sensitive to change. The disjunct in scale between the proposed development and the station, its backdrop, the White Hart Public House and parade of shops on the Broadway, from this vantage point is noted, and is likely to result in some visual tension between the proposed development and the predominantly 3 and 4-storey buildings. However, whilst some harm to the setting of the Conservation Area is acknowledged, in line with Historic England's comments, it is considered this harm to be less than substantial. In view of this, the Council must have regard for to Para 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that '*where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use*'.

#### *Archaeology*

- 8.5.22 No archaeological finds or features are recorded in the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record from this area, nor is the area designated as an area of archaeological interest. While the site has a long occupation history, it is unlikely that any remains of archaeological significance have survived the intensive redevelopment of the area in the later 19th and 20th centuries. However, a suitably worded archaeological condition is proposed, to ensure any buried remains are protected.

#### *Conclusion of Heritage Impact*

- 8.5.23 The Historic England guidance entitled *The Setting of Heritage Assets, 2015* states:

*"Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset. Negative change could include severing the last link between an asset and its original setting; positive change could include the restoration of a building's original designed landscape or the removal of structures impairing views of a building."* [p.4]

- 8.5.24 London Plan Policy 7.7 echoes this stance, stating:

"The impact of tall buildings proposed in sensitive locations should be given particular consideration. Such areas might include conservation areas, listed buildings and their settings, registered historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, battlefields, the edge of the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land, World Heritage Sites or other areas designated by boroughs as being sensitive or inappropriate for tall buildings."

- 8.5.25 Furthermore Southgate Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal states,

*'Building design:* the buildings forming the backdrop to the grade II\* listed station complex need to respect the scale and design principles of the station.

They should not dominate or overbear the existing historic buildings. Such development sites should be subject to design briefs to protect the setting of the nationally significant station’.

8.5.26 It is also noted in this balanced assessment of the scheme's merits that Policy DMD 43 states that tall buildings will not be acceptable in areas classified as inappropriate, including within the boundary or in the immediate vicinity of, or along views to, or from: conservation areas; nationally or locally listed buildings; scheduled or locally listed ancient monuments; and nationally or locally registered historic parks and gardens, noting that areas likely to be sensitive to tall buildings include: a. Locations where development would infringe upon or detract from important local views. The policy further notes “There will be a presumption against tall buildings in sensitive areas, with the onus being on the developer to demonstrate how the proposal avoids the negative impacts associated with the sensitive classification.” While careful consideration has been given to this policy position, officers are cognisant of adopted London Plan policy and emerging planning policy included the draft London Plan (Intend to Publish) which would see a location such as this with good public transport accessibility as a suitable location within which to consider densification and tall buildings. Consequently, it is considered that the substantial revisions to the scheme since the pre-application stage has resulted in a development that meets this criterion and on balance, is an appropriate development response.

8.5.27 On the basis of the above, it is acknowledged that the proposal, by virtue of its height, bulk, scale and massing will represent change and is likely to result in some level of harm in heritage terms. However, in line with Historic England, it is considered this harm would be ‘less than substantial’ and that having regard to Paragraph 196 of the NPPF, it is considered that the less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the wider public benefits of the scheme such the delivery of good quality homes, as affordable housing, meaningful regeneration of the area and the creation of high-quality public realm space on Site. In light of the above the public benefits resulting from the scheme and taking into account that the harm has been minimised and mitigated by the high-quality of the design, are considered to outweigh the ‘less than substantial harm’ arising from the proposed development.

## 8.6 Neighbouring Amenity Considerations

8.6.1 London Plan Policy 7.6 sets out that buildings should not cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity, including in terms of privacy and overshadowing. Emerging London Plan Policy D6 notes that development proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst avoiding overheating, minimising overshadowing and maximising the usability of outside amenity space. Furthermore, Policy CP30 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new developments have appropriate regard to their surroundings, and that they improve the environment in terms of visual and residential amenity while Policies DMD 6 and 8 seek to ensure that residential developments do not prejudice the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in terms of privacy, overlooking and general sense of encroachment.

*Daylight/Sunlight*



BRE Guidance - Daylight and Sunlight:

8.6.2 In general, for assessing the sunlight and daylight impact of new development on existing buildings, Building Research Establishment (BRE) criteria is adopted standard. In accordance with both local and national policies, consideration has to be given to the context of the site, the more efficient and effective use of valuable urban land and the degree of material impact on neighbours. BRE Guidelines paragraph 1.1 states: *“People expect good natural lighting in their homes and in a wide range of non-habitable buildings. Daylight makes an interior look more attractive and interesting as well as providing light to work or read by”*.

8.6.3 BRE Guidelines also recognise however at Paragraph 1.6 that *“The advice given here is not mandatory and the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design...”*.

BRE Guidance – Daylight to Existing Buildings:

8.6.4 The BRE Guidelines stipulate that... *“the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected if either:*

*“the VSC [Vertical Sky Component] measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27%, and less than 0.8 times its former value the area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value.” (No Sky Line / Daylight Distribution)”*.

8.6.5 At paragraph 2.2.7 of the BRE Guidelines it states: *“If this VSC is greater than 27% then enough skylight should still be reaching the window of the existing building. Any reduction below this level should be kept to a minimum. If the VSC, with the development in place is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The area lit by the window is likely to appear more gloomy, and electric lighting will be needed more of the time.”*

8.6.6 The BRE Guidelines state (paragraph 2.1.4) that the maximum VSC value is almost 40% for a completely unobstructed vertical wall.

8.6.7 At paragraph 2.2.8 the BRE Guidelines state: *“Where room layouts are known, the impact on the daylighting distribution in the existing building can be found by plotting the ‘no sky line’ in each of the main rooms. For houses this would include living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens. Bedrooms should also be analysed although they are less important... The no sky line divides points on the working plane which can and cannot see the sky... Areas beyond the no sky line, since they receive no direct daylight, usually look dark and gloomy compared with the rest of the room, however bright it is outside”*.

8.6.8 Paragraph 2.2.11 states: *Existing windows with balconies above them typically receive less daylight. Because the balcony cuts out light from the top part of the sky, even a modest obstruction may result in a large relative impact on the VSC, and on the area receiving direct skylight.”* The paragraph goes on to recommend the testing of VSC with and without the balconies in

place to test if it the development or the balcony itself causing the most significant impact.

8.6.9 The BRE Guidelines at its Appendix F gives provisions to set alternative target values for access to skylight and sunlight. It sets out that the numerical targets widely given are purely advisory and different targets may be used based on the special requirements of the proposed development or its location. An example given is *“in a mews development within a historic city centre where a typical obstruction angle from ground floor window level might be close to 40 degree. This would correspond to a VSC of 18% which could be used as a target value for development in that street if new development is to match the existing layout”*

8.6.10 Paragraph 1.3.45-46 of the Mayor of London’s Housing SPD states that:

*‘Policy 7.6Bd requires new development to avoid causing ‘unacceptable harm’ to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly in relation to privacy and overshadowing and where tall buildings are proposed. An appropriate degree of flexibility needs to be applied when using BRE guidelines to assess the daylight and sunlight impacts of new development on surrounding properties, as well as within new developments themselves. Guidelines should be applied sensitively to higher density development, especially in opportunity areas, town centres, large sites and accessible locations, where BRE advice suggests considering the use of alternative targets. This should take into account local circumstances; the need to optimise housing capacity; and scope for the character and form of an area to change over time.*

8.6.11 *The degree of harm on adjacent properties and the daylight targets within a proposed scheme should be assessed drawing on broadly comparable residential typologies within the area and of a similar nature across London. Decision makers should recognise that fully optimising housing potential on large sites may necessitate standards which depart from those presently experienced, but which still achieve satisfactory levels of residential amenity and avoid unacceptable harm.’*

*BRE Guidance - Sunlight to Existing Buildings:*

8.6.12 The BRE Guidelines (2011) state in relation to sunlight at paragraph 3.2.11: *“If a living room of an existing dwelling has a main window facing within 90 degrees of due south, and any part of a new development subtends an angle of more than 25 degrees to the horizontal measured from the centre of the window in a vertical section perpendicular to the window, then the sunlighting of the existing dwelling may be adversely affected. This will be the case if the centre of the window:*

- *Receives less than 25% of annual probable sunlight hours, or less than 5% of annual probable sunlight hours between 21 September and 21 March and*
- *Receives less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year greater than 4% of annual probable sunlight hours.”*

8.6.13 The BRE Guidelines state at paragraph 3.16 in relation to orientation: *“A south-facing window will, receive most sunlight, while a north-facing one will*

*only receive it on a handful of occasions (early morning and late evening in summer). East and west-facing windows will receive sunlight only at certain times of the day. A dwelling with no main window wall within 90 degrees of due south is likely to be perceived as insufficiently sunlit.”*

- 8.6.14 They go on to state (paragraph 3.2.3): “... *it is suggested that all main living rooms of dwellings, and conservatories, should be checked if they have a window facing within 90 degrees of due south. Kitchens and bedrooms are less important, although care should be taken not to block too much sun.*

*BRE Guidance - Open Spaces:*

- 8.6.15 The Guidelines state that it is good practice to check the sunlighting of open spaces where it will be required and would normally include: ‘*gardens to existing buildings (usually the back garden of a house), parks and playing fields and children’s playgrounds, outdoor swimming pools and paddling pools, sitting out areas such as those between non-domestic buildings and in public squares, focal points for views such as a group of monuments or fountains’.*
- 8.6.16 At paragraph 3.3.17 it states: “*It is recommended that for it to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. If as a result of new development an existing garden or amenity area does not meet the above, and the area which can receive two hours of sun on 21 March is less than 0.8 times its former value, then the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable. If a detailed calculation cannot be carried out, it is recommended that the centre of the area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March.*”
- 8.6.17 Whilst the BRE guidelines are not mandatory, the suitability of a proposed scheme for a site within the context of BRE guidance is largely the accepted approach. When reviewing the findings of a daylight/sunlight assessment, consideration will be given to the urban context within which a scheme is located, and daylight/sunlight will be one of a number of planning considerations which is considered.

### ***Daylight Analysis***

- 8.6.18 Significant concerns have been raised during the consultation from neighbouring properties in respect of the impact of the proposed development on surrounding daylight and sunlight leading to an impact on residential amenity.
- 8.6.19 The submitted daylight and sunlight report provides analysis on the loss of daylight and sunlight to windows of 28 neighbouring residential properties as listed below. In order to ascertain which properties contain residential use the daylight/sunlight surveyors used Council Tax Valuation Office Agency (VOA) database, external observations and undertook desktop research into surrounding properties. Only properties which are considered to be near enough to the proposed development to be potentially impacted, were included in the analysis.
- 8.6.20 Properties assessed for impact (also shown highlighted in black lines in Fig.1 below) were as follows:

- Bramwood Court
- 290 Chase Road
- 1-2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 Dennis Parade, Winchmore Hill Road
- 6 & 8 Winchmore Hill Road
- 7 Park Road
- 20-14 (even) Park Road
- 272 & 274 Chase Road
- 53-37 Odd Hillside Grove
- Newby House, 309 Chase Road



Fig.1: properties identified as residential and subject to daylight/sunlight assessment are outlined

8.6.21 The results of the daylight and sunlight assessment for the Proposed Development are summarised below:

*Daylight*

8.6.22 Of the 266 windows tested serving 138 rooms within 28 properties:

- Fourteen (14) properties experience fully BRE Compliant Vertical Sky Component (VSC) calculations and no noticeable reductions in VSC;
- Eleven (11) properties experience reductions in VSC to the primary windows of between 20%-35%, which is considered acceptable in an urban environment; and
- Two (2) properties (Bramwood Court and 7 Park Road) experience derogations from BRE Guidelines with VSC reductions of greater than 35%.

8.6.23 However, it should be recognised that these reductions are likely attributable to the design of these particular buildings, with balconies obstructing the view of the sky and exacerbating any percentage alterations. An analysis without the balconies in place (as set out in the BRE Guidelines) confirmed that the balconies are a key contributing factor. The retained absolute VSC levels, are considered commensurate of those within urban developments.

8.6.24 One (1) property (290 Chase Road) will experience derogations from the BRE Guidance with some moderate losses in VSC. However, this property is associated with an apartment in commercial use and the affected room is understood to be a bedroom (which the BRE Guidelines considers to be of less sensitivity compared to living rooms). The reduction in No Sky Line (NSL) is only marginally above 20%, as such the alterations in daylight and retained values are in line with the surrounding urban context.

#### *Sunlight*

8.6.25 The majority of the properties assessed remain fully compliant with BRE Guidelines. Where there are derogations, a significant proportion of these impact upon Winter Annual Probably Sunlight Hours (APSH) when the sun is much lower in the sky and any additional massing will cause impacts. A number of the properties assessed have windows that face the Site, within an easterly or westerly orientation. Whilst technically valid for assessment, due to the southerly rotation of the sun these properties will be limited in their ability to meet the BRE criteria for sunlight.

8.6.26 As a result of their orientation, these properties will receive sunlight in the evening or early morning when the sun is low in the sky and therefore are sensitive to any additional massing built close by. Overall the sunlight levels will remain adequate as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Development.

#### *Conclusion*

8.6.27 The impacts of the Proposed Development on daylight and sunlight are considered to be limited given the scale of the development and the urban nature of the local area, with levels of daylight and sunlight in most of the neighbouring residential properties remaining largely unaffected by the proposals. As such, the Proposed Development is considered to have at worst a minor effect upon daylight and sunlight levels in nearby residential properties.

#### *Overshadowing*

8.6.28 In addition to the above daylight and sunlight assessment the applicants also undertook an overshadowing analysis of nearby properties. Forty-six (46)

properties in the immediate vicinity of the site with identified external amenity space were assessed for impact as follows:

- Bramwood Court
- 290 Chase Road
- 2-20 (even) Park Road
- 264-274 (even) Chase Road
- 1-27 (odd) Hillside Grove
- 37-61 (odd) Hillside Grove
- St Andrew's School

- 8.6.29 The overshadowing assessment found in the existing situation 36 of the 46 amenity spaces do not achieve the BRE recommended target of at least 2-hours of direct sunlight on the 21<sup>st</sup> March. However, this is not unexpected within urban areas where there is a lower expectation of direct sunlight due to the presence of buildings in close proximity to amenity spaces.
- 8.6.30 The report concluded that of the 46-surrounding residential properties material for the overshadowing assessment, seven (7) of the properties deviate from the BRE Guidance when assessed at the 21<sup>st</sup> March equinox. Within these seven properties, five already achieve less than 2-hours of direct sunlight to 50% of their amenity space. As such the reductions to these five properties is noticeable as the amenity space is left with less than 0.8 times of direct sunlight when compared to the existing situation.
- 8.6.31 Whilst there would be noticeable impacts to overshadowing levels in five (5) properties the report concludes that amenity spaces are more likely to be used in the summer months; in this respect the report notes that *"The results of the assessment at the summer solstice in this circumstance indicate full BRE compliance by April 30<sup>th</sup>. In the circumstance, considering the urban gain these figures represent a high degree of compliance with the BRE guidelines where the BRE readily states that a degree of flexibility of the numerical guidelines is required, such as in higher density areas like Southgate."*

#### *Privacy, Overlooking & Outlook*

- 8.6.32 As noted above London Plan Policy 7.6 sets out that buildings should not cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity whilst draft London Plan Policy D6 notes that development proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing. Furthermore, Policies DMD 6 and 8 seek to ensure that residential developments do not prejudice the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in terms of privacy, overlooking and general sense of encroachment and Policy CP30 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new developments have appropriate regard to their surroundings, and that they improve the environment in terms of visual and residential amenity.
- 8.6.33 The Site is within Southgate District Centre and is Urban in character. Whilst the development will be much larger and taller than the existing buildings, this is where you would expect to find such building typologies as evident in other locations across London.
- 8.6.34 The nearest properties to the Proposed Development would be 7 Park Road (more so the units within the southern section of the building) to the north-east on the opposite side of the road, and 20 Park Road which sits to the north

and abuts the site. The design of the proposed development is such that the proposed buildings within the scheme nearest to these residential properties would be the lowest in the development at 2-storeys high plus ground floor. Whilst there would be some residential windows facing north at first and second floor from this element, these would either be bathroom windows (and as such would be fitted with obscure glazed windows and fixed shut (part of high level openings) or secondary windows to lounges. However, in order to protect the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers a planning condition is recommended requiring these secondary windows to also be opaque glazed and to have restricted opening. The distance and layouts of the other taller blocks are such that they would not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact in terms of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. In addition any minor impact would not be considered untypical of that experienced in an urban location, and not considered significant enough to warrant refusal on this ground.

### *Noise*

- 8.6.35 Guidance relevant for the assessment of noise affecting new developments is given in the February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 180 sets out that that new development should be appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should seek to a) 'mitigate and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life'. Furthermore, DMD Policy 68 states that developments that generate or would be exposed to an unacceptable level of noise will not be permitted
- 8.6.36 Meanwhile Policy D14 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) sets out that in order to reduce, manage and mitigate noise to improve health and quality of life, residential... development proposals should manage noise by, amongst other things: '3) mitigating and minimising the existing and potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, as a result of, or in the vicinity of new development without placing unreasonable restrictions on existing noise-generating uses', and '4) improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes...'
- 8.6.37 The submission documents include a Noise and Vibration Assessment undertaken by Cass Allen in relation to the proposed residential use element of the Proposal. The Assessment surveyed the existing noise climate at the Site and identified that noise levels are dominated by road traffic on Chase Road and railway noise from the nearby Piccadilly Line. Noise from aircraft movements was also identified however this noise source was considered largely insignificant compared to noise from road traffic and railway noise. In addition, no measurable commercial noise was observed, including from the adjacent gym to the south. Ground-borne vibration levels at the Site were also measured and considered acceptable. The assessment concluded that the Site is suitable for the Proposed Development in terms of noise and vibration levels and would provide a satisfactory internal noise environment for sleeping. In order for noise and vibration levels to remain at an acceptable level a planning condition is recommended to secure this to the satisfaction of

the Local Planning Authority and in line with relevant policy and guidance as outlined above.

8.6.38 With regards to occupier amenity the assessment concluded that noise levels on the majority of balconies within the Proposal would be expected to exceed the BS8233 recommended level of 50 – 55 dB LAeq,T for an outdoor amenity space. However, it is recognised that exceedance of the BS8233 recommended levels does not normally mean that balconies would be unacceptable to future residents for several reasons including as follows:

- Most developments in urban areas will be subject to noise levels above the BS8233 recommended levels for balconies;
- It is reasonable to assume that future occupiers would prefer the option to have a noisier balcony as opposed to having no balcony at all; and
- It is likely that the balconies may have a dense material such as concrete balustrades, which will reduce the road traffic noise levels on the balconies as far as is practicable (a planning condition requiring details of balcony materials is recommended).

8.6.39 Furthermore, it is acknowledged that there are no other noise mitigation measures available for balconies other than fully enclosing them (i.e. 'winter gardens'), which essentially changes the balconies into internal rooms. On this basis the development is considered acceptable in relation to noise levels in external to private amenity areas.

8.6.40 Some concern has been raised in relation to potential light pollution arising from the development. Whilst it is acknowledged that a large-scale development will generate significantly more light than the existing buildings, planning conditions are recommended requiring detailed technical specifications of lighting across the development including residential, commercial and public realm areas. Furthermore, a Management Plan will be required outlining how light to the commercial and public realm areas will be appropriately managed to ensure there is no light spill or unacceptable levels of light arising from the development. In relation to the residential element of the development, it is not considered light generating from the flats would be unreasonable given they are expected to be used in a normal residential fashion.

#### *Conclusion of Neighbouring Amenity Considerations*

8.6.41 Whilst concern has been raised by local residents in relation to loss of daylight / sunlight arising from the development, these are not considered to result in sufficient harm to render the scheme unacceptable. It is also noted that concern has been raised from people living a sufficient enough distance from the development that they have not been included in the analysis. As such, taking into account existing levels of light to the properties and the urban context of the site, it is considered that the analysis satisfactorily demonstrates that whilst there are some deviations, these are not significant enough to warrant the scheme unacceptable, particularly in the context of the urban setting of the development, whereby some impact can be considered acceptable. The Proposed Development is therefore considered acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight impact to neighbouring occupiers.



- 8.6.42 In terms of outlook, privacy and overlooking as outlined above the nearest building to the most likely affected existing properties would also be the lowest at two-storeys plus ground floor, and measures can be implemented to ensure windows facing north are opaque glazed and have restricted opening mechanisms. The other buildings are considered sufficient distance away and have layouts that would be unlikely to give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts to neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.6.43 With regards to potential noise and disturbance arising from the use/occupation of the development it is noted that there is some level of concern from neighbouring occupiers in relation to this. It is also noted that there is concern that existing noise and disturbance could become worse however as a result of new measures in terms of vehicle movements and drops-offs, and improved building fabric and internal noise mitigation measures, it is considered that the opposite will likely occur. That is, the proposed new measures, will result in a quieter facility, despite the intensification of the use. It is considered therefore that the scheme will not generate an unacceptable level of noise.
- 8.6.44 Also, as mentioned above, conditions are recommended requiring further details in the way of an acoustic report to in relation to the building mechanical plant and for details of opaque/restricted opening windows to be submitted for approval. Subject to these details being satisfactory, the Proposed Development is considered acceptable in terms of amenity impact to neighbouring occupiers.

## 8.7 Transportation, Access & Parking

- 8.7.1 Core Strategy (2010) policies aim to both address the existing deficiencies in transport in the Borough and to ensure that planned growth is supported by adequate transport infrastructure that promotes sustainable transport choices including the use of public transport, cycling and walking.
- 8.7.2 Furthermore, Policy DMD 45 Parking Standards and Layout states that the Council aims to minimise car parking in support of this sustainability objective.
- 8.7.3 London Plan (2016) Policy 6.1 encourages partnership working by ensuring the approach to transport and development is coordinated to reduce the need to travel, especially by car whilst also supporting development with high levels of public transport accessibility and/or capacity. The policy also supports measures that encourage shifts to more sustainable modes of transport.
- 8.7.4 Parking, highway, pedestrian conflict and increased traffic levels has been cited as a concern from neighbouring properties, and these issues are considered by the Transport Assessment submitted by the Applicant which has been assessed.
- 8.7.5 The Proposal is considered to be well placed for access to public transport services, and is located in an area of formal parking control. However, the effect of the development needs to be carefully managed and as such suitable mitigation will be necessary to manage these to make the development acceptable in transportation terms.

*Trip Generation:*

- 8.7.6 The current use of the site is for 4,433sqm of office floorspace with this being replaced by 216-residential units and 1,720sqm of commercial space. The trip generation work undertaken by the applicant uses the industry standard TRICS database and demonstrates that, due to the almost car free residential accommodation and reduction in office floorspace, the number of vehicle trips will actually reduce from 54 two-way trips in the AM weekday peak (the period when the network is being used most intensively) to 18. It should be noted that a separate assessment has not been made for the disabled parking provision however, even if all of the users accessed the site in the AM peak this would only represent 6 additional trips (24 in total). This means the development is forecast to have a positive impact on the capacity of the local highway network.

*Pedestrian access:*

- 8.7.7 The development will be served by pedestrian access points on Chase Road and Park Road. On Chase Road there will be public realm improvements due to the reconfiguration of the vehicle access arrangements and the reduction in surface level parking.
- 8.7.8 On Park Road an access will be provided which will open up a new route to a bridge over the adjacent Underground lines. This will also involve the provision of a pocket park which will see three car parking spaces turned into green space. Parking surveys have confirmed that this will not have a significant impact on available kerbside parking in the area.
- 8.7.9 The applicant will be required to enter into a S278 agreement or appoint the Council's Highways team to undertake the necessary works.

*Vehicular Access:*

- 8.7.10 The proposal is for an existing access on Chase Side to be moved and then used solely for the servicing of the site. This approach is considered acceptable however the applicant, in line with TfL requirements, will need to undertake a road safety audit of the proposed scheme. This will be covered by a condition.
- 8.7.11 The access to the basement parking areas will be from Park Road. This approach has been taken because it makes best use of the change in gradients across the site to accommodate car parking at a basement level, rather than using land to provide this at a surface level as is currently the case. This means that there will be additional vehicles using Hillside Grove and Park Road, with the trip generation work undertaken by the applicant indicating that there will be 18 two-way trips in the AM peak and 19 in the PM peak. Whilst this is an intensification of use, it does not represent a level which would be inappropriate or unexpected for a street of this nature street and, taken across the AM peak hour, represents significantly less than 1 additional movement every 3 minutes.
- 8.7.12 The applicant has acknowledged that they will need to enter into a S278 agreement or appoint the Council to undertake the necessary highway access works. If the latter, the scheme design and cost will be agreed and included as an obligation in the S106 agreement.

*Car Parking:*

- 8.7.13 The applicant is proposing that the only parking for the residential element of the development is seven disabled spaces (circa 3% of the total in line with the Draft London Plan). Additional disabled parking spaces (up to another 7% in line with the Draft London Plan) can be provided by utilising the spaces currently used by the other uses as people switch mode, in line with the Travel Plan.
- 8.7.14 Given that the development is in an area with good access to public transport, as indicated by the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 and the proximity to an Underground station and bus services, as well as being in a controlled parking zone, this approach is acceptable and is in line with relevant policies in both the London Plan and the Council's Development Management Document as well as emerging plan policy.
- 8.7.15 However, whilst disabled blue badge holders' visitors can use public highway adjacent to the site for parking, it is considered that it would be more convenient to allow some disabled parking in the courtyard area within the site. This is something that will be required via a planning condition.
- 8.7.16 The proposed parking for the office uses is 17-spaces at a ratio of 1-space per 94sq.m. Whilst this is slightly in excess of the Draft London Plan maximum of 1-space per 100sq.m, this is significantly less than the maximum provision of 140-spaces already available on the site and includes an element of retained parking for existing occupiers of the current office accommodation. In addition, the predominant use on the site, residential accommodation, is effectively car free. Therefore, this is viewed as an acceptable level of car parking provision for the office use.
- 8.7.17 To avoid overspill parking into the local area, residents and businesses will not be able to obtain permits for the Southgate Controlled Parking Zone or any successor parking control areas. This exemption will be secured through a legal agreement .
- 8.7.18 The development proposes that 20% of spaces will be provided with electric vehicle charging points, while passive provision will be made for the other 80%. The applicant has considered various trigger points (requests from staff, in line with wider market demand, etc) for switching from passive to active electric vehicle charging provision and will be secured through the Travel Plan. This is in line with the Draft London Plan so is acceptable.
- 8.7.19 The applicant has also prepared a draft Car Parking Management Plan and has committed to review this regularly; this will be captured by way of a planning condition and/or S106 obligation.

*Car Club Provision:*

- 8.7.20 The applicant has approached car club providers and the feedback is that the preferred solution is to provide publicly available bays on Park Road which can also serve the wider community. This therefore has the benefit of offering increased provision for the wider area and is supported by the Traffic & Transportation Team. However, given that this involves public highway, this will be captured through the legal agreement and a £5,000 contribution to cover the cost of related traffic orders.

*Cycle Parking:*

8.7.21 The proposed number of long and short stay cycle parking spaces meets the minimum standards as set out in the Draft London Plan (it should be noted that these standards are higher than those in the current London Plan). The cycle parking located in the basement will be accessible both by using appropriately sized lifts and an access ramp which has a shallow enough gradient to make it suitable for use by cyclists. The proposed layout should provide enough space for cyclists to safely and conveniently access the cycle parking provision.

*Active Travel Zones and Healthy Streets:*

8.7.22 A Healthy Streets Design Check is a requirement of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy T2. This requires developments to reduce the dominance of vehicles and deliver improvements that support the ten Healthy Streets Indicators. A top-level assessment has been undertaken and some key local destinations identified. However, one of these is unlikely to be a priority (the Priory Hospital because it does not provide readily accessible health services) and for the others, a more detailed assessment of the routes, with a view to identifying improvements in line with the Healthy Streets approach, has not been undertaken. As stated previously this is a requirement for applications being assessed against the Draft London Plan. In addition, given that residents and visitors will rely on active and sustainable travel modes, there is an expectation that the development will contribute to improving the public realm in the area, in particular for the route to the town centre, Underground station and bus stops. A planning condition is recommended requiring a design check to be undertaken to ensure the development meets requirements in London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy T2.

8.7.23 The assessment of routes is likely to identify improvements which will facilitate active and sustainable travel. In terms of Section 106 monetary contribution, it is estimated that this is likely to be in the region of £50,000 to £100,000.

*Travel Plan and Sustainable Travel:*

8.7.24 A travel plan prepared in line with current TfL guidance will be required by condition. In broad terms this will need to:

- Define a baseline position and develop targets for achieving mode shift to active and sustainable modes in line with the Mayor of London's 80% target.
- Identify measures being delivered, including the promotion of sustainable transport as set out below, to encourage mode shift particularly in respect of the office uses.
- Include details of the monitoring being undertaken ideally via TRICS compliant surveys.

8.7.25 The applicant has agreed to provide a Travel Plan Monitoring contribution of £4,024.80 which will be secured by way of S106 obligation.

8.7.26 As noted above, there will also need to be a commitment, secured via a S106 agreement, to delivering Sustainable Transport measures:

- Car club membership for 1 year with £50 in credit.
- An Oyster card per bedroom with £50 in credit.
- Membership of the London Cycling Campaign for 1 year.
- Promotional materials.

8.7.27 If the applicant is unable to demonstrate that these have been provided, then a payment of up to £380.00 per residential unit will be required to be made to the Council. This has been agreed by the applicant and will be secured by way of a S106 agreement.

*Deliveries, Servicing, Refuse and Recycling:*

8.7.28 Deliveries, servicing and refuse and recycling collections will take place within the site boundary and vehicles tracking has been provided to indicate that a 10m vehicle can enter and exit safely. Access is via a controlled bollard system and details of the approach to be taken should this stop functioning or if emergency vehicles require access would be covered by condition. In addition, a draft Delivery and Servicing Management Plan has been submitted and whilst broadly acceptable, further details are required to be submitted by way of planning condition.

*Construction Traffic:*

8.7.29 A draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been provided with the application. The scale of the development requires the provision of a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) prepared in line with TfL guidance and which contains:

1. Introduction
2. Context, considerations and challenges
3. Construction programme and methodology
4. Vehicle routing and site access
5. Strategies to reduce impacts
6. Estimated vehicle movements
7. Implementing, monitoring and updating

8.7.30 The draft CTMP provided covers many of these areas and so is considered a good basis for a CLP which will be secured via planning condition.

*Conclusion of Transport Considerations*

8.7.31 With the mitigation identified and specifically the controls over access to the CPZ, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the surrounding highway network or significant increase on car parking demand in this location. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the local transport network, meeting policy requirements and, where necessary, providing appropriate mitigations. The development does not raise any issues which would be significantly prejudicial to highway safety or the free flow of traffic on the public highway and according to trip rate forecasts, will actually have a positive impact on the number of vehicle trips. The following elements will be required to either provide additional information, secured by condition and/or a financial contribution:

- Active Travel Zones local routes assessment;
- Car parking in the courtyard area for disabled visitors;
- Stage 1 road safety audit for proposed changes to access from Chase Road;
- Active travel and Healthy Streets improvements – level to be confirmed but in the region of £50,000 to £100,000 (including Sustainable Transport measures);
- Car Club bays on Park Road - £5,000;
- Car Parking Management Plan;
- Construction Logistics Plan;
- Delivery and Servicing Plan;
- Exemption from current and future controlled parking zones secured using S16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974;
- Sustainable travel incentives - £380 per unit maximum;
- S278 agreement or payment to Council to undertake access works on the public highway; and
- Travel Plan and related monitoring fee - £4,024.80.

## **8.8 Trees**

- 8.8.1 Policy DMD 80 requires all development that involves the loss of or harm to trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders or trees of significant amenity or biodiversity value, to be refused unless there are exceptional circumstances that can be justified.
- 8.8.2 Furthermore, Policy G7 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) requires existing trees of value to be retained, and any removal to be compensated by adequate replacement, based on the existing value of benefits. The Policy further sets out that planting of new trees, especially those with large canopies, should be included within development proposals. The Council's own emerging policy also recognises the benefits that trees offer to people and the environment by improving air quality, reducing noise pollution, contributing to climate change adaptation and reducing the urban heat island effect.
- 8.8.3 The application documents state that the Proposed Development will not involve the removal of any trees or affect trees on land adjacent to the proposed Site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. However, as the Site lies in close proximity to neighbouring trees a planning condition is recommended requiring an appropriate Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted detailing how nearby trees will be protected during construction and where appropriate operational stages.

### *Conclusion of Trees*

- 8.8.4 The proposal involves no loss of TPO trees or those having significant amenity or biodiversity value. Therefore, on the basis of an Arboricultural Method Statement being submitted, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to trees. It is also noted that tree planting is proposed as part of the development and as such there will be an improvement resulting from this gain in trees in terms of visual amenity and biodiversity benefits.

## 8.9 Water Resources, Flood Risk and Drainage

- 8.9.1 The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA) was introduced to address the increasing risk of flooding and water scarcity, which are predicted to increase with climate change. The act sets out requirements for the management of risks in connection with flooding and coastal erosion. Whilst the Environment Agency is responsible for developing a new national flood and coastal risk management strategy Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA), such as the London Borough of Enfield will have overall responsibility for development of a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for their area and for co-ordinating relevant bodies to manage local flood risks.
- 8.9.2 Policy DMD 59 and London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy SI 12 requires developments to ensure flood risk is minimised and mitigated and that residual risk is addressed. As the site is located within Flood Zone 1 the sequential test does not apply to the development.
- 8.9.3 Although the proposals involve a change of use from 'Less Vulnerable' (offices) to a 'More Vulnerable' (residential) occupation as set out in Flood Risk Table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance, given the designation of the site as Flood Zone 1, this is considered acceptable .
- 8.9.4 Meanwhile London Plan Policy 5.13 and London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy SI13 relate to sustainable drainage whereby the preference is to reduce surface water discharge from the site to greenfield run off rates.
- 8.9.5 The Council's draft Local Plan sets out the Borough's ambitions in relation to growth until 2036. Policy SUS5: Surface Water Management notes the following overarching aims in relation to drainage and floor risk:
- All major developments to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to enable a reduction in peak run-off to greenfield run-off rates for the 1 in 1 year and the 1 in 100-year event (plus climate change allowance);
  - All major developments to provide a sustainable drainage strategy that demonstrates how SuDS will be integrated to reduce peak flow volumes and rates in line with the requirements of this draft policy approach;
  - All other developments to maximize attenuation levels and achieve greenfield runoff rates where possible or increase the site's impermeable area;
  - Development to be designed to minimise flood risk and include surface water drainage measures to be designed and implemented where possible to help deliver other Local Plan policies such as those on biodiversity, amenity and recreation, water efficiency and quality, and safe environments for pedestrian and cyclists;
  - All new outdoor car parking areas and other hard standing surfaces be designed to be rainwater permeable with no run-off being directed into the sewer system, unless there are practical reasons for not doing so;
  - Living roofs to be incorporated into new development, to help contribute to reducing surface water run-off; and

- Where installed, SuDS measures be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development and details of their planned maintenance provided to the Council.

8.9.6 Supporting these principles is Development Management Document Policy DMD 61 which requires a drainage strategy to be produced that demonstrates the use of SuDS in line with the London Plan discharge hierarchy. The policy requires the use of SuDS to be maximised with consideration given to their suitability, achieving greenfield run off rates, the SuDS management train and to maximise the opportunity for improved water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value.

#### *Surface Water Flooding*

8.9.7 The nearest surface water feature to the Site is a culverted watercourse situated 165m to the north. As mentioned above the Site is located within a 'Flood Zone 1' area which represents land assessed as having a 'low risk' of fluvial or tidal flooding, of less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability (<0.1%). A very limited part of Chase Road is indicated to be at a 'low' risk of surface water flooding, whereby the annual probability is greater than 1 in 1000 but less than 1 in 100. A small area directly to the east (rear) of Solar House between the building and Chase Road is indicated to be at a 'medium' risk of flooding, with an annual probability of greater than 1 in 100 but less than 1 in 30.

8.9.8 Mapping published by the Environment Agency indicates that the Site is not located within an area potentially at risk from reservoir flooding, and the risk associated with flooding from sewers, and flooding from other sources (such as reservoirs and canals) is considered to be low especially given the topography of the site.

8.9.9 The Site is not located within an identified redevelopment area at risk of fluvial flooding and neither is it located within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA).

8.9.10 During intense rainfall ponding may occur to depths greater than 300mm adjacent to the basement at the rear of Solar House however the residential accommodation / pedestrian access to the Development will be located significantly above this level (at raised ground floor level and above) and therefore would not be impacted.

8.9.11 Overall, taking the above into consideration the risk to the proposed residential units associated with surface water flooding is considered to be low.

#### *SuDS Measures*

8.9.12 A Drainage Impact Assessment dated 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019, (prepared by Walsh) outlines that an assessment of suitable SuDS interventions found green/brown roofs, blue roofs, permeable paving, and below ground tanks as being suitable for implementation within development layouts, including provision within the scheme for trees and soft landscaping. In line with the London Plan discharge hierarchy the use of 'at source' SuDS, comprising green/brown roofs and permeable paving has been strongly promoted within the scheme within the landscaping layouts.



*Conclusion of Water Resources, Flood Risk and Drainage*

- 8.9.13 The current SuDS Strategy could be expanded to include more green infrastructure SuDS elements such as rain gardens and rain planters for roof areas that aren't being served by green roofs and as such a planning condition is recommended requiring details of these measures.
- 8.9.14 It is noted that the site may be subject to perched groundwater flooding and there have been a number of groundwater flooding incidents close to the site, which correlates to the interface of two geological typologies (London Clay and Dollis Hill Gravel). Due the scale of the proposed basement, it is important to understand if the basement will be subject to perched groundwater flooding, and if it has potential to cause groundwater flooding on adjacent sites. As such a further planning condition is required in order to ensure this is fully investigated and mitigation secured if necessary.
- 8.9.15 Subject to planning conditions requiring further information pertaining to an updated Groundwater Flood Risk Assessment (GW FRA); a final detailed Sustainable Drainage Strategy; a Verification Report demonstrating that the approved drainage / SuDS measures have been fully implemented, and a SuDS Green Infrastructure Plan, the proposal is considered compliant with the policies of the NPPF, London Plan and Enfield Local Plan in relation to flood risk and drainage.

**8.10 Environmental Considerations**

- 8.10.1 The NPPF maintains the presumption in favour of sustainable development, including environmental sustainability, and requires planning to support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate (Para.148). This entails assisting in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability, encouraging the reuse of existing resources and supporting renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure.
- 8.10.2 DMD 49 requires all new development to achieve the highest sustainable design and construction standards having regard to technical feasibility and economic viability. Meanwhile London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy G1 acknowledges the importance of London's network of green features in the built environment and advocates for them to be protected and enhanced. The Policy notes that green infrastructure 'should be planned, designed and managed in an integrated way to achieve multiple benefits. Also, of relevance is Policy G6 which requires developments to manage impacts on biodiversity and secure a net biodiversity gain.
- 8.10.3 Paragraph 150 of the NPPF requires new developments to 'be planned for in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts from climate change... and help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design'. The Council's Cabinet declared a state of climate emergency in July 2019 and committed to making the Authority carbon neutral by 2030 or sooner. Meanwhile the London Plan (Intend to Publish) and the Council's Regulation 18 Issues and Options Plan, each make reference to the need for development to limit its impact on climate change, whilst adapting to the consequences of environmental changes. Furthermore, the London Plan sets out its intention to lead the way in tackling climate change by moving towards a zero-carbon city by 2050.

*Energy and Sustainability*

- 8.10.4 Currently, all residential schemes are required to achieve net zero carbon with at least an on-site 35% reduction in carbon emissions beyond Part L of 2013 Building Regulations. The same target will be applied to nondomestic developments when the new London Plan is adopted.
- 8.10.5 The NPPF (Para.153) requires new developments to comply with local requirements for decentralised energy supply and minimise energy consumption by taking account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping and these objectives are reflected in DMD Policies 49-54.
- 8.10.6 Policy SI2 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) sets a target for all development to achieve net zero carbon, by reducing CO2 emissions by a minimum of 35% on-site, of which at least 10% should be achieved through energy efficiency measures for residential development (or 15% for commercial development). Meanwhile Policy DMD55 and paragraph 9.2.3 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) advocates that all available roof space should be used for solar photovoltaics.
- 8.10.7 An Energy Statement and Sustainable Design and Construction Statement have been prepared by Envision which provide an overview of the energy and sustainability strategies for the Proposed Development. The Energy Statement demonstrates how the proposal has sought to meet London Plan requirements and relevant Council policies.
- 8.10.8 In order to reduce the energy consumption of the development and to assist in achieving a compliant scheme, the Energy Statement states that the following design measures are recommended to be incorporated into the detailed design:
- Building fabric construction U-values significantly improved compared with standard Building Regulations U-values;
  - Reduced Air Permeability, lower than the standard required to meet the Building Regulations;
  - It is proposed that all residential units have space and water heating provided via connection to the Energetik Oakwood district heating network;
  - On-site efficient energy generation through the use of heat pumps and photovoltaics (PV) to non-domestic areas;
  - Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery (MVHR) to each dwelling;
  - Highly efficient LED lighting throughout; and
  - Reduction in solar gain through the use of lower g-values in the Proposed Development.
- 8.10.9 It is noted that in relation to the proposed measure 'On-site efficient energy generation through the use of heat pumps and photovoltaics (PV) to non-domestic areas' this option is acceptable, the Council would prefer for an alternative such as fan coil units to be investigated for the commercial element. These would feed from the District Energy Network (DEN) for heating and a local chiller system for cooling and, would remove further CO2 and NOx as the heating component would be provided via the DEN not via an electricity supply. The applicant is liaising with 'Energetik' in relation to linking the site to the DEN. Given the efficiencies that would result from this

alternative method, a planning condition requiring this to be fully explored and if feasible, be secured.

8.10.10 The Sustainable Design and Construction Statement indicates how the scheme will deliver a series of sustainability measures which are compatible with the GLA and Enfield's requirements. The measures include the following:

- A minimum of BREEAM Excellent for all commercial uses on site;
- An Energy Strategy which will achieve a circa 36% improvement beyond Part L (using SAP 10 emission factors) via on site savings;
- The intention to connect to the Oakwood Heat Network, run by Energetik delivering efficient space and water heating;
- Incorporation of climate adaptation measures, including green roofs, permeable paving, landscaping and passive building design including natural ventilation;
- An ecologically beneficial landscaping scheme, to deliver a net gain in biodiversity over the existing conditions at the Site;
- Water conservation measures within the units to comply with 80 litres per bed space per day; and
- Provision of new play space and public realm.

8.10.11 In terms of predicted carbon savings, the submitted Energy Strategy sets out that, in total the development would reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 88.57 tonnes.CO<sub>2</sub>.year, equal to a 35.25% saving beyond the Part L 2013 baseline (using SAP 10 emission factors). This carbon reduction would meet London Plan and Enfield policy requirements for major residential and non-residential developments

8.10.12 As the non-residential areas meet the 35% reduction target, only residential areas would be subject to the GLA and LBE carbon offset payment. In order to bring the residential carbon savings up to 100%, the applicant proposed to offset the remaining residential carbon emissions through a carbon offset payment in the Section 106 agreement. The calculation for the offset payment would be £232,506.00 based on the sum of £60 per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> per year (over 30 years). However, whilst the ambition to make a carbon offset payment was welcomed this would have had an impact on scheme viability and thereby, a direct bearing on the Affordable Housing provision. Recognising that DMD49 acknowledges scheme viability can be a consideration and giving weight to the emphasis placed on delivering affordable housing, it is recommended that this offset payment is not sought in the legal agreement in order to protect the Affordable Housing offer.

8.10.13 During the course of the application (pre and post-submission) the applicant has continued to work with the GLA's Energy Team to ensure the GLA are satisfied with the proposal in Energy terms.

#### *Ecology and Biodiversity*

8.10.14 The NPPF (Para.170) requires planning decisions to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value, providing net gains for biodiversity and establishing resilient ecological networks. This is consistent with the Council's adopted DMD policies 78 & 79 which seeks to ensure development minimises any impact on ecological assets and enhancement should be provided on site where possible.

- 8.10.15 Meanwhile London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy GG2 requires development to 'protect and enhance... designated nature conservation sites and local spaces and promote the creation of new infrastructure and urban greening, including aiming to secure net biodiversity gains where possible'. This guidance is also evident in London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy G6 which requires developments to manage impacts on biodiversity and secure a net biodiversity gain. Enfield Core Policy 36 requires development to protect, enhance, restore or add to existing biodiversity including green spaces and corridors, whilst draft Local Plan policy G14 refers to the need to promote qualitative enhancement of biodiversity sites and networks and encourage the greening of the Borough.
- 8.10.16 The Site comprises predominantly buildings and bare ground (hardstanding) with minimal trees and shrubs, and as such is considered to offer limited or negligible potential to support notable species due to the lack of suitable habitats. However once completed, it is considered that there would be greater potential to support species of ecological value, such as bird species and invertebrates, as a result of measures such as the proposed landscaping, including the provision of native plant species, a range of boxes for birds, lacewings and mason bees and wildflower planting and green roofs.
- 8.10.17 In order to ensure the development provides sufficient biodiversity and ecological enhancements, a condition requiring the submission of a Phase 1 Habitat Survey is recommended to confirm the likely presence or absence of protected and notable species from the Site and immediate surroundings.
- 8.10.18 On this basis, the proposed development is considered to comply with the requirements of policy with there being no significant adverse effects on ecology and biodiversity but with a potential positive environmental effect as a result of the proposed landscaping and ecological enhancements. This would also demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the NPPF (Para 170) and London Plan (Intend to Publish) Policy G6 for development to deliver biodiversity net-gain.

*Greenhouse Gases (GHG) and Climate Change*

- 8.10.19 The submission documents indicate a strategy based on i) adaptation, ii) resilience and iii) mitigating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The submitted SuDS Strategy (discussed further in the Flood Risk and Drainage section), is intended to demonstrate adaptation by being able to adapt to the predicted scenario of increased rainfall. Meanwhile submission documents attempt to show resilience to climate change predictions through the inclusion of measures such as drought resilient planting within the Landscape Strategy and a strategy to avoid the overheating of the buildings. Lastly the application seeks to illustrate the mitigation of greenhouse gases through the demolition, construction and operational phases.
- 8.10.20 In order to ensure the development complies with the above measures a planning condition is recommended requiring details as to how the strategy will be implemented, ensuring the development meets relevant standards in relation to sustainable design and construction. Subject to this and on the basis of the information submitted in the application, it is considered that no significant effects on GHG emissions and climate change will arise as a result of the proposal.

*Wind Microclimate Assessment*

- 8.10.21 The application documents include a Wind Microclimate Assessment, including a virtual wind tunnel test (undertaken through Computational Wind Engineering, CWE), prepared by WINDTECH Consultants, to quantitatively assess the effect of the proposal on pedestrian comfort levels in and around the site.
- 8.10.22 The assessment shows some change on the surrounding area where air flow will be accelerated and funnelled due to the inclusion of the proposed tall buildings, most notably to the south-west on Chase Road. Results for the winter season, identified as the worst-case scenario, showed greater effects on pedestrian comfort in and around the development at this point when compared to the existing conditions, however it is noted the increases did not constitute levels where there would be any safety effects on pedestrians.
- 8.10.23 The results of the study conclude therefore that the majority of areas will have suitable wind conditions for their intended public use however, certain locations will experience elevated wind flow and will require mitigation in the form of landscaping treatment to achieve the desired wind speed criteria for pedestrian comfort and/or safety.
- 8.10.24 The results overall indicate that there are no significant effects arising from the development but to ensure the necessary mitigation is implemented, a planning condition is required ensuring the development includes the inclusion of the following:
- Localised screening and/or landscaping at Level 0 Outdoor Space (Emergency Exit);
  - Retention/Inclusion of a 1.6 metre (m) high impermeable balustrade at the perimeter of the Level 2 Outdoor Space;
  - Inclusion of additional landscaping and 1.3 m high shrubs at Level 2 Outdoor Space; and
  - Retention of 1.3 m balustrades on all proposed balconies and inclusion of localised full height screening on the south-east facing elevated areas above Level 11 of the East tower.
- 8.10.25 Subject to this condition therefore, it is considered that no significant adverse wind effects would arise as a result of the development.

*Conclusion of Environmental Considerations*

- 8.10.26 The Proposed Development is considered to meet national, London and local policy requirements which seek to ensure developments protect and enhance the natural environment. As well as the measures outlined above, as noted elsewhere in this report the development will be car free which would mark a significant milestone towards addressing climate change by removing the opportunity for and subsequently reducing the reliance on private motor vehicles.
- 8.10.27 The proposals support London and local action plans to mitigate climate change, minimising its impacts and ensuring development is resilient to its effects. It employs strategies such as promoting sustainable travel, removing cars from the road, proposing efficient systems and energy consumption

reduction measures as well as enhancing and expanding the green infrastructure network. The design also seeks to account for the likely future extreme weather events such as higher temperatures and more rainfall as well as mitigating the effect that would have on future residents and the local and wider community. With the above taken into consideration, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of environmental considerations.

#### 8.11 Waste Storage

- 8.11.1 The NPPF refers to the importance of waste management and resource efficiency as an environmental objective. Policy SI7 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) encourages waste minimisation and waste prevention through the reuse of materials and using fewer resources whilst noting that applications referable to the Mayor should seek to promote circular economy outcomes and aim to achieve net zero-waste.
- 8.11.2 Furthermore, Core Policy 22 (Delivering Sustainable Waste Management) sets out that in all new developments, the Local Planning Authority will seek to encourage the inclusion of re-used and recycled materials and encourage on-site re-use and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste with DMD 64 stating that development will only be permitted if pollution or the risk of pollution, is prevented, reduced or mitigated.
- 8.11.3 The proposal would result in the alteration of current waste streams and volumes arising from the Site through both the construction and operational phases. Application documents note that construction materials and methods will seek to minimise waste generation as far as reasonably practicable, whilst waste generated during construction will be managed in accordance with best practice guidance, and such waste would be segregated, recycled and re-used wherever possible. Furthermore, all waste generated during construction will be collected and disposed by licensed waste management contractors.
- 8.11.4 In relation to the operation of the development, the application states that waste will be collected and disposed by licensed waste management contractors. To that end, adequately sized refuse stores are proposed within the blocks at ground level, with access to the stores proposed from street level along the access road.
- 8.11.5 On the basis that the development will seek to prevent and minimise waste generation as much as is feasible during both the construction and operational phase and use sustainable construction and waste disposal methods as much as possible in accordance with the Development Plan, it is considered that no significant adverse effects in respect to waste management would arise as a result of the Proposal. This is also subject to a planning condition requiring a Waste Strategy to be submitted and giving details of the frequency.

#### 8.12 Contaminated Land

- 8.12.1 Given the current use of the site, ground contamination is not considered to represent a significant risk but given the scale of the development, it is appropriate to investigate this matter. Therefore, a condition is required to

ensure this is investigated and any contamination that is identified is appropriately and safely dealt with.

8.12.2 Subject to appropriate condition/s being attached requiring a scheme to deal with contamination is submitted and approved, the development is considered acceptable in terms of contaminated land.

### 8.13 Air Quality / Pollution

8.13.1 London Plan Policies 3.2, 5.3 and 7.14 and London Plan Policy (Intend to Publish) S11 set out requirements relating to improving air quality. These Policies require development proposals to be at least Air Quality Neutral and use design solutions to prevent or minimise increased exposure to existing air pollution. Furthermore, the policies require developments to consider how they will reduce the detrimental impact to air quality during construction and seek to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings. Additionally, Policy DMD 65 requires development to have no adverse impact on air quality and states an ambition that improvements should be sought, where possible.

8.13.2 The NPPF (Para.103) also recognises that development proposals which directly address transport issues and promote sustainable means of travel can have a direct positive benefit on air quality and public health by reducing congestion and emissions.

8.13.3 Given the reduction in car traffic, proposed energy strategy and inclusion of electric car charging points, the proposal is considered unlikely to result in a negative environmental impact, including in relation to air quality .

8.13.4 The submission documents include an air quality report that demonstrates the future residents will not be exposed to poor air quality. The report contains an assessment of dust emissions during demolition/construction and proposes mitigation to control emissions during development. A condition will be required ensuring all of the measures proposed to control dust are fully implemented during site works. As London-wide is a low emission zone for non-road mobile machinery a condition is also required to ensure machinery complies with emission standards.

8.13.5 On the basis of the above and subject to recommended planning condition/s as outlined, the Proposal is considered to align with relevant policy and is acceptable in terms of Air Quality / Pollution.

### 8.14 Socio-economics Impact and Health

8.14.1 Based on the latest ONS statistics (2018) , the ward population for Southgate, is estimated to be 16,070. Within that ward population the economically active (in full time work, part time work, self-employed, full time students or unemployed) is 10,255 or 63.8% which is consistent with that for the wider Borough at 64%.

8.14.2 The proposed development will provide new homes and is expected to lead to increased local spending which will benefit the local economy.

8.14.3 Due to the change in use from office to a mixed use comprising residential with office and cafe use, there is a reduction in office floor area with an

associated change in employment levels. However, whilst there will be a reduction in office area to 1,720 sq.m including office hub / cafe, this should be viewed in the context of the existing Prior Approval permission on the site which, if implemented as an alternative to this development proposal, would result in all of the employment space being lost. However, the office space that will be re-provided will be more flexible and more capable of meeting the needs of the current office market. It is also noted the applicant is seeking to retain many of the existing occupiers by making available accommodation in nearby office accommodation which can be used for decant purposes during construction.

8.14.4 In addition there will also employment and training opportunities arising during the construction phases.

8.14.5 From a health perspective, the development provides high quality residential units and incorporates sufficient open space and private amenity spaces for the wellbeing and mental health of future occupiers.

8.14.5 Taking the above into consideration, overall it is considered that some positive environmental effects on socio-economics would arise as a result of the development. Furthermore, it is not considered there would be any significant effects on health occurring as a result of the development.

#### 8.15 Education

8.15.1 Policy S3 of the London Plan (Intend to Publish) seeks to ensure there is a sufficient supply of good quality education and childcare facilities to meet demand and notes that needs should be assessed locally and sub-regionally.

8.15.2 Meanwhile Local Plan Core Policy 8 sets out that the Council will contribute to improving the health, lives and prospects of children and young people by supporting and encouraging provision of appropriate public and private sector pre-school, school and community learning facilities to meet projected demand across the Borough.

8.15.3 The applicants have submitted information indicating the Development Child Yield will be 25 primary school age children, 9 secondary school age children, and 4 further / higher education age children.

8.15.4 Based on submitted information to the Department of Education (DoE), this has been carefully considered by Education and it is considered there would not be an issue with school places as a result of the development. Furthermore 2019 primary admissions data indicates there are surplus primary places in the Borough, including places in the local area.

8.15.5 Current data for the Borough indicates there are sufficient primary places across the borough (currently 6% over demand rising to 10% in 2022/23). Published School Capacity and Planning data (SCAP18) supports this and indicates there are surplus places at the borough level at present and for the next few years. However, whilst there is a projected shortfall of 38 places from 2022/23, this is expected to be managed through bulge classes in local provision if necessary .

8.15.6 On the basis of the above information, the proposal is considered to align with relevant policy guidance and would not place unacceptable pressure on



school places or give rise to unacceptable scenario in terms of education provision to existing or future residents.

## **9.0 Equality Statement**

- 9.1 London Plan Policy 3.1 and Policy GG1 of the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan highlight the diverse nature of London's population and underscore the importance of building inclusive communities to guarantee equal opportunities for all, through removing barriers to, and protecting and enhancing, facilities that meet the needs to specific groups and communities.
- 9.2 More generally, the 2010 Equality Act places a duty on public bodies, including the Council, in the exercise of their functions, to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This requirement includes removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic and taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it. The Act defines protected characteristics, which includes age, disability, gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation.

## **10.0 S106 Heads of Terms**

- 10.1 These are the Heads of Terms are proposed and includes the following monetary and non-monetary contributions:
- 1) Early and Late stage review mechanism
  - 2) Management and monitoring fee
  - 3) Employment and Skills Strategy
  - 4) Transport monetary contribution £50 to £100k
  - 5) Travel Plan and Sustainable Travel Plan
  - 6) Affordable housing – 35% (hab. rooms) with a breakdown of 49% (31 units) affordable rent and 51% (37 units) shared ownership
  - 7) Monetary contribution towards Public Realm improvements linked to separate TfL ('Holden') scheme
  - 8) Considerate Constructors Scheme
  - 9) Management Plan of commercial element
  - 10) Architect Retention Clause

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

- 11.1 Both Enfield CIL and the Mayor of London CIL will be payable on this development to support the development of appropriate infrastructure. A formal determination of the CIL liability will be made when a Liability Notice is issued should this application be approved but the following contributions have been identified:

---

**CIL Charge Breakdown**


---

## LBE

Gross Charge	£2,371,147.43
Less Social Housing Relief	£0.00
Less Other Relief	£0.00
Total Net Charge	£2,371,147.43

**12.0 Conclusion**

- 12.1 The proposed redevelopment of Southgate Office Village has been developed in the context of the relevant local, London and national planning policy. It will deliver 216 new homes and make an important contribution towards meeting both the Council's and the Mayor's annualised housing targets. Furthermore, the approach to height, densification and the re-provision of housing mean that 35% affordable housing can be delivered.
- 12.2 Although it is recognised the development represents substantial change for the Borough, and is close to residential properties and the Southgate Circus Conservation Area / listed heritage assets, the proposed site is a brownfield site in a highly sustainable location on the edge of Southgate District Centre and within close proximity of Southgate Underground Station. As a previously developed site which is currently underutilised, the development for housing is fully supported by policies for boosting the supply of homes including the NPPF (Para.59). It is also a location where densification would normally expect to be encouraged.
- 12.3 The Site is located north of Southgate District Centre and is closely linked to the Centre. The current offices provide employment which support the District Centre shops and service providers and the Proposed Development will continue that provision by re-providing vital office floorspace. The District Centre also provides shopping and employment opportunities for current and future employees and future residents of the scheme.
- 12.4 The Site has a good PTAL rating of 4, being situated in close proximity of Southgate Underground Station which provides access to the Piccadilly Line, linking the site to most areas within the City. In addition, the site and Southgate District Centre is served by a large number of bus services, with 7 bus routes providing a total of 33 services per hour. The well-connected Site aligns with Mayoral and emerging local ambitions of moving towards providing exemplary designed high density residential led developments in sustainable locations.
- 12.5 The Proposed Development is a design-led scheme which optimises development on the site and has been informed by the site's constraints and local character. Although involving substantial height, it has been designed to respond positively to and minimise and mitigate impact on nearby heritage assets including Southgate Underground Station, Southgate Conservation Area and Groveland's Park. Whilst a degree of harm is caused to heritage assets by the proposals, this is considered to be less than substantial harm and is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme in terms of the re-

provided employment space, new homes and new affordable homes as well as the delivery of new public realm.

- 12.6 Whilst concern has been raised by local residents in relation to loss of daylight / sunlight arising from the development as well as in terms of loss of outlook, privacy and overlooking, these are not considered to result in sufficient harm to render the scheme unacceptable.
- 12.7 The significant reduction of car parking, and provision of a new public realm, will vastly improve permeability throughout the site, in stark contrast to the existing situation. It will also result in a shift away from the private car and encourage active travel and the use of public transport in line with the Mayor's Transport Strategy for Healthy Streets. The proposed buildings and public realm will have a positive impact on the immediate locality and introduce a contemporary style of architecture to Southgate that also responds positively to and complements the existing vernacular.
- 12.8 Optimisation of development on the site has also considered the requirements for residential space standards, private external amenity, play space and creating mixed and inclusive communities through the provision of wheelchair accessible and adaptable units, public transport accessibility and movement, impact on residential amenity, townscape and character and the adequacy of existing social infrastructure.
- 12.9 Overall, while the proposals is not fully compliant with all policies, on balance, the proposal is considered to accord with the development plan as a whole, and as such it benefits from the statutory presumption in favour of the development plan as set out in section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This policy support for the proposal is further reinforced by its compliance with important other material planning considerations, such as the NPPF, the adopted London Plan and the London Plan (Intend to Publish).
- 12.10 With this in mind, the proposal is recommended for approval.

Appendix 1

*Photos of neighbouring properties*

**Property 1:** Hillside Grove, northern side



Fig.1: Front lounge, facing south



Fig.2: Rear dining room and amenity space, facing north

**Property 2:** Hillside Grove, southern side



Fig.3: Rear section of kitchen/lounge/diner, facing south



Fig.4: Facing south towards rear garden



**Property 3:** Hillside Grove, southern side



Fig.5: Rear kitchen/diner, facing south





Fig.6: Front lounge, facing north

**Property 4:** Mayfair Terrace, southern side



Fig. 7: Rear dining room, facing south



Fig.8: Rear garden, facing south

Appendix 2

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING PANEL  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 JANUARY 2020**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT**

Mahmut Aksanoglu, Chris Bond, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE and Jim Steven

**OFFICERS:**

Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Kevin Tohill (Strategic Development Manager) and Evie Learman (Principal Planning Officer) Jane Creer (Secretary)

**Also Attending:**

Applicant / Agent representatives:  
Viewpoint Estates – Applicant  
Simply Planning – Agent

Southgate Ward Councillors: Cllr Charith Gunawardena,  
Cllr Stephanos Ioannou, Cllr Derek Levy

Approximately 120 members of the public / interested parties

**1**

**OPENING / WELCOME**

1. Councillor Aksanoglu as Chair welcomed all attendees and introduced the Panel members.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to receive a briefing on the proposals for Southgate Office Village, to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the application, and for the applicants, officers and Panel members to listen to the reactions and comments. These views, and all the written representations made, would be taken into account when the application was determined by the Planning Committee (committee meeting hopefully to take place in March).
3. This panel was an important part of the consultation process. Notes would be taken, and they would be attached to the officers' report when the application came before the Planning Committee.
4. Officers from Enfield Council's Planning Department were present, as well as representatives of the applicants and agents.

**2**

**OFFICERS' SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING PROCESS / ISSUES**

Andy Higham (Enfield Council Head of Development Management) introduced the officers present and highlighted the following points:

1. This was not a decision-making meeting. A decision on the application would be made by the full Planning Committee. This meeting was part of the consultation process and the notes of this meeting would be appended to the report to Planning Committee so that all Members were aware of the comments and views put forward.
2. The application was for demolition of existing office buildings and erection of a mixed use office and residential scheme ranging from 2 to 17 storeys with a business café dual use, with associated access, basement car and cycle parking and energy centre, and landscaping and ancillary works.
3. When assessing an application, the Planning Authority had to consider it against the policy framework.
4. For this application, the key planning issues to consider included:
  - The principle of the quantum of development and mix of uses.
  - The rationale for the proposed height of the development.
  - The visual impact of the development on the wider area.
  - The viability of the scheme and its ability to support affordable housing and re-provide employment floorspace.
  - The relationship of the development to the adjacent Southgate district centre and neighbouring residential / commercial properties.
  - The potential effect of the development on the free flow and safety of vehicles using adjoining highways, parking and traffic generation.
  - The potential effect of the development on the setting and appearance of the Southgate Circus Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings and heritage assets.
  - The architectural and design quality of the proposed buildings.
  - The mix of residential housing and the level of affordable housing proposed.
5. The purpose of this meeting was to hear everyone's concerns, and to inform the Planning Committee.

### **3**

#### **PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT / AGENT**

Holly Mitchell, planning consultant, led the presentation and set out the proposals as follows:

1. The site was on the edge of Southgate centre and had excellent transport links and was close to shops. Housing development should be maximised on brownfield sites. There was a large demand for housing and supply was not keeping up. Enfield had not kept pace with its housing delivery target of 1246 homes per year – its current provision was 530 homes per year, so this needed to double. In particular there was a huge need for affordable housing.

2. It was acknowledged there was mixed public opinion about the proposal, and concern about the height. There was also acknowledged support from the communities who would welcome affordable housing provision.
3. The application was supported by a full suite of technical documents. These showed there were no overly negative impacts.
4. The site currently had planning approval for 82 residential homes and associated parking via conversion of the existing office village. This accommodation would not be the best quality and therefore this new scheme was explored to develop the site. It was a town centre site, close to retail property and spreading rapidly to residential. This scheme would retain mixed use, with commercial at the ground floor and residential above. It would be well connected and there would be improved permeability between the roads. The massing would be to the south of the site, and to the north it would step down.
5. In respect of the design, it was noted that Southgate had some remarkable architecture, including the Underground station. Use of materials in a contemporary way had been explored, and the stepping down of the buildings, and the colours.
6. A scheme was proposed in May 2019 to provide 200 homes and associated commercial space. Feedback was then received from Enfield Council and the public and developed for further resubmission in September 2019, with an increased quantum of affordable housing (now 35%) and reduced commercial space.
7. An objection was made from Historic England in respect of the impact of the tallest building from Groveland's Park, so the proposed height was reduced by 4m, and Historic England removed their objection at that point.
8. There had also been a reduction in the basement plan, and the amount of parking. In respect of the ground floor, the operators were keen for more flexible workspace to make it a vibrant destination for people to work locally. With regard to the residential accommodation, there had been a rigorous design process including the Greater London Authority (GLA). The accommodation would be high quality and most dwellings would be dual aspect, in line with the London Plan.
9. Computer generated images were shown in illustration, including the view from the station, and of the new public connection between the two roads.
10. It was noted there were two levels of planning across London and that this application would be submitted to Enfield Council as the local planning authority and then to the GLA who had given strategic planning advice and supported the principle. Any harm would be less than substantial and would be outweighed by the benefits. The Police, Fire Brigade, Traffic and Transportation Department, and Transport for London had no objections. The Enfield independent design panel supported the quantum of

development proposed. The public benefits would include the delivery of 67 new affordable homes, 149 new homes, office space to support the town, and a new pedestrian route and access across to the Marks and Spencer store. The scheme would also deliver a contribution of £820k for schools, GP surgery provision, etc. There would also be new jobs in construction.

11. The envisaged timeline was for determination by Planning Committee in late February / early March, then back to the GLA as it was a large scale application. If consent was granted, it was hoped to start work in the summer of 2020, with construction complete 2 years after that.
12. In conclusion, London has a housing crisis and this proposal would provide a number of new homes and affordable homes; and a new business centre and jobs. It was supported by the strategic planning authority. Additionally, there would be a contribution for local facilities in the community.

#### 4

#### QUESTIONS BY PANEL MEMBERS

NOTED the following questions and observations from Members of the Panel.

1. Q. It was questioned what was the next highest building in Southgate, relationship to the immediate area, and how the proposal picked up on designs in the existing architecture of Southgate? It would be important that points of detail should be subject to approval, such as unsightly lift over-runs. There was also no reference to communal aerials.  
A. It was acknowledged that the proposed development was a step change in height in Southgate and would be taller than anything else in Southgate town centre at the moment. However, South Point House was 7 storeys and Hobart Court was 10 storeys (residents interjected that Hobart Court was 5 storeys rather than 10).  
It was not only Southgate which was having to consider high rise development in a town centre: this was happening all over London. It was likely that all brownfield sites would need to be developed, and then greenfield sites considered as well. It was important to consider the scheme's economics and impacts. Such town centres were well served by public transport. The GLA was pushing for housing need to be met. Building design was subjective and that people would disagree with the design was respected. Originally, red brick had been considered for the scheme, but this was felt to merge into the roof profile too much. Grey brick was chosen so it would stand apart. The design panel had not supported the proposal to use red brick but had been very complimentary about the revisions to the scheme.  
There were no lift over-runs, but there were design features to break up the massing and the profile, so the scheme was not one dark mass that merged into the skyline.  
There should not be individual aerials. It was confirmed that a standard condition would be attached to any planning approval that there must be a communal system.

2. Q. Noting the position of the development on top of a hill, it was queried whether there had been testing around wind turbulence, over-shadowing, effect on local residents' tv signals, and reflected glare?

A. The proposals had been fully wind tested. There had been a full daylight, sunlight and overshadowing survey. TfL requirements in respect of glare would be met. It was acknowledged there had been no work in respect of tv interference.

## 5

### **OPEN SESSION - QUESTIONS AND VIEWS FROM THE FLOOR**

NOTED the following questions and comments from attendees.

1. Residents of Hillside Grove had concerns about the appearance from their rear gardens and the impact of the development on them, particularly on their privacy due to overlooking. From the new development there would be views directly into their kitchens and bedrooms. There would also be loss of daylight and sunlight, and problems of artificial light at night. They urged councillors to make a site visit to 41/47 Hillside Grove see the impact for themselves.

Response: The Head of Development Management advised that a member site visit would be arranged as part of the process, and the contact would be Kevin Tohill (Strategic Development Manager).

2. A resident highlighted the reaction of many attendees to the computer generated images and the strong negative feelings. The blocks high on the hill would be very visible. There was not a good record in Enfield of respect for surroundings in previous planning decisions. There was 2 storey artisan housing and school buildings next to this site. The development would be visible from Groveland's Park despite the illustrations shown which included the full tree canopy.
3. An attendee, and patient of the local mental health trust, raised that the mental health of people in the area should be taken into account when assessing this planning proposal. It had caused anxiety and there was emotional impact over what would be a massive change that would alter the face of Southgate forever.
4. On behalf of Southgate District Civic Trust, it was raised that the Government's national design guide had been launched last year, but these proposals did not meet its requirements. This important application should be considered carefully: it would be the most significant change to Southgate since the extension of the Piccadilly Line. Good design basic principles had not been followed. This design was contentious and did not relate to the site and its wider context. It did not respect the area's history or culture and would have a negative impact on the locality in its scale, form and appearance. The opportunity for a well-designed building, sensitive to the site, had been ignored. This development could be anywhere in the UK: it did not relate specifically to this site. It would not be valued as tomorrow's



heritage. There would be an environmental impact, and the loss of light had not been resolved. It had not been shown how the shadow was going to fall and the impact on those further down the hill, or the winter sunlight. The local community had been excluded from the design process. The developers were purely interested in the creation of income from the development. The proposal should be refused for poor design. There would be benefits, but these would be limited and not for the local community. He questioned the £820k contribution and how much would be Community Infrastructure Levy and how much Section 106, commenting that CIL was likely to go to supporting Meridian Water and not to the local area.

Response: In respect of overshadowing, privacy and overlooking the distance requirement in policy was 21m and in parts of London was 18m. The applicants had undertaken a full light report: all the work had been done and there was a plan of overshadowing. Daylight and sunlight had been assessed under BRE guidance and national guidelines in relation to reductions and retained daylight values in properties. There were recommended retained values in urban settings and the calculations throughout the area indicated that all properties would be BRE compliant. In Hillside Grove in accordance with the national guidelines of 18%, the daylight reductions would be no more than 17% and would not be noticeable. There would be no additional impact.

The view from Groveland's Park had been verified, including in winter. The proposed height had been reduced by 4m and where the top could previously have been seen from the park it now would not. English Heritage had withdrawn its objection on the basis of that work.

It was accepted that opinions on design were subjective, but the GLA agreed this was a well-designed scheme, and it was about provision of homes that were needed. It would be a Council decision where any CIL money was used, but the developer would pay the contribution they were asked to make.

5. On behalf of Civic Voice, it was advised they had organised an independently facilitated community view workshop regarding the proposals as there was concern there had not been adequate consultation or discussion given the importance of the site. An independent survey had shown that 45% of local residents had not known about the proposed development beforehand. 100 people attended the workshop. Developers should engage with local communities, but it was felt this had not happened in this case. The overwhelming view was that this would be overdevelopment, and that any proposal should retain Southgate's village feel and be in proportionate scale, and sensitive to the listed station. A height of 6 to 8 storeys would be more acceptable. Grant of this application would set an unwelcome precedent in the area. The proposal had little architectural merit and would be seen from miles around. The traffic assessment was considered unrealistic: there would be exacerbation of existing traffic congestion problems. Local GP services and schools would not cope with the increased population. The workshop findings had been

shared with Enfield Council, and had been included in their 2019 annual review shared with 250 civic societies across England and with the Government Minister.

6. On behalf of Enfield's Conservation Advisory Group, there was concern this was a developer-led proposal, and that changes to the borough should be set rather by Enfield Council. The Council had not yet concluded its new Local Plan: that document would lead on to defining which areas of the borough were suitable for accommodation of more people and for high rise development. As an attendee at the Enfield design panel, he disputed the appraisal of the proposal was as comfortable as made to appear in the applicant's presentation.

Response: The developer did undertake public consultation, however it was acknowledged that the right image had not been used on the front of documents. It was not a statutory requirement for the applicants to be at this meeting, but they had come to answer the residents' questions. They had to take into account the views of a lot of people, including in respect of economics, politics, and statutory consultees. Any proposal in London had to achieve viability and to deliver affordable housing that was required. This was the right sort of area to develop housing: such sites with low parking and close to public transport had to be brought forward. The Underground station must have also looked incongruous in Southgate at the time of its construction. It was acknowledged the general consensus was that the development would be too tall, but it could not be made viable at a lower level and deliver the housing requirements of the London Plan.

The local traffic situation would not be exacerbated. The current 140 parking spaces would be reduced to 23, which would be a positive change. There would be a reduction in traffic movements from the site as a result.

7. An attendee raised that the aesthetics and colour of the development were a great concern to residents, and they would like to see a proper coloured model to be able to make an assessment. Previous development, such as The Grange in High Street were cited as unsuitably coloured.
8. Concerns were expressed that once planning permission was obtained; the site would be flipped to a developer for financial gain.
9. A parent asked for more consideration of the children at the local toddler group who could be affected by fumes and traffic from the development.
10. A commuter questioned the effect on the viability of the Underground station which was already under pressure and getting busier every year.

Response: The GLA toolkit indicated 417 people would be housed in the development, with 63 children. This would not have a noticeable effect on the Underground. Transport for London did not have objections to the scheme.

11. The evidence base for tall buildings was questioned. Other sites in High Street and Chase Road had been identified as inappropriate for higher development so why should this site be appropriate.
12. The description as 'affordable housing' was seen as deceptive as it would be out of the reach of many local people.
13. It was questioned whether other major developments in the area had been taken into account, including at Cat Hill, Cockfosters Station, and East Barnet gas site. All these would affect the traffic, schools, etc.

Response: The impact on local services had been discussed with the Local Authority. Certain schools were more popular than others, but the Council did not have a shortage of school places in the borough.

14. The 17 storey tower had been focused on, but the heights of the second and third buildings were also queried.

Response: The three buildings were 8, 13 and 17 storeys.

15. An attendee remarked that the Underground station had made the area, but this development would destroy it, and he would like to know what the developers' profit was.
16. It was questioned whether the borough did in fact have a shortfall in housing, as there was an understanding it had a 5 year land supply. It was also questioned why planners felt that Southgate needed a new landmark.

Response: The Head of Development Management confirmed that the Council was required to demonstrate a 5 year land supply, but it was still not meeting targets, and that this was a live issue. He clarified the control able to be exercised by planners and highlighted the policy frameworks and the need for balance, and the challenges faced, particularly the targets for delivery of more housing.

17. Though residents' parking was minimal, it was raised that there would still be deliveries by road to the commercial and residential parts, which should be taken into account by the Highways Team. Traffic queues were a regular problem on Chase Road, and gridlock was likely.
18. Further comments were received that the development would be too dominant and too high, and out of character for Southgate, and that a precedent would be set if permission was granted. Also that the proposal was ugly and would be widely visible from the surrounding area.

## **6 QUESTIONS BY WARD COUNCILLORS**

NOTED the following statements and questions from Southgate Ward Councillors.

1. Councillor Derek Levy advised that he had been gathering representations made by constituents in respect of this application, and listening to their views. He emphasized that Southgate residents should benefit from any planning gain if planning permission was granted: as much CIL money as possible should be redeployed in Southgate ward.
2. Councillor Stephanos Ioannou advised that he had attended the public consultation but had considered it not a true representation of the proposal. The affordable housing issue was not a relevant argument to be made by the developers. The office village commercial estate was an asset to the area and offices were an important part of the locality. He understood the environmental targets and wish to reduce car parking spaces, but future residents could have cars and would park elsewhere. He understood there had been Fire Brigade objections originally. There were potential safeguarding issues around overlooking the school playground. The developers should show compassion for the character of Southgate.
3. Councillor Charith Gunawardena highlighted the median income of local households and that the deposits for this housing would be out of reach for most. There would be no homes available at social rents. There would be an influx of people from outside who would not contribute to the local economy. He questioned how many people locally would really benefit from this development.

#### Officer Responses:

It would be ensured that the proportion of affordable housing was met and that developer contributions went towards local needs. These issues would be covered within the officers' report to the Planning Committee.

Objections to the application were currently being collated and would be set out in the report. They were not visible on the online portal due to GDPR restrictions on data in the public domain.

Current rules allowed change from office to residential use under permitted development, by-passing Local Authority controls.

In respect of overlooking and safeguarding, there were many examples of schools in urban areas which were part of mixed development. There was no protected space as such, but the aim was to achieve a good balance.

#### Developer Responses:

There had been a full viability assessment, and the developer had to prove they were offering the maximum amount of affordable housing. A viable maximum had been offered at the beginning, and more affordable housing now being offered showed them at a loss.

There was a need for employment and there were also offices in this scheme. A scheme under permitted development to change the existing building to residential would result in a loss of all offices on site.

The viewpoint of the current office occupiers was being taken into consideration. A community was being built up to enable alternative office accommodation to be offered until they could move back into the new development if they wished to do so. If a permitted development scheme went ahead instead the alternative office offer would be lost.

The aim was to try to offer housing and jobs and to support the town centre. More details were available to read online.

## 7

### **CLOSE OF MEETING**

NOTED the closing points, including:

1. The Chair thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting. He hoped everyone had found it informative, and thanked residents for putting forward their views.
2. Notes taken at this meeting would be attached to the agenda when the application was presented to the Planning Committee for decision.
3. There was a deputation procedure whereby residents and involved parties could request to speak at the Planning Committee meeting. Ward councillors would also be entitled to speak on their behalf. For more details contact Democratic Services Team [democracy@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@enfield.gov.uk) or telephone 020 8132 1211.
4. Full details of the application were available to view and download from the Council's website (Application Ref. 19/01941/FUL) [https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/?\\_ga=2.11282544.598533514.1580123248-464521226.1539091048](https://planningandbuildingcontrol.enfield.gov.uk/online-applications/?_ga=2.11282544.598533514.1580123248-464521226.1539091048)



Planning Application only, not for construction purposes. This drawing is copyright of BPTW Ltd



**Notes:**  
Assumed site boundary based on Land Registry documents received 10.05.17 & Ordnance Survey. Client to confirm.

**Revisions:**

No.	Date	Revised By	Revised For

**Revisions:**

No.	Date	Revised By	Revised For

**Revisions:**


No.	Date	Revised By	Revised For

PLANNING ISSUE			
Date:	04/11/18	Client:	Venquest Estates LTD
Drawn:	AM	Project:	Bealings Office Design
Check:	PKB	Rev:	Proposed Floor Plan
Scale:	1:200	Sheet:	10-173
		Drawn:	AM

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9XA  
t 020 8093 5275  
www.bptw.com







**Notes:**  
Assumed site boundary based on Land Registry documents received 10.05.17 & Ordnance Survey. Client to confirm.

**Revisions:**

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

**Revisions:**



Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

**Revisions:**



Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	AC
A	30.08.2019	AC	PS

**PLANNING ISSUE**

Date: MAY 19	Client: Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn: AR	Project: Southgate Office Village
Check: PSo	Title: Proposed Second Floor Plan
Scale: 1 : 200	Revision: A







Notes:

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drwn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	
A	30.08.2019	AC	<i>PSO</i>

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drwn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	
A	30.08.2019	AC	<i>PSO</i>

PLANNING ISSUE			
Date:	MARCH 19	Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR	Project:	Southgate
Check:	PSO	Title:	Section AA
Scale:	1 : 200 @A2	Dwgno:	16-173
		D-23	Revision: A

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9QX  
t 020 8293 5175  
bptw.co.uk





FFL 120.730 m  
 ▼ Upper Parapet

FFL 118.780 m  
 Lower Parapet

FFL 117.305 m  
 ▼ Roof Level

FFL 113.905 m  
 ▼ 16-Sixteenth Floor

FFL 110.830 m  
 ▼ 15-Fifteenth Floor

FFL 107.755 m  
 ▼ 14-Fourteenth Floor

FFL 104.680 m  
 ▼ 13-Thirteenth Floor

FFL 101.605 m  
 ▼ 12-Twelfth Floor

FFL 98.530 m  
 ▼ 11-Eleventh Floor

FFL 95.455 m  
 ▼ 10-Tenth Floor

FFL 92.380 m  
 ▼ 09-Ninth Floor

FFL 89.305 m  
 ▼ 08-Eighth Floor

FFL 86.230 m  
 ▼ 07-Seventh Floor

FFL 83.155 m  
 ▼ 06-Sixth Floor

FFL 80.080 m  
 ▼ 05-Fifth Floor

FFL 77.005 m  
 ▼ 04-Fourth Floor

FFL 73.930 m  
 ▼ 03-Third Floor

FFL 70.855 m  
 ▼ 02-Second Floor

FFL 67.780 m  
 ▼ 01-First Floor

FFL 61.480 m  
 ▼ 00- Lower Ground Floor

FFL 58.100 m  
 ▼ Energy Centre



FFL 102.325 m  
 12-Twelfth Floor ▼

FFL 99.250 m  
 11-Eleventh Floor ▼

FFL 96.175 m  
 10-Tenth Floor ▼

FFL 93.100 m  
 09-Ninth Floor ▼

FFL 90.025 m  
 08-Eighth Floor ▼

FFL 86.950 m  
 07-Seventh Floor ▼

FFL 83.875 m  
 06-Sixth Floor ▼

FFL 80.800 m  
 05-Fifth Floor ▼



FFL 77.725 m  
 04-Fourth Floor ▼

FFL 74.650 m  
 03-Third Floor ▼

FFL 71.575 m  
 02-Second Floor ▼

FFL 68.500 m  
 01-First Floor ▼

FFL 64.500 m  
 00- Upper Ground Floor ▼



Notes:

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AC	LB
A	30.08.2019	LB	PS

PLANNING ISSUE	
Date:	MAY 2019
Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR
Project:	Southgate
Check:	PSO
Title:	Section CC
Scale:	1 : 200 @A1
Dwgno:	16-173
D-25	
Revision:	A



40 Norman Road,  
 Greenwich, London  
 SE10 9GX  
 t 020 8293 5175  
 bptw.co.uk







MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>CLADDINGS:</b>	<b>OPENINGS:</b>	<b>COMPONENTS:</b>	
1 - Buff brick - Mercedes brick (Wernerberger) Dove White mortar	9 - Residential window 1. Fixed panel. 910x2400 mm. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	22 - Residential canopy with signage. Dark grey metal cladding. RAL 7043.	
2 - Dark grey brick - Darwin Falls (James Mossman) Light Brown mortar	10 - Residential window 2. Fixed panel. 1810x2400 mm. Adjacent square panel. Upper panel operable. Dark grey panel - RAL 7043.	23 - Metal panel above commercial entrance with optional signage. Dark grey. RAL 7043.	
3 - Black green small tiles. RAL 6012	11 - Residential window 3. Fixed panel. 666x2450 mm. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	24 - Parapet to accessible podium. 1100mm in height. Brick with flat stone topper.	
4 - Stone fluting detail. Grey stone colour.	12 - Residential opening to balcony. Frame RAL 7043. Size refer to plans.	25 - Coping detail.	
5 - Thin header part of balcony element.	13 - Inset balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Size refer to plans.	26 - Lift overrun and roof access. Dark grey brick - Darwin Falls (James Mossman) Light brown mortar.	
6 - Thin stone header. 300mm	14 - Projecting balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Zigzag railing system. RAL 7043.		
7 - Dark grey panel. RAL 7043	15 - Commercial window. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.		
8 - Perforated metal panel. Panel to match balcony railings. Dark grey. RAL 7043.	16 - Residential entrance doors. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.		
	17 - Entrance doors to basement. RAL 7043.		
	18 - Commercial entrance doors. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.		
	19 - Single loured door to bin store. Dark grey. RAL 7043.		
	20 - Single door for fire escape. Size to be 1100mm clear opening. Frame dark grey. RAL 7043.		
	21 - Loured door for substation access. Size to be 3000mm clear opening. Dark grey. RAL 7043.		



Notes:

--

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	
A	11.09.2019	LB	

PLANNING ISSUE			
Date:	MAY 2019	Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR	Project:	Southgate Office Village
Check:	PSo	Title:	North Block - North Elevation
Scale:	1 : 200	@A1	Dwgno: 16-173 D-27
			Revision: A

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9QX  
t 020 8293 5175  
bptw.co.uk








- FFL 120.730 m  
▼ Upper Parapet
- FFL 118.780 m  
▼ Lower Parapet
- FFL 117.305 m  
▼ Roof Level
- FFL 113.905 m  
▼ 16-Sixteenth Floor
- FFL 110.830 m  
▼ 15-Fifteenth Floor
- FFL 107.755 m  
▼ 14-Fourteenth Floor
- FFL 104.680 m  
▼ 13-Thirteenth Floor
- FFL 101.605 m  
▼ 12-Twelfth Floor
- FFL 98.530 m  
▼ 11-Eleventh Floor
- FFL 95.455 m  
▼ 10-Tenth Floor
- FFL 92.380 m  
▼ 09-Ninth Floor
- FFL 89.305 m  
▼ 08-Eighth Floor
- FFL 86.230 m  
▼ 07-Seventh Floor
- FFL 83.155 m  
▼ 06-Sixth Floor
- FFL 80.080 m  
▼ 05-Fifth Floor
- FFL 77.005 m  
▼ 04-Fourth Floor
- FFL 73.930 m  
▼ 03-Third Floor
- FFL 70.855 m  
▼ 02-Second Floor
- FFL 67.780 m  
▼ 01-First Floor
- FFL 61.480 m  
▼ 00- Lower Ground Floor
- FFL 58.100 m  
▼ Energy Centre

- FFL 102.325 m  
12-Twelfth Floor ▼
- FFL 99.250 m  
11-Eleventh Floor ▼
- FFL 96.175 m  
10-Tenth Floor ▼
- FFL 93.100 m  
09-Ninth Floor ▼
- FFL 90.025 m  
08-Eighth Floor ▼
- FFL 86.950 m  
07-Seventh Floor ▼
- FFL 83.875 m  
06-Sixth Floor ▼
- FFL 80.800 m  
05-Fifth Floor ▼
- FFL 77.725 m  
04-Fourth Floor ▼
- FFL 74.650 m  
03-Third Floor ▼
- FFL 71.575 m  
02-Second Floor ▼
- FFL 68.500 m  
01-First Floor ▼
- FFL 64.500 m  
00- Upper Ground Floor ▼

MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS		OPENINGS:		COMPONENTS:																					
1 - Buff brick - Marzale brick (Wiemerberger)	2 - Dark grey brick - Darwin Falls (James Mossman)	3 - Black green small tiles - RAL 5012	4 - Stone fluting detail. Grey stone colour.	5 - Thin header part of balcony element.	6 - Thin stone header 300mm	7 - Dark grey panel - RAL 7043	8 - Perforated metal panel	9 - Residential window 1. Fixed panel. 910x2400 mm. Dove White mortar. Dark grey frame - RAL 7043.	10 - Residential window 2. Fixed panel. 1815x2400 mm. Adjacent opaque panel. Upper panel openable. Dark grey panel - RAL 7043.	11 - Residential window 3. Fixed panel. 685x2450 mm. Dark grey frame - RAL 7043.	12 - Residential opening to balcony. Frame RAL 7043. Size refer to plan.	13 - Inset balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Zigzag railing system. RAL 7043.	14 - Projecting balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Zigzag railing system. RAL 7043.	15 - Commercial window. Balcony edges to match stone header. Dark grey frame - RAL 7043.	16 - Residential entrance doors. Dark grey frame - RAL 7043.	17 - Entrance doors to basement. RAL 7043.	18 - Commercial entrance doors. Dark grey frame - RAL 7043.	19 - Single louvered door to bin store. Dark grey - RAL 7043.	20 - Single door for fire escape. Size to be 1100mm clear opening. Frame dark grey - RAL 7043.	21 - Louvered door for substation access. Size to be 3000mm clear opening. 1100mm in height. Dark grey - RAL 7043.	22 - Residential canopy with signage. Dark grey metal cladding - RAL 7043.	23 - Metal panel above commercial entrance with optional signage. Dark grey - RAL 7043.	24 - Parapet to accessible podium. 1100mm in height. Brick with flat stone topper.	25 - Coping detail. Aluminium coping to top of building. Minimum overhang - RAL 7043.	26 - Lit overcan and roof access. Dark grey brick - Darwin Falls (James Mossman) Light brown mortar.



Notes:

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	
A	30.08.2019	LB	

PLANNING ISSUE



Date:	MAY 2019	Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR	Project:	Southgate Office Village
Check:	PSo	Title:	South Block - North Elevation (Internal street)
Scale:	1 : 200 @A1	Dwgno:	16-173 D-29
		Revision:	A

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9QX  
t 020 8293 5175  
bptw.co.uk





MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS	
<b>CLADDINGS:</b>	<b>OPENINGS:</b>
1 - Buff brick - Merzale brick (Wernerberger)	9 - Residential window 1. Fixed panel. 910x2400 mm.
2 - Dove White mortar	10 - Residential window 2. Fixed panel. 1810x2400 mm.
3 - Dark grey brick - Danwin Falls (James Mossman)	11 - Residential window 3. Fixed panel. 685x2450 mm.
4 - Light Brown mortar	12 - Residential opening to balcony. Frame RAL 7043.
5 - Dark green small tiles - RAL 5012	13 - Inset balcony. Flat bar balustrade.
6 - Stone fluting detail. Grey stone colour.	14 - Projecting balcony. Flat bar balustrade.
7 - Thin header part of balcony element.	15 - Commercial window.
8 - Dark grey panel. RAL 7043	16 - Residential entrance doors.
9 - Perforated metal panel	17 - Entrance doors to basement. RAL 7043
10 - Panel to match balcony railings.	18 - Commercial entrance doors.
Dark grey - RAL 7043	19 - Single loured door to bin store.
	Dark grey - RAL 7043.
	20 - Single door for fire escape.
	21 - Loured door for substation access.
	22 - Residential canopy with signage.
	23 - Metal panel above commercial entrance with optional signage.
	24 - Parapet to accessible podium.
	25 - Coping detail.
	26 - Lift overrun and roof access.



Notes:

--

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	03.05.2019	AR	
A	11.09.2019	LB	

PLANNING ISSUE			
Date:	MAY 2019	Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR	Project:	Southgate Office Village
Check:	PSo	Title:	South Block - South Elevation
Scale:	1 : 200 @A1	Dwgno:	16-173 D-30
		Revision:	A

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9QX  
t 020 8293 5175  
bptw.co.uk







86.245 m  
▼ Upper Parapet

83.095 m  
▼ Lower Parapet

FFL 78.445 m  
▼ 04-Fourth Floor

FFL 75.295 m  
▼ 03-Third Floor

FFL 72.145 m  
▼ 02-Second Floor

FFL 68.995 m  
▼ 01-First Floor

FFL 64.500  
▼ 00 Ground floor

FFL 63.000 m  
▼ 00 Substation Access

93.625 m  
Upper Parapet ▼

91.800 m  
Lower Parapet ▼

FFL 86.950 m  
07-Seventh Floor ▼

FFL 83.875 m  
06-Sixth Floor ▼

FFL 80.800 m  
05-Fifth Floor ▼

FFL 77.725 m  
04-Fourth Floor ▼

FFL 74.650 m  
03-Third Floor ▼

FFL 71.575 m  
02-Second Floor ▼

FFL 68.500 m  
01-First Floor ▼

FFL 64.500 m  
00- Upper Ground Floor ▼

LONSTO HOUSE



NORTH BLOCK

CENTRAL STREET

SOUTH BLOCK

WHITE HART PUB

MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>CLADDINGS:</b>		<b>OPENINGS:</b>	
1 - Buff brick - Marziale brick (Wernesberger)	9 - Residential window 1. Fixed panel. 910x2400 mm. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	14 - Projecting balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Zigzag railing system. RAL 7043.	20 - Single door for fire escape. Size to be 1100mm clear opening. Frame dark grey. RAL 7043.
2 - Dark grey brick - Darwin Falls (James Mosman)	10 - Residential window 2. Fixed panel. 1810x2400 mm. Adjacent opaque panel. Upper panel openable. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	15 - Commercial window. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043. Size refer to plans and elevations.	21 - Louvered door for substation access. Size to be 3000mm clear opening. 1100mm in height. Dark grey. RAL 7043.
3 - Black green enamel tiles. RAL 6012.	11 - Residential window 3. Fixed panel. 685x2450 mm. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	16 - Residential entrance doors. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	22 - Residential canopy with signage. Dark grey metal cladding. RAL 7043.
4 - Stone listing detail. Grey stone colour.	12 - Residential opening to balcony. Frame RAL 7043. Size refer to plan.	17 - Entrance doors to basement. RAL 7043. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	23 - Metal panel above commercial entrance with optional signage. Dark grey. RAL 7043.
5 - Thin header part of balcony element.	13 - Inset balcony. Flat bar balustrade. Zigzag railing system. RAL 7043.	18 - Commercial entrance doors. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	24 - Parapet to accessible podium. 1100mm in height. Brick with flat stone topper.
6 - Thin stone header. 300mm.		19 - Single louvered door to bin store. Dark grey frame. RAL 7043.	25 - Coping detail. Aluminum coping to top of building. Minimum overhang. RAL 7043.
7 - Dark grey panel. RAL 7043.			26 - Lift overrun and roof access. Dark grey brick Darwin Falls (James Mosman). Light brown mortar.
8 - Perforated metal panel. Panel to match balcony railings. Dark grey. RAL 7043.			



Notes:

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd

Revisions:

Rev	Date	Drawn	Chkd
-	Planning Issue	03.05.2019	AR
A	Planning Updates - Commercial removed. Height reduced	11.09.2019	LB

PLANNING ISSUE			
Date:	MAY 2019	Client:	Viewpoint Estates LTD
Drawn:	AR	Project:	Southgate Office Village
Check:	PSo	Title:	Chase Road Elevation
Scale:	1 : 200 @A1	Dwgno:	16-173 D-31
		Revision:	A

40 Norman Road,  
Greenwich, London  
SE10 9QX  
t 020 8293 5175  
bptw.co.uk