

LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**PLANNING COMMITTEE****Date:** 5th September 2023**Report of**Director of Planning &
Growth - Brett Leahy**Contact Officers:**Lap Pan Chong
Sharon Davidson**Category**

Major

Ward

Upper Edmonton

Councillor Request

No


LOCATION: Former Public House , 50-56 Fore Street, Edmonton**APPLICATION NUMBER:** 20/01742/FUL

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of the site involving demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new development comprising a residential use (Class C3) with flexible community/commercial space at ground floor (Class A1/A3/A4/D1), creation of landscaping and associated works.

Applicant Name & Address:Social Capital Partners (Fore Street Ltd)
C/O agent**Agent Name & Address:**Mr Tom Sweetman
DP9
100 Pall Mall
London
SW1Y 5NQ**RECOMMENDATION:**

In light of the update information provided in this report:

1. That the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a s106 Agreement.
2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the s106 Agreement and the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of the original report dated 18 January 2022 and this report.



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. Note for Members:

1.1 This application was first considered by the Planning Committee on 26 October 2021. At this meeting Members identified three grounds of concern:

- i) the bulk, mass and height of the development relative to setting and appearance of the Fore Street Conservation Area which did not outweigh the public benefits of the scheme.
- ii) the residential mix and the number of 1- and 2-bedroom residential units as opposed to family units for which there is the greatest local need.
- iii) the height, bulk and design of the proposed development relative to the impact on the character and appearance of the area

1.2 As a result, it was agreed to defer making a decision to enable officers to prepare detailed reasons for refusal based on the aforementioned grounds.

1.3 Following this resolution, the Applicant responded to the concerns identified by Members with an offer to revise the planning application by:

- increasing the number of family units to 20% at London Affordable Rent (from 14 x 3b units to 22 x 3 bed units)
- decreasing the overall number of residential units from 113 to 110.

1.4 This new information was presented to Planning Committee on 23rd November 2021 alongside draft reasons for refusal contained in a Part 2 report. After consideration, Members confirmed there was merit in the proposed amendment warranting further assessment in an additional report to Planning Committee. As a result, the application was again deferred to enable the additional information to be assessed.

1.5 The application with the additional information was then considered at the Planning Committee on 18 January 2022, when Members having given weight to the revisions, resolved to refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

1. The proposal, by reason of its bulk, mass, height, and elevational design, would represent a form of development that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Fore Street Conservation Area and would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the non-designated heritage assets in the immediate vicinity of the site, namely the former Edmonton Country Court building and the former Phoenix public house (now LT Bar). This would result in less than substantial harm, to the Fore Street Conservation Area as well as harm to the non-designated assets which taking account of the need to consider the "sequential approach"; the 'at risk' status of the Conservation Area; the concept of cumulative harm; the requirement for 'great weight' to be given to this harm; and the requirement for 'clear and convincing justification' for any level of harm, would not be outweighed by the public benefits of delivering new residential accommodation including affordable residential accommodation having regard to housing need, the presumption in favour of approving sustainable development and the 'tilted balance'. The proposal is therefore contrary to the objectives of Section 66 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990; the sequential test as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021; Policies HC1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021; Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Core Strategy 2010; Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document 2014; and Objective 10 of the Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019.

2. The proposal, by reason of its siting, presence, height, bulk, appearance and design, is not well designed and would represent an insufficiently high quality, incongruous and overly dominant form of development that, having regard to housing need, the presumption in favor of approving sustainable development and the tilted balance, fails to satisfactorily integrate with its surroundings negatively impacting on the enjoyment, function and safety of surrounding spaces, detrimental to and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area which would not be outweighed by the public benefits of delivering new residential accommodation including affordable residential accommodation. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design objectives as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (in particular Section 12); Policies D3, D4 and D9 of the London Plan 2021; Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy 2010; Policy DMD37 and DMD 43 of the Development Management Document 2014.

1.6 Following the resolution of Planning Committee, the planning application was referred to the GLA for its Stage 2 consultation in accordance with statutory procedure.

1.7 The decision of the Mayor was made on 30th May 2022 and although it was confirmed that the Mayor was content to allow the local planning authority to determine the case itself, it did make a number of comments in support of the proposal. In particular, the Mayors Stage 2 response confirmed that the development would contribute to meeting the target of additional homes in London and the 100% London Affordable Rent offer would contribute towards meeting the affordable housing target with the GLA commenting:

“This refusal would therefore mean that new residential units, including affordable, which could contribute to meeting London’s housing need, would not be delivered and this would have an impact on the implementation of the London Plan. The units would also contribute towards the London Plan and Enfield’s affordable housing targets and respond to London’s acute need for low-cost rental housing. The Council in its committee report identifies that the Borough needs to optimise all options in terms of housing delivery, particularly on existing brownfield sites and transport hubs to meet its housing target.

The proposed development would therefore make a welcome contribution to housing and affordable housing. Borough officers have also assessed the application against Enfield’s recent housing performance, given that borough has been placed in the “presumption in favour of sustainable development category” by the Government through its Housing Delivery Test. The delivery of 110 affordable housing units would therefore have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, albeit to a limited degree due to the limited scale of the development.”

1.8 In respect of affordable housing and mix, the GLA also advised that:

a) Affordable Housing

The proposal has been revised to deliver all of the 110 residential units proposed at London Affordable Rent (LAR). Given the acute need for affordable housing within London and the preference for low-cost rent products due to the level of need for this type of tenure, the substantially improved affordable housing offer is strongly supported. Should the proposal be considered at appeal, or a future application submitted, key details including affordability levels and eligibility should be secured in line with the Mayor’s Affordable Housing and Viability SPG and London Plan Policy H6.

b) Unit mix

At Stage 1, officers raised no strategic concern with the proposed unit mix when considering the site location, PTAL and the density and form of the proposals. The provision of family-

sized units has been increased to 20% of units which is welcomed given the strategic need for family sized affordable accommodation. The Council's committee report states that although the proposed mix is significantly weighted towards 1- and 2-bedroom units which is not immediately consistent with local need for larger family accommodation, the proposed unit mix could be accepted on balance in the context of the location and the 100% LAR affordable housing offer. Accordingly, GLA officers remain supportive of the proposed mix.

c) Height

At Stage 1, the massing strategy was considered legible, however concerns were raised that the proposed tower appears bulky and top heavy, that the proposed materiality further emphasises the height of the tower and the applicant was advised to further refine the massing and materiality of the building to better complement the surrounding context. As set out in paragraph 17 of this report, the applicant has sought to address concerns raised during the application process. Significant changes to materials, a softened appearance with the inclusion of curved balconies and emphasised verticality through detailing throughout the tower and changes to fenestration are also welcomed changes in response to the surrounding context. The relocation of the main entrance and the removal of the colonnade also improve the appearance of the scheme from immediate views. GLA officers remain supportive of the massing strategy across the site. The terrace extension along Fore Street, the tallest element on the north-west corner and stepping down to relate to lower-rise homes to east, is a logical approach to the massing distribution. The revisions to the scheme have gone some way to mitigate the impacts raised at Stage 1, however, the bulk of the tower appears page 13 similar to the original proposal reviewed at Stage 1 when viewed from mid-range views, so concerns identified at consultation stage remain over the building's response to the local townscape in this respect. As addressed from paragraph 53 of this report, GLA officers consider that the heritage impacts of the proposed development could be acceptable on balance when weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

In summary, the proposed development is not in an area deemed in the development plan as suitable for tall buildings as required by London Plan Policy D9(B), and the proposal is not therefore fully compliant with Policy D9. However, in view of the broad compliance of the scheme against the criteria in Policy D9(C), GLA officers remain broadly supportive of the tall building in the proposed location. However, some concerns remain over building bulk and a revised fire statement would be required. Any required mitigation measures to ensure acceptable wind conditions should also be secured. Should the scheme be considered at appeal, or a revised application submitted, the outstanding matters identified as part of the above assessment in accordance with Policy D9(C) should be addressed and appropriate mitigation secured where necessary.

d) Heritage

Although the resulting harm to heritage assets would be contrary to London Plan Policy HC1, the NPPF heritage balance would also be triggered, and in accordance with the NPPF this harm would need to be able to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Since Stage 1, the proposal has been revised to include 110 affordable units at London Affordable Rent in addition to improvements to the design and appearance. Accordingly, the public benefits of the proposal have been increased since the consultation stage. GLA officers consider that the benefits of the proposal in this instance would outweigh the less than substantial harm, which would result to heritage assets, in accordance with paragraphs 202 and 203 of the NPPF.

- 1.9 Essentially while the Mayor does not object to the Council determining the application in accordance with its resolution, the Stage 2 response confirmed the GLA's support for the proposal on these key issues. This is an important consideration and is new information Members need to consider when deciding whether to reaffirm their previous resolution or

not as the comments will be presented against the Council's case by the Applicant in any appeal. However, it should be underlined that Members retain the right to refuse the application if so minded, for the reasons contained in Paragraph 1.5 of this report. notwithstanding the new information.

- 1.10 Notwithstanding the extant resolution made by Planning Committee, legal advice is that any new information material to the assessment of the application, should be considered prior to the final decision of the local planning authority being issued.
- 1.11 Mindful of this requirement, it is also considered that the current pressures on the Council to provide new homes and meet local housing needs has also changed and is this a further material consideration.

Housing Update

- 1.12 Since the last resolution of the Planning Committee, there remains a continued and increasing need for new homes especially those available to provide rented accommodation in the Borough. Recent economic trends have meant that the number of properties available to rent is declining. For the Council, this means there is an increased pressure on the Council to provide temporary accommodation for homeless persons with the Council having to resort to a costly reliance on hostels and B&B accommodation.
- 1.13 At present, there are around 3,121 households in temporary accommodation and 187 children in B&B/hotel accommodation which has increased since January 2022 when the matter was previously considered.
- 1.14 The Council's housing team have confirmed they continue to experience increased pressure for all different types and sizes of accommodation but there is an overarching need for affordable housing and particularly social rented units in response to the Boroughs housing need.
- 1.15 As of January 2023, there were 5000 households on the housing needs register. Whilst demand remains for family housing, the priority is for supply across all bedroom sizes. Including one and two bedroom units which would be more appropriate to be delivered in a tall building such as that proposed. Enfield has one of the highest numbers of homeless households in the country. Insecurity and unaffordability of private sector housing has evidence-based links with homelessness. One of the most common reasons for homelessness in London is currently due to the ending of an assured tenancy (often by buy to let landlords). Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (now called Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) (2018) data shows a significant increase in the number of households in Enfield using temporary accommodation – with a significant 67% increase between 2012 and 2018.
- 1.16 There are 703 households with a 1 bed need, of which 469 are homeless households. Additionally, 1beds help to support under occupiers in existing social rented properties to be released through downsizing, which creates chain links and makes larger existing properties available to address pressures on allocations for family housing. Furthermore, homeless demand is currently at crisis point fuelled by rising demand and collapse of available private sector properties, especially at the affordable end of the market. This impact is being felt across London and in other parts of the country.
- 1.17 Given the primacy of meeting housing need set out at all levels of planning policy and the tilted balance with the presumption in favour of approving sustainable development, it is considered this the current Borough circumstances represent a material change requiring assessment prior to any final decision being made.
- 1.18 In terms of the balance to be applied, the policy context within which the decision must be framed is important. The NPPF (Paragraph 125) is clear that where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, (as it is in this case), it is

especially important that planning decisions avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. Furthermore, the London Plan (2021) identifies a need for a minimum of 1,246 dwellings per year to be delivered over the next 10 years in the Borough, an increase over the previous target of 798 which the Council is not in a position to meet.

- 1.19 Enfield's Authority Monitoring Report 2020/2021 shows that during the preceding 10 years, the Borough had delivered a total of 5,616 homes which equates to approximately 562 homes per annum. Enfield's 2020 Housing Delivery Action Plan recognises that the construction of more affordable high-quality homes is a clear priority, with only 60% of approvals being implemented. A Local Housing Need Assessment (LHNA) was undertaken in 2020 and identifies an annual housing need of 1,744 homes across the Borough.
- 1.20 In 2016/17, 30% of housing completions were affordable, whilst in 2017/18 this decreased 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 not currently being met in the Borough. The Housing and Growth Strategy (2020) sets out an ambition to increase the target of 50% of new homes to be affordable housing in the next Local Plan. Enfield's Housing and Growth Strategy (2020) states the Borough's ambition to develop more homes that are genuinely affordable to local people, so more people can live in a home where they spend a more reasonable proportion of their household income on housing costs.
- 1.21 Enfield is in a category of "presumption in favour of sustainable development" having failed to meet a minimum 75% of its housing targets in the preceding three years – meaning homes that have received permission to be built are not being constructed and completed at a rate that delivers needed housing. In practical terms this is referred to as the "tilted balance" and the NPPF states that for decision-making this means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This also means that Development Plan policies carry lesser weight and applications for new homes are given greater or "tilted" weight. The level of weight given is a matter of planning judgement and the statutory test continues to apply, that the decision should be, as section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires, in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 1.22 It must be noted that the previous 100% London Affordable rent offer has now changed to 100% social rent. This remains acceptable and is welcomed by the Housing team as there is a need for this type of tenure in the borough. The rent levels will need to be equivalent to 60% of market rent (i.e., discount of 40%) and this will be secured through a s106 legal agreement. Moreover, the fact that the development would still provide 100% affordable rent (which the Applicant is committed to deliver) in the context of the current market and cost inflation which has affected the viability of many schemes, is a positive factor, which also needs to be considered in the overall balance before confirming a final decision.

Fire Safety

- 1.23 The GLA Stage 2 response made reference to the need for the development to provide a second staircase, in response to the direction of travel regarding fire safety in tall buildings over 30metres in height. This change required a second fire escape staircase to be incorporated within the design and the Applicants requested this be addressed prior to formal determination of the application. As a result, the core was shifted marginally to the right to ensure that both staircases would have access to the basement and a separated final escape was added. No external changes are proposed as part of the reconfiguration and the commercial frontage, refuse storage with collection point, cycle storage and servicing would be retained. The proposals have resulted in changes to the unit mix breakdown, which are discussed within the Housing Section of this report.
- 1.24 A neighbour re-consultation was not required due to the minor change to the scheme. However, following a re consultation with the statutory consultee, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), no objections were raised and the HSE is content with the fire safety design. It is recommended that a planning condition is included requiring compliance with the Fire Strategy to accord with London Plan Policy D12.

- 1.25 London Plan Policy D12 outlines that in the interests of fire safety and to ensure the safety of all building users, all development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety and ensure that they follow a set criterion. Part B of the policy outlines that all major development proposals should be submitted with a Fire Statement which is an independent fire strategy, produced by a third party, suitably qualified assessor.
- 1.26 It is considered the provision of the second staircase addresses the concern identified.
- 1.27 The revisions to accommodate a second staircase, however, have resulted in minor changes to the mix. Although, the overall breakdown within the mix has changed to incorporate increased 1b1p (15%) and 2b3p (52%), previously 0% and 25%, and reduced 1b2p (13%) and 2b4p (0%), previously 27% and 24%, this is considered acceptable as it would still maintain the previous split of unit sizes, which is deemed acceptable having regard to the tilted balance in favour of approving schemes for residential development. The Housing team also raise no concerns with the mix proposed.

Conclusion

- 1.28 The previous resolution of the Planning Committee is recognised, and Members retain the right to refuse the application, having considered the new information presented in this report. The relationship to the surrounding area and conservation area remains as previously reported and previously members considered the benefits of the proposal did not outweigh the harm to the surrounding area and the conservation area. Nevertheless, officers feel the comments of the GLA, the current housing circumstances and the need for new affordable homes are pertinent and mean that additional weight can be given in the planning balance, to these aforementioned considerations as outlined in this report when deciding whether to confirm a decision on this application.
- 1.29 As Members will be aware, there is an increasing demand for housing, and affordable housing within the Borough. Enfield has an extremely challenging 10-year housing delivery target accentuated by the low housing delivery over recent years – only 73% of that required being delivered with only 3.8 years of housing land supply identified as opposed to the required 5 years. In this context the provision of 110 homes all of which would be delivered at social rent, which is accessible to local residents, represents a significant contribution and weighs heavily in favour of the development despite the acknowledged concerns with the proposal. This is reflected in the comments of the GLA in their Stage 2 response which will be used by the Applicant in any appeal against a decision to refuse planning permission.
- 1.30 Mindful of the above, whilst taking into account both the housing need of the Borough together with the track record of delivery against target alongside changing circumstances, it is clear that the Council must seek to optimise development on brownfield sites such as this. The comments of the GLA in their Stage 2 response are pertinent in this respect. They advise that they consider this site to be an appropriate location for a tall building and that the public benefits outweigh the harm to the conservation area, must also be noted.
- 1.31 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is the development plan and the need to determine planning application in accordance with the development plan. It is clear this is a development in a sensitive location wherein the relationship to a number of heritage assets and the wider townscape needs to be carefully assessed in accordance with relevant legislation, guidance and policy.
- 1.32 Members have previously expressed concerns regarding the harm arising from the development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and the effect arising from the height of the development on the surrounding area. The matter to be considered therefore is whether the additional information in the form of the GLA comments and the current pressures for affordable rented accommodation as a public benefit, is sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area and the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

- 1.33 Designated heritage assets are listed as areas or assets of particular importance. In making this assessment of planning balance therefore, Members need to consider the advice on the weight to be given to harm to heritage assets in Paragraphs 9.81- 9.104 of this report. However, the application also has to be considered in the light of the Housing Delivery Test and the need for housing to meet the Council's strategic housing targets, triggering the tilted balance in any assessment and the presumption that planning permission should be granted unless "any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole" (Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF). Furthermore, Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, acknowledges that planning permission should be granted unless "the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed".
- 1.34 Having regard to the assessment in this report, it is concluded the development would cause 'less than substantial harm' to identified heritage assets.
- 1.35 Where there is 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the public benefits of the development include:
- i) 110 new residential homes
 - ii) 100% of the residential units being genuinely affordable and provided at social rent which Housing have confirmed meets an identified need

In addition, other public benefits of the proposal are considered to be:

- iii) replacement multi use commercial space
- iv) enhancement of Clive Avenue to address anti-social activity
- v) employment opportunities during construction
- vi) investment into Fore Street

It is considered that these public benefits especially the fact that the all the residential units would be affordable rent levels, outweigh the 'less than substantial harm' identified.

- 13.7 Consequently, it is considered the application of policies in the Framework which protect areas or assets of particular importance do not provide a clear reason for refusal. As mentioned above, Limb ii. of paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is therefore engaged, whereby planning permission should be granted unless "*any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole*".
- 1.38 It is acknowledged and as is recognised throughout this report and that previously considered that consideration of this proposal has involved finely balanced judgements. Compromises have been made in the consideration of the proposal in order to optimise the development potential of this highly sustainable brownfield site and thus contribute to the Boroughs challenging housing targets. It is recognised that sites such as this need to be optimised in order to contribute to housing delivery and minimise encroachment into the Borough's Green Belt and other protected designations.
- 1.39 It is also considered that the social benefits of the proposal carry significant weight in favour of the proposed development. Further economic and social benefits include employment during construction, as well as the continued and improved use of local services and facilities.

- 1.40 It is considered that the conflicts identified with other Development Plan policies, as identified in the analysis section of this report, would not on their own or cumulatively significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.
- 1.41 Having regard to the aforementioned comments, and the original reports presented to the Planning Committee on 18th January 2022, if so minded, it is considered Members could give more weight to the current housing circumstances, the need for additional homes and how the development would contribute to meeting this need, and the 100 units of affordable housing proposed and if so minded, resolve to grant planning permission subject to a S106 legal agreement and conditions.
- 1.42 This report should be read in conjunction with the report prepared for the Planning Committee on 18 January 2022 which is appended to this report.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject the completion of a s106 Agreement and the following conditions:
1. Standard 3-year time limit
 2. In accordance with approved plans.
 3. Construction Management Plan.
 4. Non road mobile machinery
 5. Details of Levels
 6. Contaminated land survey and remediation scheme
 7. Updated Flood Risk Assessment including flood evacuation plan
 8. Details of a sustainable urban drainage strategy.
 9. SuDS verification report.
 10. Details of surfacing materials.
 11. Detailed of external materials – samples on site.
 12. Site waste management plan.
 13. Details of boundary treatments.
 14. Details of a soft landscaping plan.
 15. Details of ecological enhancements.
 16. Details of the green roof.
 17. Details of external lighting.
 18. Details of the construction of access junctions and highway alterations.
 19. Energy statement – 40% carbon dioxide emission improvements

20. Submission of energy performance certificate
21. Submission of BREEAM accreditation (Excellent) – design and post occupancy stage
22. Cycle storage
23. Details of refuse storage facilities including facilities for the recycling of waste to be provided within the development.
24. Delivery and servicing plan.
25. The A4 unit or commercial unit hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the proposed extractor flues serving the unit in question (if required) and passing up through the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
26. No pipes or vents (including gas mains and boiler flues) shall be constructed on the external elevations unless they have first been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing.
27. The pub unit hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the acoustic performance of any plant and extracts and an appropriate scheme of noise mitigation has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning. These details should include a specification of flue extractors proposed including details of the odour emissions and sound emissions from the extractor.
28. Not less than 10% of residential units shall be constructed to wheelchair accessible requirements (Building Regulations M4(3)) and the remainder shall meet easily accessible/adaptable standards (Building Regulations M4(2)).
29. Notwithstanding the information provided in the Groundwater Technical Note 1945-A2S-XX-XX-TN-Y-0001-02 15/09/2021, the development shall not commence until a final Groundwater FRA has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
 - a) On site geological investigations demonstrating the depth of the water table with respect to the finished basement level. The groundwater monitoring should be conducted in winter to determine the higher groundwater levels
 - b) Determination of the groundwater flow directions as a result of the geological investigations
 - c) Specific mitigation measures to ensure the basement will be safe from flooding and will not increase flood risk elsewhere

REASON: To minimise flood risk in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy and Policies 5.12 of the London Plan, DMD Policy 62 and the NPPF

30. Notwithstanding the information provided in the SuDS Addendum 17/09/2021, the development shall not commence until a Sustainable Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be based on the disposal of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and should be in line with our DMD Policy SuDS Requirements:
 - i) Shall be designed to a 1 in 1 and 1 in 100-year storm event with the allowance for climate change, or Qbar

- ii) Provide source control for the majority of the site in the form of green roofs, rain gardens and permeable paving
- iii) Follow the London Plan Drainage Hierarchy and maximise the amount of infiltration and above ground storage before below ground storage is utilised
- iv) Should maximise opportunities for sustainable development, improve water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value
- v) The system must be designed to allow for flows that exceed the design capacity to be stored on site or conveyed off-site with minimum impact
- v) Clear ownership, management and maintenance arrangements must be established

The details submitted shall include levels, sizing, cross sections and specifications for all drainage features

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of water, minimise flood risk, minimise discharge of surface water outside of the curtilage of the property and ensure that the drainage system will remain functional throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy, DMD Policy 61, and Policies 5.12 & 5.13 of the London Plan and the NPPF and to maximise opportunities for sustainable development, improve water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value

31. Prior to occupation of the development, a Verification Report demonstrating that the approved drainage / SuDS measures have been fully implemented shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This report must include:
- Photographs of the completed sustainable drainage systems
 - Any relevant certificates from manufacturers/ suppliers of any drainage features
 - A confirmation statement of the above signed by the site manager or similar

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of water, minimise flood risk, minimise discharge of surface water outside of the curtilage of the property and ensure that the drainage system will remain functional throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy, DMD 61, and Policies 5.12 & 5.13 of the London Plan and the NPPF

- 32. Archaeology - Stage 1 written scheme of investigation
- 33. Opening hours of flexible commercial units
- 34. No roller shutters to be fixed to the external face of the building
- 35. Permitted development restrictions on use of flexible spaces.

LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 18th January 2022

Report of
Head of Planning
- Vincent Lacovara

Contact Officer:
Andy Higham
Eloise Kiernan

Ward:
Upper Edmonton

Ref: 20/01742/FUL

Category: Major Dwellings

LOCATION: 50-56 Fore Street, London, N18 2SS

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of the site involving demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new development comprising a residential use (Class C3) with flexible community/commercial space at ground floor (Class A1/A3/A4/D1), creation of landscaping and associated works.

Applicant Name & Address:

Social Capital Partners Fore Street Ltd
C/o agent

Agent Name & Address:

DP9
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the obligations set out in this report, the Head of Development Management/Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.

2. That the Head of Development Management/Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

1.0 Note for Members

- 1.1 At the meeting of Planning Committee on 26th October, Members were minded to refuse planning permission but resolved to defer making a final decision to enable officers to prepare detailed reasons for refusal based on the concerns identified at the meeting. The reasons to be brought back to a future Planning Committee for consideration.
- 1.2 During the discussion, Members identified three grounds of concern:
- i) the bulk, mass and height of the development relative to setting and appearance of the Fore Street Conservation Area which did not outweigh the public benefits of the scheme.
 - ii) the residential mix and the number of 1- and 2-bedroom residential units as opposed to family units for which there is the greatest local need.
 - iii) the height, bulk and design of the proposed development relative to the impact on the character and appearance of the area
- 1.3 Following the resolution of Planning Committee, the Applicant responded to the concerns identified by Members with the following offer to revise the current planning application:
- An increase in the number of family units to 20% at London Affordable Rent (from 14 x 3b units to 22 x 3 bed units)
 - A decrease in the number of units 113 to 110.
- 1.4 This new information was presented to Planning Committee on 23rd November alongside draft reasons for refusal contained in a Part 2 report. After consideration Members confirmed there was merit in the proposed amendment warranting further assessment in an additional report to Planning Committee. As a result, the application was again deferred to enable the additional information to be assessed.
- 1.5 This report on the proposed development has been updated to reflect the assessment of the additional information and Members are requested to consider the same in light of the offer to increase the percentage of family units to 20% and whether having regard to the presumption in favour of approving sustainable development and the tilted balance, this outweighs the concerns previously identified.
- 1.6 For clarification, this planning application is categorised as a “major” planning application and in accordance with the scheme of delegation, is required to be reported to Planning Committee for determination.

2.0 Executive Summary

- 2.1 The report seeks approval for the redevelopment of the site involving demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new development comprising a residential use (Class C3) with flexible community/commercial space at ground floor (Class A1/A3/A4/D1), creation of landscaping and associated works.
- 2.2 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is the development plan and the need to determine planning application in accordance with the development plan. It is clear this is a development in a sensitive location wherein the relationship to a number of heritage assets and

the wider townscape needs to be carefully assessed in accordance with relevant legislation, guidance and policy.

- 2.3 This application also has to be considered in the light of the Housing Delivery Test and the need for housing to meet the Council's strategic housing targets, triggering the tilted balance in any assessment and the presumption that planning permission should be granted unless:

“(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed (7); or

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”.

- 2.4 As identified, designated heritage assets are listed as areas or assets of particular importance and thus need careful consideration. In this connection and the assessment in this report, it is concluded the development would cause 'less than substantial harm' to identified heritage assets. Where there is 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the public benefits of the development include:

- i) 110 new residential homes
- ii) 100% of the residential units being genuinely affordable and provided at London Affordable Rent
- iii) an increase in the % of family homes to 20%
- iii) replacement of multi-use commercial space
- iv) enhancement of Clive Avenue to address anti-social activity
- v) employment opportunities during construction
- vi) investment into Fore Street

- 2.5 It is acknowledged that consideration of this proposal has involved finely balanced judgements. Compromises have been made in the consideration of the proposal in order to optimise the development potential of this highly sustainable brownfield site and thus contribute to the Boroughs challenging housing targets. It is recognised that sites such as this need to be optimised in order to contribute to much needed delivery of new homes and to minimise encroachment into the Borough's Green Belt and other protected designations.

- 2.6 It is also considered that the social benefits of the proposal carry significant weight in favour of the proposed development. Further economic and social benefits include employment during construction, as well as the continued and improved use of local services and facilities.

- 2.7 Overall it is considered the application proposes a high-quality residential development on existing underutilised, highly sustainable brownfield land. It is acknowledged that due to the quantum of homes proposed and the resultant extent of site coverage there are shortcomings to the proposal as identified in the analysis section of this report. However, it is also recognised that there is a pressing need for housing, including affordable housing within the Borough, and Enfield has an extremely challenging 10-year housing delivery target. In this context the provision of 110 homes all of which would be delivered at

London Affordable Rent represents a significant contribution and weighs heavily in favour of the development despite the acknowledged deficiencies with the proposal.

- 2.8 In conclusion, and giving weight to the need for development which provide new homes, it is concluded that the development for reasons set-out within this report, to broadly accords with the adopted policy framework as well as relevant emerging policy. Subject to the appropriate mitigations as set out within the recommended condition schedule, and within the Section 106 Agreement, the application is recommended for approval.

3. Recommendation

- 3.1 That conditional planning permission is GRANTED subject to the completion of a S106 planning agreement.

Conditions

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. In accordance with approved plans.
3. Construction Management Plan.
4. Non road mobile machinery
5. Details of Levels
6. Contaminated land survey and remediation scheme
7. Updated Flood Risk Assessment including flood evacuation plan
8. Details of a sustainable urban drainage strategy.
9. SuDS verification report.
10. Details of surfacing materials.
11. Detailed of external materials – samples on site.
12. Site waste management plan.
13. Details of boundary treatments.
14. Details of a soft landscaping plan.
15. Details of ecological enhancements.
16. Details of the green roof.
17. Details of external lighting.
18. Details of the construction of access junctions and highway alterations.

19. Energy statement – 40% carbon dioxide emission improvements
20. Submission of energy performance certificate
21. Submission of BREEAM accreditation (Excellent) – design and post occupancy stage
22. Cycle storage
23. Details of refuse storage facilities including facilities for the recycling of waste to be provided within the development.
24. Delivery and servicing plan.
25. The A4 unit or commercial unit hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the proposed extractor flues serving the unit in question (if required) and passing up through the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
26. No pipes or vents (including gas mains and boiler flues) shall be constructed on the external elevations unless they have first been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing.
27. The pub unit hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the acoustic performance of any plant and extracts and an appropriate scheme of noise mitigation has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning. These details should include a specification of flue extractors proposed including details of the odour emissions and sound emissions from the extractor.
28. Not less than 10% of residential units shall be constructed to wheelchair accessible requirements (Building Regulations M4(3)) and the remainder shall meet easily accessible/adaptable standards (Building Regulations M4(2)).
29. Notwithstanding the information provided in the Groundwater Technical Note 1945-A2S-XX-XX-TN-Y-0001-02 15/09/2021, the development shall not commence until a final Groundwater FRA has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
 - a) On site geological investigations demonstrating the depth of the water table with respect to the finished basement level. The groundwater monitoring should be conducted in winter to determine the higher groundwater levels
 - b) Determination of the groundwater flow directions as a result of the geological investigations
 - c) Specific mitigation measures to ensure the basement will be safe from flooding and will not increase flood risk elsewhere

REASON: To minimise flood risk in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy and Policies 5.12 of the London Plan, DMD Policy 62 and the NPPF

30. Notwithstanding the information provided in the SuDS Addendum 17/09/2021, the development shall not commence until a Sustainable Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be based on the disposal of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and should be in line with our DMD Policy SuDS Requirements:
- i) Shall be designed to a 1 in 1 and 1 in 100 year storm event with the allowance for climate change, or Qbar
 - ii) Provide source control for the majority of the site in the form of green roofs, rain gardens and permeable paving
 - iii) Follow the London Plan Drainage Hierarchy and maximise the amount of infiltration and above ground storage before below ground storage is utilised
 - iv) Should maximise opportunities for sustainable development, improve water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value
 - v) The system must be designed to allow for flows that exceed the design capacity to be stored on site or conveyed off-site with minimum impact
 - v) Clear ownership, management and maintenance arrangements must be established

The details submitted shall include levels, sizing, cross sections and specifications for all drainage features

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of water, minimise flood risk, minimise discharge of surface water outside of the curtilage of the property and ensure that the drainage system will remain functional throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy, DMD Policy 61, and Policies 5.12 & 5.13 of the London Plan and the NPPF and to maximise opportunities for sustainable development, improve water quality, biodiversity, local amenity and recreation value

31. Prior to occupation of the development, a Verification Report demonstrating that the approved drainage / SuDS measures have been fully implemented shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This report must include:
- Photographs of the completed sustainable drainage systems
 - Any relevant certificates from manufacturers/ suppliers of any drainage features
 - A confirmation statement of the above signed by the site manager or similar

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of water, minimise flood risk, minimise discharge of surface water outside of the curtilage of the property and ensure that the drainage system will remain functional throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy, DMD 61, and Policies 5.12 & 5.13 of the London Plan and the NPPF

32. Archaeology - Stage 1 written scheme of investigation

33. Opening hours of flexible commercial units


34. No roller shutters to be fixed to the external face of the building

35. Permitted development restrictions on use of flexible spaces.

3.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management/Planning Decisions Manager to finalise the wording of the s106 obligations and the conditions.

4.0 Site and Surroundings

4.1 The application site is situated on the south eastern corner of the junction of Fore Street with Claremont Street and Grove Street. The site which is currently occupied by the former Gilpin Bell Public House, is bounded by Fore Street, Claremont Street and Clive Road.



4.2 The site is situated within the Angel/ Edmonton district centre and is located at the southernmost end of Fore Street, a short distance from the Borough boundary with LB Haringey. It is also situated within the Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area

4.3 The public house comprises a 3 storey / part single storey building containing a public house on the ground floor with ancillary accommodation at the upper floor. The site is reasonably level with a rear yard serving as a parking area.

4.4 The surrounding area is mixed in character. Fore Street by its nature is predominantly commercial, although there are residential uses over the upper floors and there are various high rise residential developments dispersed around the area, the most prominent of which is the new Silverpoint (9-storeys) development which lies a short distance north of the site.

4.4 The site has a PTAL rating of 5, and has an area of approximately 2760sqm or 0.276ha.

4.5 The application site is not in a conservation area but is adjacent to the Fore Street Conservation Area. To the north on the opposite side of Claremont Street lies the LT Bar while diagonally opposite the site across Fore Street (on the corner of Grove Road), lies the former County Court building. Both of these are locally listed. The public house is identified as having a negative

impact on the setting of the Conservation Area in the adopted Fore Street Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

- 4.6 The site lies in Flood Zone 1.
- 4.7 The Site also sits opposite a petrol filling station. Proposals have previously been granted for the redevelopment of the site involving a 9 storey tower. Whilst the planning permission has expired, this indicates an acceptance of changes to the townscape in this locality.

5. Proposal

- 5.1. The planning application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing Public House and redevelopment to include the erection of a part 18, part 4 storey development to provide 110 residential units (Class C3) with 267 sq.m of flexible community/commercial space at ground floor (Class A1/A3/A4/D1) together with creation of amenity space, landscaping and associated works.
- 5.2 The development would provide 100% affordable housing all of which would be delivered at 100% London Affordable Rent. As a result, the proposal qualifies as a “ fast track” application in accordance with the requirements of Policy H5 of the adopted London Plan. No viability assessment is therefore required. The residential mix now comprises 30 x 1-bed, 58 x 2-bed, and 22 x 3+ bed units. Of these larger family sized units, 7 are 4 bed, 6 person houses and 5 are 3 bed 4 person houses. The previous mix was 35 x 1-bed, 65 x 2-bed, and 14 x 3+ bed.
- 5.3 The development would comprise of a tripartite facade to include part four and part 18 storeys with a defined plinth / base element to third floor to demarcate the entrances to serve both residential and commercial elements. This would give the impression of three sections, base, middle and crown. The building would incorporate art deco inspired detailing. It would be predominantly constructed of brickwork with the use of other materials such as zinc and aluminium to provide detailing and architectural relief. The flat roof design would incorporate 120 sq. m of intensive green roof and 224 sq. m of extensive green roof.
- 5.4 Residential access to the tower element would be from Claremont Street while the family houses would have direct access from both Claremont Street and Clive Road.
- 5.5 The development would also incorporate landscaped areas, private amenity space and child play space within the site. All units within the tower would have their own private amenity space served by balconies alongside access to the 542 sq.m of communal (courtyard) space, including 124 sq.m of child play space (0-4 years) at ground floor level and mezzanine level to the north at the junction with Fore Street and Claremont Street. The main courtyard area would comprise 340 sq.m of permeable paving, 150 sq.m of planted trees in natural soil and 28 sq.m of flower rich perennial planting.
- 5.6 The development would be car free and on-street servicing would be provided along Fore Street and Claremont Street. These areas would also be used for deliveries and refuse collection. There are four parking spaces to serve disabled users provided on Clive Avenue. Cycle storage facilities would be

provided both within the shared private amenity space, and within the first floor of the tower. Each terrace house would have its own private cycle storage to provide a total of 206 spaces. Furthermore, three additional on street cycle stands would be provided for visitors on Fore Street within close proximity to both main entrances.

- 5.6 The basement level would serve the emergency escape, plant room, generator, cold water storage and wet riser tank.
- 5.7 The originally submitted scheme was for 112 build to rent units with a 35% affordable housing at Discounted Market Rent.

6. Relevant Planning History

- 6.1. 18/00760/FUL - Redevelopment of site involving demolition of existing buildings to provide a part 2-part 9 storey block of 68 residential units comprising (30 x 1 bed, 26 x 2 bed and 12 x 3 bed) with balconies and terraces together with 2 commercial units (A1/A2 unit and A4 Public House unit) on the ground floor with car parking, landscaping and associated works – pending. This was granted at Planning Committee on 11 July 2018 subject to discussion with applicant regarding contributions to CCTV and Air Quality Monitoring, the Head of Development Management / Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and clearance of Section 106 Agreement by Chair, Vice-Chair and Opposition Lead
- 6.2 17/00815/FUL - Redevelopment of site involving demolition of existing buildings to provide a part 4-part 7 storey block of 58 residential units comprising (17 x 1 bed, 24 x 2 bed and 17 x 3 beds with balconies and terraces together with 2 commercial units (1X A1 or A2 unit and 1x A4 Public House unit) on the ground floor with car parking, landscaping and associated works. (Amended Description) – refused for the following reasons, and allowed on appeal:
 - 1. Notwithstanding the viability information provided, it is considered that the proposal fails to provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing for a development of this scale, contrary to policies 3.11 and 3.12 of the London Plan (2015), Policies CP3 and CP39 of the Core Strategy and DMD 1 and DMD 3 of the Development Management Document.
 - 2. The proposed development particularly due to high density, together with its architectural approach, bulk, scale, mass and design, would result in the introduction of an overly intensive form of development. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, to the adjacent listed buildings and the Fore Street Conservation area. The development fails to integrate satisfactorily with its surroundings and would result in the introduction of a visually prominent form of development out of keeping with the surrounding area. It is thus considered that the proposal fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area, contrary to Policies CP5 and CP30 of the Core Strategy, Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD10, DMD37 and DMD38 of the Development Management Document, London Plan Policies 3.4, 7.4 & 7.6 and the NPPF.

3. The proposed development would result in the generation of additional traffic and parking pressures on the local and strategic road network, adding to existing traffic and parking capacity issues. In this respect the development would be contrary to Policy 6.13 of the London Plan, CP 24 and CP30 of the Core Strategy and Policy DMD 45 and DMD 47 of the Development Management Document.
4. The proposed development due to lack of communal amenity space and children's on-site play space, taken together with the inclusion of winter gardens rather than balconies, due to the design constraints, would fail to provide sufficient and meaningful external amenity space, resulting in a poor quality living environment for future residents. The proposal would be contrary to CP30 of the Core Strategy (2010), 3.5, 3.6 of the London Plan (2015), the London Housing SPG and DMD 8 and DMD 9 of the Development Management Document (2014).

6.3 Within the Appeal Decision, the Inspector concluded the following:

- Whilst the proposed building would be prominent and large, it would not be overly large compared to the existing tall buildings within the vicinity, including the 8 storey Silverpoint development between Alpha Road and Cowper Road. The architectural design would also make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area
- The development would be significantly taller than nearby historic buildings, including the two locally listed buildings and would add to the enclosure of the southernmost part of the conservation area. The heritage assets would be more hemmed in by tall modern development which would add to the sense of an isolated remnant of historic development along Fore Street. However, this harm would be tempered by the separation provided by width of Claremont Street and the variation in heights and materials provided by the development. Views into the conservation area along Fore Street to the south would not be greatly impeded and the prominence of the County Court and no. 58 would remain. Furthermore, the extent and scale of existing modern development in the vicinity of the most southernmost part of the conservation area and the two local listed buildings means that the introduction of an additional tall building would not be particularly out of keeping. Therefore, the harm to significance would be less than substantial and no greater than moderate.
- From the evidence submitted, the provision of 12 affordable units would be the maximum reasonable amount in this instance. The proposed split of tenure between social rent and shared ownership falls within the percentages within the Core Strategy, DMD and London Plan and thus is deemed acceptable.
- Based on the site-specific circumstances and the proposed mitigation measures, it was concluded that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on transport and parking.
- The proposed development does not include any communal external space; however, each duplex house and a number of flats would meet or exceed the private amenity space requirements as set out in policy DMD9 for dwellings without access to communal space. The urban district centre location makes it difficult to accommodate any meaningful provision of communal space on site. Furthermore, the

applicant has offered a contribution of £25,000 towards amenity space provision within the vicinity of the site. This could be targeted towards an appropriate site such as Florence Hayes Adventure Playground. The contribution would be necessary, directly related and fair and reasonable in scale and kind. Notwithstanding the lack of on-site communal space, the balconies and terraces proposed for each unit would provide a meaningful amount of private external space and a generous amount for some flats on the 4th to 6th floors. The use of winter gardens would be necessary for flats on the inside corner of the development at the rear to ensure privacy between adjoining flats. Para 2.4.15 allows of the DMD allows for such types of external space. It was concluded that they would provide a reasonable amount of private space for this development and would be in addition to the provision of balconies for those specific flats. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the living conditions of future occupiers in terms of the provision of private and communal external space.

7. Consultations

Pre Application Engagement

7.1 As part of the pre application process, the Applicant was encouraged to engage with the local community about their proposals. This was undertaken through on line engagement promoted through the distribution of flyers and social media to communicate the proposed development to the residents and the wider community was organised. The consultation organised by the Applicant saw 1,006 people visit the website and 53 people filled in the online survey.

7.2 The key findings were:

- 70% either agreed or were neutral that the development would improve the quality of rental accommodation in the area;
- 62% agreed, are neutral or undecided with the plans being car-free;
- 72% said that landscaping and efforts to minimise the environmental impact of new housing was important to them;
- Those who were surveyed were split 50/50 when asked if they thought the proposed height was appropriate for the area. 49% of respondents saying the height was not appropriate and 51% of respondents agreed that height was appropriate or remained neutral or undecided.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Internal

7.3 Traffic and Transportation

No objection in principle to the development in terms of it being car free and the potential impact on the surrounding highway network subject to appropriate conditions, s106 legal agreement and a S278 agreement for highway works.

Highway Services have advised that:

- As stated in CLP, “The temporary construction crossover extension and parking bay suspensions will require a traffic management order.” Developer is required to get in contact with HDCrossovers@enfield.gov.uk to apply for the Heavy Duty Crossover extension. We can also guide the developer with parking bay suspensions as required.
- There are major road works planned to commence in early September on Fore Street junction with Claremont Street. Works are permitted for 3-4 Weeks, during these works developer to avoid use of Fore Street route for their deliveries as much as possible.
- Construction Traffic restricted hours to be between 09:30hrs to 15:30hrs.
- Regarding covered walkway and gantry level, this would have to be looked in a greater detail by highway officer and NRSWA team.
- Please advise developer to provide photographic condition survey of the public roads and footway leading to the site including Clive Avenue.

7.4 SuDS Officer

Having received additional information on Groundwater Flood Risk Assessment and the Drainage Strategy, no objection is raised subject to conditions.

7.5 Environmental Health

No objections, subject to conditions relating to as there is unlikely to be a negative environmental impact. However, conditions are recommended with respect to construction dust, contamination, sound insulation, acoustic report, and non-road mobile machinery.

External

7.6 Metropolitan Police -Designing out Crime Officer

Conditions are requested requiring the developer to submit additional details demonstrating further detail on how the building will be designed to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.

7.7 Transport for London

No objections and comments are summarised as follows:

- A revised trip generation assessment should be provided and agreed with TfL. The applicant should update the assessment using relevant TRICS data from the past five years, with 4 or 5 examples for each use type (affordable housing, market housing, and commercial). The trip generation should be split out by mode, line, station and direction of travel.
- The applicant should work with Enfield Council to expand the Controlled Parking Zone.

- Cycle parking should be redesigned to ensure easy access for all people and for a variety of cycles. Cargo cycle parking should be provided in the public realm to enable active freight. Additional spaces should be provided to meet the minimum standards set out in the Intend to Publish London Plan.
- The Delivery and Servicing Plan should be amended to show how active freight will be encouraged and enabled.
- A full Construction Logistics Plan should be secured by condition

7.8 Greater London Authority

In principle, there is support for the scheme which delivers 110 residential units at 100% LAR. However, a number of points are highlighted

Principle of development

The redevelopment of the site within an opportunity area and district town centre to provide a residential-led mixed use development is strongly supported. The applicant is required to demonstrate that the proposal would suitably secure re-provision of the public house

Housing

The scheme has been amended to include 100% affordable housing with funding provided by the GLA.

Urban design and heritage

The proposed layout and massing strategy is legible; however, the proposed bulk and materials could be further refined. (This has been picked up in more recent revisions). There would be less than substantial harm to heritage asset, which could be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, namely the provision of affordable housing units and public realm improvements that collectively could be a catalyst for the regeneration of the district centre. An amended fire statement should be submitted.

Transport

The applicant should submit a revised trip generation assessment. The applicant should work with Enfield Council to expand the Controlled Parking Zone. Additional cycle parking is required to meet the minimum standards. Cycle parking should be redesigned to meet LCDS standards and provide space for cargo bikes. A revised Delivery and Servicing Plan is required to demonstrate inclusion of active freight. A Construction Logistics Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan should be secured by condition or Section 106 agreement, as appropriate.

Sustainable development

Further information is required in respect of energy, water, and urban greening matters.

7.9 Haringey Council

An objection is raised due to the effect of the development in terms of its height, on the setting of the nearby Conservation Area within the Borough of Haringey

7.10 Thames Water

No objections in regard to wastewater network and sewerage treatment works subject to conditions for piling method statement and source protection strategy, alongside informatives.

7.11 Historic England (Archaeology)

No objections subject to conditions for Stage 1 written scheme of Investigation (WSI),

7.12 CAMRA

No comments received.

7.13 London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority

The London Fire Brigade commented that the fire safety approach for the scheme is satisfactory and the dry risers proposed on each floor of the building will be discussed further during the consultation on the building regulation submission.

7.14 Enfield Disablement Association

No comments received

7.15 NHS London – Health Urban Development Unit

No comments received

7.16 Historic England

No comments received

7.17 Design Review Panel

7.17.1 The conclusions from the March 2019 DRP are as follows:

- The principle of developing a distinctive corner at the junction of Fore Street and Claremont Street is supported. This is an opportunity to reference elements of the area's historic character in the detailed design.
- The developer's business model, based on working with local authorities to provide homes that are suitable for local area needs, is novel and potentially ground-breaking. It could play a valuable role in enabling the regeneration of Snell's and Joyce estates by providing decanting opportunities.
- As Fore Street and Angel Edmonton start to undergo extensive change through development the proposed development on this key site will play an important role in setting the standard of development for the wider area and must be of a high quality.

- A comprehensive study of Fore Street and the wider area led by the Council is required to help understand the capacity for growth and how it can be accommodated into the townscape.
- There is a need to further justify the approach to height through contextual analysis and improved design quality. Consideration needs to be given to the requirements of Policy 7.7 of the London Plan on the location and design of tall and large buildings.
- there is a need for great articulation for example, making better use of recessed balconies
- the significant proportion of dual aspect dwellings on the north and east blocks is welcomed, as is the wide, generous deck access overlooking a landscaped, communal amenity space.
- The principle of providing commercial frontages onto the high street is supported. This could include a retained updated licensed establishment and/or community facilities. It will be important to create outlets that fulfil a number of purposes in order that they will be active each day and not just on occasions when Tottenham Hotspur are playing at home.
- The ground floor uses should be prominently marked using appropriately dimensioned floor to ceiling heights, potentially to mezzanine level.
- The development should contribute to the improvement of the surrounding public realm. Clive Avenue could be converted into a home zone or play street and the access to businesses improved through improvements to street surfaces and use of street furniture and public art.
- The determination of height needs to be framed by a contextual analysis of the townscape and heritage impact and the new context emerging from proposed developments in the vicinity. Design development should incorporate these factors to provide the justification for a tall building when assessed against lower height alternatives.
- A significant and distinctive building may be appropriate to provide a 'marker' at the end of the high street; however, the main townscape objective should be to help knit the street and surrounding areas together.
- There is concern at the single aspect apartments serviced off these internal corridors, particularly those facing north west on to the traffic of Fore Street and which feel somewhat disconnected from the rest of the community. The design team is encouraged to investigate introducing deck access on this block as an option to both increase the amenity of the circulation space and the potential for more dual aspect apartments.
- The high proportion of dual aspect dwellings in the north and east blocks is welcomed. Relocating the balconies within the taller element of the building, which are currently north-facing, to the corners of the apartments would enable a dual aspect balcony to be achieved.
- Overall the approach could be articulated further to become more successful - more inset balconies and less of a monolithic appearance would help soften the overall appearance of the building.

7.17.2 In response to these and Urban Design / Heritage comments, the emerging scheme was developed whilst seeking to maintain viability and optimise the delivery of new homes in the is sustainable town centre location.

7.17.3 In October 2021, the scheme was considered again by the DRP. They comment that:

- The design of the tower has improved since the previous review, having a more elegant form but is still bulky and would benefit from further improvement;
- The panel agrees the building is too tall, out of scale for the context and damages the heritage of the area;
- Overall the proposal is overdevelopment. This results in an incongruous height and massing which is not appropriate for the context. Fundamentally the design does not represent a bespoke response or relate to the character of the conservation area; both in terms of the materiality and also the vertical, on the street design of the tower, which is more appropriate for a city centre location than an outer London Borough town centre on a linear route.
- The proposal will set a precedent for height along the east side of Fore Street that undermines the height strategy being promoted at Joyce and Snell's (across the street) and in the Council's emerging local plan.
- The inclusion of the townhouse typology is welcome. These relate well to the low-rise context and are high quality.
- The colonnade is not supported as there are potential practical issues around secure by design as well as the design not integrating with the character of the street.
- The proposals are balanced between a need for affordable housing in the Borough and the need for high quality design that works with the local context and heritage. The panel's comments are focused on the design aspects of the scheme and are intended to add to the information that the LPA is considering in the determination process.
- Reference was made to the scale and massing of surrounding buildings (particularly Silverpoint, 8 storeys and the two towers in Haringey, 22 and 20 storeys) as an argument for a building of substantial height in this area. The panel disagrees and argues that Silverpoint in particular is detrimental to the area and is already overbearing on the high street. The nearby towers in Haringey do not provide any useful urban design context and should not be used as a justification.
- Whilst the site sits within the formally designated town centre it is on the very edge of the designated area. Experientially the site sits at the edge of the town centre. A tall 'marker' building is not appropriate in this location as it is too distant from the core of the centre and transport hubs.
- Locating the tower right on the corner of the site with a strong vertical emphasis detracts from the horizontal and linear kinetic experience of travelling along Fore Street.
- The heritage assets nearby already function as a gateway to the town centre and, due to its scale, the new tower would undermine this function.
- In order to address these issues, the design team is encouraged to explore an option in which the tower is set back from the street and the 3-4 storey plinth is continued to the street corner. Edmonton County Court and Lt's Bar, two landmark buildings mentioned in the conservation area appraisal, will be detrimentally affected by the proposed development because of its height, scale and proximity.

- The colonnade is not working to tie the building into the conservation area and is more appropriate for a city centre location.
- The use of materials does not suggest a bespoke response to either the heritage assets nearby, the setting of the conservation area or the local palette of materials.
- Overall the quality of architectural detailing and material has seen improvement since the previous review.

Public

Neighbours

- 7.17 In respect of the consultation on the scheme as originally submitted (Build to Rent), letters were sent to 1219 neighbouring and nearby properties. In addition, site notices were displayed directly outside and in the vicinity of the site while notice was also published in the local newspaper.
- 7.18 In response, 7 letters of objection were received which raised all or some of the following points:
- Close to adjoining properties;
 - Increase in traffic;
 - Increase of pollution;
 - Loss of parking;
 - Conflict with Local Plan;
 - Loss of privacy to many neighbouring properties;
 - Loss of light to many neighbouring properties;
 - Noise nuisance;
 - Out of keeping with character of area;
 - Over development;
 - Strain on existing community facilities-already lacking in adequate open spaces;
 - Affects local ecology;
 - Development too high;
 - More open space needed on development;
 - Limited greenery and open spaces within the local area
- 7.19 In addition, we have received several more detailed contributions from local residents which are set out here:
- Several buildings within the local area are referenced within the supporting documents, two of which, (the tallest) are in neighbouring Haringey, as evidence of a wide variety of heights in the area - this is supposed to be support for the height of their 18-storey plan. The majority of the structures cited have been the subject of regeneration talk for many years - those specific buildings are not deemed as having a positive visual impact; their form is not something to be replicated. Amongst the lowest of the buildings cited is Prowse Court at 8 stories which was a re-development of the Highmead Estate in Angel Edmonton, whereas the current application is for the demolition of a structure that is in keeping with the scale of its surrounding buildings. The proposed development is out of scale and overbearing;

- The position of the site means that the proposed development will loom over the public street and road, dwarfing everything around it, including trees and pedestrians, and casting a long shadow. In some of their mocked-up photos, the natural shadow of the existing building can be seen and gives an indication of the shadow that would be thrown by this development. The imposing height has no sympathy for the value of human scale and the relationship of a community to its surrounding buildings;
- This building will be a landmark feature. Positioned as it is on a key corner at the entry to Angel, Edmonton, it will set the tone for the neighbourhood and any hopes for future well designed builds. If the intention is to reflect the tone of a neighbourhood already struggling, then its materials, ugliness and height fit the bill;
- A car-free development is not going to mean a reduction in traffic. People will still have cars and will use them. This is already a very high-volume traffic area and even the slightest increase in traffic will be detrimental to the community and the environment and put added pressure on the roads. The increase in traffic as a result of this development will not be slight;
- Car-free developments might be desirable for an area in theory (although only three disabled car parks - what happens when a long-term resident becomes disabled and all spaces are claimed?) but people will still have cars. This is a large development. It will be a nuisance for residential roads and disruptive for existing residents as they compete for car park space and endure an influx of cars circling for spaces, adding even more noise and pollution to an area already struggling with that. The inadequacy of appropriate car park facilities will have a significant impact on the area.
- Good design enhances communities; the visual environment has a psychological effect. The development will do nothing to enhance this particular urban environment which desperately needs an attentive design eye and a sympathy for humanly scaled buildings. The materials of the building are not in keeping with the surrounding buildings and the height of the building only serves to emphasise that. It cannot be claimed that its dominating, visual impact on the view of pedestrians, passing motorists and residents will be a positive one. The development does nothing to draw upon the positives of the surrounding buildings but expressly seeks out the negative; The lack of parking will not only impact on Claremont Street, Ingleton Road and the surrounding roads where parking is often difficult; It will also negatively impact local residents and the activities of the church, but also the businesses in Fore Street where customers park and also use the Edmonton County Court.
- Easy access to public parkland will be very important for the health and wellbeing of future residents of the development, especially as the development is high density housing in a built-up area with limited access to suitably sized outdoor space. However, the application says the residents will be able to access Pymmes Park, which is a 14-minute walk away and is located on the other side of the north circular, so is unlikely to be frequently used. The application also mentions Florence Hayes Recreation Ground as a space for residents - my understanding is that Florence Hayes Recreation Ground was closed approx. 4 years ago due to the grounds not being safe and the large play equipment had to be removed. The grounds were also used by

gangs as a meeting point and drug paraphernalia was found on the grounds. The space is not opened to the public so cannot be included as open space for future residents.

- About 11% of the units would be 3 bed + vs. a policy requirement of 60% and the SHMA 2015 assessed need of 50%, therefore, the proposal does not sufficiently address local needs (e.g. help to reduce overcrowding);
- Some units appear to be under the Gross Internal Floor Area standards - it appears the applicant may be adding the balcony areas to the measurements in some cases, which shouldn't be included in internal floor space calculations;
- Rebuilding on The Gilpin will be a great loss to the areas history and heritage assets. It will damage the historical corridors of Edmonton. This is also the boundaries of Tottenham & Edmonton. Where Edmonton ends with its historical corridor and Tottenham begins with its historical corridor;
- There are already huge problems with prostitution, begging and drug dealing within this area
- The development will further drain the existing local resources such as schools, health care, policing etc, which are already saturated.

8. Relevant Planning Policies

8.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out national planning policy objectives. It introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is identified as having three dimensions - an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. Other key relevant policy objectives are referred to as appropriate in this report

8.2 London Plan 2021

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:

- GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities
- GG2 Making the best use of land
- GG3 Creating a healthy city
- GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need
- GG5 Growing a good economy
- GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience
- D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
- D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities
- D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- D7 Accessible housing
- D8 Public realm
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12 Fire safety

D14	Noise
HC6	Supporting the night-time economy
HC7	Protecting public houses
G5	Urban greening
G6	Biodiversity and access to nature
G7	Trees and woodlands
SI 1	Improving air quality
SI 2	Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
SI 3	Energy infrastructure
SI 4	Managing heat risk
SI 5	Water infrastructure
SI 8	Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
SI 12	Flood risk management
SI 13	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
T6.1	Residential parking
T6.5	Non-residential disabled persons parking
T7	Deliveries, servicing and construction
T9	Funding transport infrastructure through planning
DF1	Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations
M1	Monitoring

8.3 Local Plan - Overview

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 policies 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 and the London Plan, 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.

8.4 Core Strategy (2010)

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.

CP2	Housing Supply and Locations for New Homes
CP3	Affordable Housing
CP4	Housing Quality
CP5	Housing Types
CP9	Supporting community cohesion
CP11	Recreation, leisure, culture and arts
CP20	Sustainable energy use and energy infrastructure

CP21	Delivering sustainable water supply, drainage and sewerage infrastructure
CP24	The road network
CP26	Public transport
CP25	Pedestrians and cyclists
CP28	Managing flood risk
CP30	Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment
CP31	Built and Landscape Heritage
CP32	Pollution
CP46	Infrastructure Contribution

8.5 Development Management Document (2014)

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. 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
DMD16	Provision of New Community Facilities
DMD17	Protection of Community Facilities
DMD27	Palmers Green District Centre
DMD30	Floorspace above Commercial Premises
DMD32	Managing the Impact of Food & Drink Establishments
DMD34	Evening Economy
DMD37	Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development
DMD44	Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets
DMD45	Parking Standards and Layout
DMD47	New Roads, Access and Servicing
DMD48	Transport Assessments
DMD49	Sustainable Design and Construction Statements
DMD50	Environmental Assessment Methods
DMD51	Energy Efficiency Standards
DMD53	Low and Zero Carbon Technology
DMD55	Use of Roof Space
DMD56	Heating and Cooling
DMD58	Water Efficiency
DMD59	Avoiding and Reducing Flood Risk
DMD60	Assessing Flood Risk
DMD61	Managing Surface Water
DMD62	Flood Control and Mitigation Measures
DMD64	Pollution Control and Assessment
DMD65	Air Quality
DMD66	Land Contamination
DMD68	Noise
DMD69	Light Pollution
DMD70	Water Quality

DMD73	Children's Play Space
DMD79	Ecological Enhancements
DMD80	Trees on Development Sites
DMD81	Landscaping

8.6 Enfield Draft Local Plan

8.6.1 Work on a New Enfield Local Plan has commenced so the Council can proactively plan for appropriate sustainable growth, in line with the Mayor of London's "good growth" agenda, up to 2041. The Enfield New Local Plan will establish the planning framework that can take the Council beyond projected levels of growth alongside key infrastructure investment.

8.6.2 The Council consulted on Enfield Towards a New Local Plan 2036 "Issues and Options" (Regulation 18) (December 2018) in 2018/19. This document represented a direction of travel and the draft policies within it will be shaped through feedback from key stakeholders. Nevertheless, it is worth noting the growth strategy identifies New Southgate and Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area as a potential option for a key location for growth. The draft Local Plan states that the Council will work with the Mayor to bring forward the OAPF.

8.6.3 The Council consulted on a draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) during the summer of 2021. The draft Local Plan includes site allocations and a number of place based policies, with a particular focus on growth areas such as Meridian Water. It is anticipated that following this consultation a final draft plan (Regulation 19) will be published in 2022, with submission to the Secretary of State for examination in public anticipated during 2023 and adoption in 2023/24.

8.6.4 As the emerging Local Plan progresses through the plan-making process the draft policies within it will gain increasing weight but at this stage it has relatively little weight in the decision-making process.

8.6.5 Key emerging policies from the plan are listed below:

- Policy DM SE2 – Sustainable design and construction
- Policy DM SE4 – Reducing energy demand
- Policy DM SE5 – Greenhouse gas emissions and low carbon energy supply
- Policy DM SE7 – Climate change adaptation and managing heat risk
- Policy DM SE8 – Managing flood risk
- Policy DM SE10 – Sustainable drainage systems
- Strategic Policy SPBG3 – Biodiversity net gain, rewilding and offsetting
- Policy DM BG8 – Urban greening and biophilic principles
- Policy DM DE1 – Delivering a well-designed, high-quality and resilient environment
- Policy DM DE2 – Design process and design review panel
- Policy DM DE7 – Creating liveable, inclusive and quality public realm
- Policy DM DE10: Conserving and enhancing heritage assets
- Policy DM DE11 – Landscape design
- Policy DM DE13 – Housing standards and design
- Policy DM H2 – Affordable housing
- Policy DM H3 – Housing mix and type
- Policy DM T2 – Making active travel the natural choice
- Strategic Policy SP D1 – Securing contributions to mitigate the impact of development

8.7 Other relevant policy and guidance

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2019
Enfield Climate Action Plan (2020)
Enfield Intermediate Housing Policy (2020)
Enfield Decentralised Energy Network Technical Specification SPD (2015)
TfL London Cycle Design Standards (2014)
GLA: Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012)
GLA: Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG (2014)
GLA: London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014)
GLA: Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (2014)
GLA: Housing SPG (2016)
GLA: Affordable Housing & Viability SPG (2017)
Healthy Streets for London (2017)
Manual for Streets 1 & 2, Inclusive Mobility (2005)
National Design Guide (2019)
Fore Street Angel Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015)

8.8 Housing Delivery Test and Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

8.8.1 The National Planning Policy Framework sets out at Para 11 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means:

“(c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to date development plan without delay; or
(d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date (7), granting permission unless:
(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed (6); or
(ii) any adverse impacts of so doing would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

8.8.2 Footnote (7) referenced here advises “This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73); or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous 3 years.”

8.8.3 The Council’s recent housing delivery has been below our increasing housing targets. This has translated into the Council being required to prepare a Housing Action Plan in 2019 and more recently being placed in the “presumption in favour of sustainable development category” by the Government through its Housing Delivery Test.

8.8.4 The Housing Delivery Test (HDT) is an annual measurement of housing delivery introduced by the government through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It measures the performance of local authorities by comparing the completion of net additional homes in the previous three years to the housing targets adopted by local authorities for that period.

- 8.8.5 Local authorities that fail to meet 95% of their housing targets need to prepare a Housing Action Plan to assess the causes of under delivery and identify actions to increase delivery in future years. Local authorities failing to meet 85% of their housing targets are required to add 20% to their five-year supply of deliverable housing sites targets by moving forward that 20% from later stages of the Local Plan period. Local authorities failing to meet 75% of their housing targets in the preceding 3 years are placed in a category of “presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 8.8.6 In 2018, Enfield met 85% of its housing targets delivering 2,003 homes against a target of 2,355 homes over the preceding three years (2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18). In 2019 we met 77% of the 2,394 homes target for the three-year period delivering 1,839 homes. In 2020 Enfield delivered 56% of the 2,328 homes target and we now fall into the “presumption in favour of sustainable development” category.
- 8.8.7 This is referred to as the “tilted balance” and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that for decision-taking this means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole – which also includes the Development Plan. However, where a development having regard to the policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, causes harm, this can provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed
- 8.8.8 Under the NPPF paragraph 11(d) the most important development plan policies for the application are deemed to be ‘out of date’. However, the fact that a policy is considered out of date does not mean it can be disregarded, but it means that less weight can be applied to it, and applications for new homes should be considered with more weight (tilted) by planning committee. The level of weight given is a matter of planning judgement and the statutory test continues to apply, that the decision should be, as section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires, in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

9. Analysis

- 9.1. This report sets out an analysis of the issues that arise from the proposals in the light of adopted strategic and local planning policies. The main issues are considered as follows:
- Principle of Development
 - Housing (including affordable and tenure mix)
 - Impact on Character of Area (Tall Building & design)
 - Impact on Setting and Appearance of Conservation Area
 - Internal Layout / Residential Quality
 - Impact on Neighbouring amenity
 - Transportation (Parking, Access and Servicing)
 - Sustainable Construction
 - Landscaping, biodiversity and trees
 - Environmental considerations

Principle of Development (Land Use)

- 9.2. 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. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.
- 9.3 The Development Plan includes local policies (Core Strategy / Development Management Plan) as well as the London Plan (2021) and national guidance. The London Plan policies will have greater weight where they are inconsistent with local policy given its more recent adoption in March 2021.
- 9.4 Running alongside the presumption that proposal in accord with the development should be approved, is the aim that planning should facilitate sustainable development. This is at the heart of the NPPF which advocates a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In particular, at paragraph 118 the NPPF advocates the promotion and support for the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially 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.
- 9.5 Such an approach to maximise the efficient use of land, is consistent with the adopted London Plan which states at Para 1.2.2 of the London Plan
- “The key to achieving this will be taking a rounded approach to the way neighbourhoods operate, making them work not only more space-efficiently but also better for the people who use them. This will mean creating places of higher density in appropriate locations to get more out of limited land, encouraging a mix of land uses, and co-locating different uses to provide communities with a wider range of services and amenities.”*
- 9.6 Para 1.1.4 of the London Plan also states:
- “Delivering good quality, affordable homes, better public transport connectivity, accessible and welcoming public space, a range of workspaces in accessible locations, built forms that work with local heritage and identity, and social, physical and environmental infrastructure that meets London’s diverse needs is essential if London is to maintain and develop strong and inclusive communities”.*
- 9.7 These strategic planning ambitions are captured in Policies GG1 (Building Strong & Inclusive Communities), GG2 (Making the best use of Land) , GG3 (Creating a Healthy City) and GG4 (Delivering the Homes Londoners Need) with the proposal needing to be viewed in this policy context. These London Plan policies are also consistent with Strategic Objective 5 set out in the Core Strategy
- 9.8 Making more efficient use of land is presently significant due to the identified need for housing and the consequences of failing to meet the Housing Delivery Test which has triggered the “tilted balance” and the presumption in favour (NPPF) which for decision-taking, means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably

outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole – which also includes the Development Plan.

- 9.9 The location within a district town centre with good PTAL makes this a suitable site for more intensive development consistent with the good growth policies of the London Plan and should be site where development is optimised to realise necessary housing delivery. Although little weight can be attributed to the fact given the status of the draft plan, it can be noted that the site is also identified in the Council's Regulation 18 Local Plan as a site allocated for redevelopment (SA16: 50-56 Fore Street).
- 9.10 It is acknowledged the property in its current form is of limited architectural merit and makes a negative contribution to the setting and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is considered the site incorporates opportunity to obtain a more intensive form of development to assist in strategic policy objectives around growth
- 9.11 In light of the above, the principle of demolition including the loss and provision for replacement of the existing public house is therefore considered acceptable. This approach has also been established by previous planning decisions (ref: 18/00760/FUL and 17/00815/FUL) which included acceptance on appeal. It is also considered the proposed mix of residential together with ground floor commercial (A1/A3/A4 and D1 floorspace) is acceptable in principle and would be consistent with the character and designation of the locality

Loss of Public House

- 9.12 The primary use of the existing building is as a public house (Use Class A4). These can often be valued assets of benefit to the local community although it must be noted, this public house is not designated as an Asset of Community Value.
- 9.13 Policy HC7 of the London Plan (Protecting public houses) states that public houses should be protected where they have a heritage, economic, social or cultural value to local communities, or where they contribute to wider policy objectives for town centres, night-time economy areas, Cultural Quarters and Creative Enterprise Zones. Applications that propose the loss of public houses with heritage, cultural, economic or social value should be refused unless there is marketing evidence that demonstrates that there is no realistic prospect of the building being used as a pub in the foreseeable future. This approach would also be consistent with Policy DMD 17 which seeks to protect community facilities within the Borough.
- 9.14 The current premises (the Gilpen Bell PH) is closed and has been for some time. Although the initial plans proposed involved the complete loss of the pub use, following negotiations with the applicant, the proposal has been amended and floorspace is now identified within the development with frontage onto Fore Street that could be used to provide a new public house should this be economic. The floorspace is otherwise flexible so that it could be used for alternative uses within the A1/A3 and D1 use class to facilitate the most suitable use for the local area, which is welcomed.
- 9.15 The approach is considered acceptable against Policy HC7 of the London Plan and is also considered reasonable given the proximity of an alternative

public house on the opposite side of the Claremont Street / Fore Street junction.

Residential

- 9.16 With specific regard to the residential element of the proposal, it is noted that the NPPF 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 London Plan supports this intention, stating that planning and development must 'ensure that more homes are delivered'.
- 9.17 Policy H1 of the 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), identifies 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. The Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG also sets out the intention to bring forward more public land for affordable homes.
- 9.18 NPPF (Paragraphs 102 and 103) sets out objectives for considering transport issues in the planning process, including ensuring opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and requires development 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. In this regard, the development site is considered to be in an accessible and sustainable location with good connections to local social infrastructure, bus routes and reasonable walking distance to Silver Street over ground station.
- 9.19 The proposal is for 110 residential units on a site where the emerging Local Plan(Reg 18) has identified potential to introduce new housing. 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.
- 9.20 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. Furthermore, 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 and transport hubs, as is the case here.
- 9.21 The Council is currently updating its Local Plan and through publishing the Issues & Options (Regulation 18) in 2019 and the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) in 2021 has been transparent about the sheer scale of the growth challenge for Enfield. The two most recently published Regulation 18 documents in 2019 and 2021 were clear about the need to plan differently to attain a significant step change in delivery and secure investment in our Borough. The Council needs to encourage a variety of housing development including market, affordable and Build to Rent products, in order to meet varied local demand.

- 9.22 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 accessible to social and transport infrastructure 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 housing to assist in meeting the Borough's housing target and help bridge the shortfall that has been the case in previous years.
- 9.23 Significant weight must also be attributed to the presumption in favour of approving sustainable residential development and the planning merits of providing new homes (including 100% offer of affordable homes) and additional A1/A3/A4/D1 floorspace.

Summary of Principle

- 9.24 Given the above considerations, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable and in line with relevant policies, most notably London Plan Policy G2 & G4, Core Strategy Policy 4.1, DMD Policy 28, the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and Paragraphs 59, 102 and 105 of the NPPF. As such the Development is supported in principle terms subject to other detailed considerations as discussed below.

Housing Need and Delivery

- 9.25 The current London Plan sets a target for the provision of 52,287 new homes across London each year with Enfield identified as contributing 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): an increase over the previous target of 798. Notwithstanding, only 51% of approvals in the Borough have been delivered over the previous 3-years meaning that unit approvals must exceed this figure considerably if the targets are to be met.
- 9.26 Enfield's Housing and Growth Strategy (2020) was considered by Cabinet in January 2020 and approved at February's Council meeting (2020) and sets out the Council's ambition to deliver adopted London Plan and Core Strategy plus ambitious draft now adopted London Plan (2021) targets.
- 9.27 The Strategy sets five ambitions, the third of which is 'Quality and variety in private housing'. The key aims of the Strategy seek to address the housing crisis within the Borough. During consideration of the Cabinet report Members discussed the current housing situation and highlighted the rise in private sector rents in proportion to the average salary and the significant rise in homelessness. Enfield had one of the highest numbers of homeless households in the country. Insecurity and unaffordability of private sector housing has evidence-based links with homelessness. One of the most common reason for homelessness in London is currently due to the ending of an assured tenancy (often by buy to let landlords). MHCLG (2018) data shows a significant increase in the number of households in Enfield using temporary accommodation – with a significant 67% increase between 2012 and 2018.

- 9.28 The fourth and fifth ambitions of the strategy are in respect of Inclusive placemaking; and accessible housing pathways and homes for everyone. While the Housing and Growth Strategy is not a statutory document it sets the Council's strategic vision, alongside metrics, in respect of housing delivery. It was approved at a February 2020 Council meeting. Its evidence, data and metrics are considered relevant material considerations.
- 9.29 The 2018 London Housing SPG outlines a vision that delivers high quality homes and inclusive neighbourhoods by ensuring that appropriate development is prioritised. Policy H1 of the London Plan seeks housing delivery to be optimised on sites that have good public transport accessibility (with a PTAL 3-6 rating).
- 9.30 As mentioned elsewhere in this report, 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 providing critical industrial land that serves the capital and wider south east growth corridors. The reality of these land designations means the call on optimisation of our brownfield land is greater and brings complex development issues and a major shift in how Enfield's character will need to transform.
- 9.31 In 2016/17, 30% of housing completions were affordable, whilst in 2017/18 this decreased 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 not currently being met in the Borough. The Housing and Growth Strategy (2020) sets out an ambition to increase the target of 50% of new homes to be affordable housing in the next Local Plan. Enfield's Housing and Growth Strategy (2020) states the Borough's ambition to develop more homes that are genuinely affordable to local people, so more people can live in a home where they spend a more reasonable proportion of their household income on housing costs.
- 9.32 Taking into account both the housing need of the Borough together with the track record of delivery against target, it is clear that the Council must seek to optimise development on brownfield sites such as this particularly those that are currently underused and not delivering any benefit to the wider area.

Affordable Housing

- 9.33 The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF 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)". London Plan Policy H4 sets out a strategic target for 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable.
- 9.34 Enfield sets a Borough-wide affordable housing target of 40% in Core Policy 3 but acknowledges the appropriate figure will need to take into account site-specific land values, grant availability and viability assessments, market conditions, as well as the relative importance of other planning priorities and obligations on the site.
- 9.35 DMD 1 supporting text notes that affordable housing comprises three tenures: social rent, affordable rent, and intermediate housing. Enfield's Development

Management Document Policy DMD 1 (Affordable Housing) states that development should provide the maximum amount of affordable housing with an appropriate mix of tenures to meet local housing need.

- 9.36 Following discussions, the proposed development as revised, would now deliver 100% affordable housing with all the units available at London Affordable Rent in excess of policy requirements. This is achieved through the allocation of grant funding from the GLA.
- 9.37 Previously the development was presented on the basis of Build to Rent scheme delivering 112 residential units of which 35% would be affordable homes by habitable room. The viability review identified that this exceeded what the development reasonable sustain without grant. As a result, the scheme has been amended so that 100% of the 110 proposed residential units are affordable housing at London Affordable Rent, with funding provided by the GLA.
- 9.38 Due to the 100% affordable offer, Policy H5 (Threshold approach to applications) identifies this as a fast track application. Fast tracked applications are not required to provide a viability assessment at application stage.
- 9.39 To ensure an applicant fully intends to build out the permission, the requirement for an Early Stage Viability Review will be triggered if an agreed level of progress on implementation is not made within two years of the permission being granted (or a period agreed by the Borough).
- 9.40 A qualifying criterion does require the local planning authority to be satisfied regarding the tenure mix with Policy H5 stating: Developments which provide 75 per cent or more affordable housing may follow the Fast Track Route where the tenure mix is acceptable to the Borough or the Mayor where relevant.
- 9.41 Policy H6 of the London Plan (Affordable Housing Tenure) advises that the following split of affordable products should be applied to residential development:
- 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.
- 9.42 The 2017 SHMA shows London's significant need for low-cost rental housing which is reflected in priorities for our own Borough; There is therefore presumption that the 40 per cent to be decided by the Borough will focus on Social Rent and London Affordable Rent given the level of need for this type of tenure across London.
- 9.43 In this instance the tenure mix of 100% London Affordable Rent is acceptable. The London Plan is committed to delivering genuinely affordable housing and

within the broad definition of affordable housing, the Mayor's preferred affordable housing tenures includes London Affordable Rent.

- 9.44 London Affordable Rent is for households on low incomes where the rent levels are based on the formulas in the Social Housing Regulator's Rent Standard Guidance. The rent levels for Social Rent homes use a capped formula and London Affordable Rent homes are capped at benchmark levels published by the GLA. Rents are significantly less than 80 per cent of market rents, which is the maximum for Affordable Rent permitted in the NPPF.

Summary of Housing Tenure & Mix

- 9.45 The proposed Affordable Housing offer of 100% is based on residential units Tenure mix is set out below.

Tenure	1b2p	2b4p	3b4p/5p	4b6p	
London Affordable Rent	30	58	15	7	110
Private Rent	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotals	30	58	15	7	110

- 9.46 A further breakdown of the residential mix is set out below:

Type of Unit	Number of Units
1 Bed, 1 Person Units	0
1 Bed, 2 Person Units	29
1 Bed, 2 Person Units (DDA)	1
2 Bed, 3 Person Units	28
2 Bed, 3 Person Units (DDA)	3
2 Bed, 4 Person Units	26
3 Bed, 4 Person Units	5
3 Bed, 4 Person Units (DDA)	5
4 Bed, 6 Person Units	7
Total	110

Residential Mix

- 9.47 Officers have assessed the scheme in accordance with London Plan (2021) policies as well as having regard to the Council's development plan policies and the Council's current and emerging evidence around housing need. It is acknowledged the proposed mix is significantly weighted towards the 1 & 2 bedroom units which is not immediately consistent with local need and as a result there would be a preference for more larger family accommodation. The proposal has been revised increasing the number of family sized units to 22 which represents 20% of the total facilitated by a decrease in the number of smaller 1 and 2 bedroom units. This change is welcomed and it is considered this improve the acceptability of the proposed residential offer. Nevertheless, the proposed mix has to be acknowledged. This, however, does have to be viewed in the context of the housing delivery test and the presumption in favour of approving sustainable development. Moreover, the current offer of 100% affordable housing at London Affordable Rent is significant and can be attributed considerable weight in the assessment
- 9.48 Furthermore, it is noted that the Council as the Strategic Housing Authority supports this application as it secures the delivery of 100% affordable housing. The SHA comments:
- “that the social housing will be subject to 100% nominations to the Council which will help to meet the needs of people on the housing register. The concentration of 1 bed and 2 bed accommodation is high as, overall, there is a need for more family housing in the Borough. Although the scheme proposes 11%, these are houses. The highest demand is currently for 3 beds and 6 persons and therefore the provision of houses is welcomed in a town centre location. Therefore, on balance, the Council as Strategic Housing Authority, supports this application given the site context and affordable housing offer”.*
- 9.49 Taking this into account, and the tilted balance in favour of approving schemes for residential development, it is considered the low percentage of family housing can be accepted but only in the context of the location and the 100% LAR affordable housing offer which would be secured through a legal agreement.

Design

- 9.50 The main element of the current iteration of the scheme following recent design enhancements, is the 18 storey tower.
- 9.51 It comprises 3 elements -base , mid elevation and crown.

Base:

- Three-storey order with well defined entrances and generous glazing.
- Removal of the colonnade to be in keeping with the surrounding context and increase flexible space at ground floor plan.
- Articulation of flexible space corner entrance to enhance way finding

Mid Elevation

- Material change to a softer red brick with a red tone within the zinc roof cladding

- Slender overall appearance expressed through the 4 central bays and dematerialising the corners.
- Large windows and wide piers generate a strong overall architectural appearance.
- Curved balconies to soften the overall massing and reference the art deco heritage and the Gilpin Bell.

Crown:

- Stepped height to create more verticality and create a slender form
- Expressing the white detailing down the facade creates a slender form and more defined tower



Elevation View of Proposal From Fore Street

9.52 In addition to the tower element, the proposal involves terraced dwellings fronting Claremont Street and Clive Avenue.

Claremont Street

- Expressed vertical element through framing each house with brick piers
- High level of family houses with terrace level private amenity space and shared amenity space in the centre of the site.

- Material changes to a softer red brickwork

Clive Avenue

- 7 Terrace houses with defensible space and improved streetscape to Clive Avenue.
- Provided roof terrace private amenity space and shared amenity space in the centre of the site.
- Setback mansard roof reduces appearance of scale to mediate surrounding residential context.



9.53 Following the recent Design Review Panel in October 2021, the scheme has been amended to:

- remove the three storey colonnade enabling the tower to be better grounded in the street scene
- further elements of horizontal detailing have been introduced to improve its setting and tie in with adjacent buildings
- introduction of predominately red brickwork (revised from grey tones)
- Vertical emphasis to architectural detailing of tower to accentuate slenderness
- introduction of articulation between base and mid elevation

- vi) introduction of curved corner balconies to further reduce mass and accentuate slenderness of tower
- vii) Art deco inspired detailing – high quality

9.54 The proposals also involves significant public realm enhancement of Clive Avenue



and will address the current public experience of this space.

Design development

- 9.55 The proposed scheme has undergone a number of iterations throughout a long pre-application process, which has included extensive pre-application discussions with officers, GLA officers, local people and the Enfield Design Review Panel (DRP).
- 9.56 There has been significant debate as officers seek to navigate an appropriate development response on this sustainable town centre location, balancing the sensitivities of the heritage and urban design considerations against the objective to deliver new homes and the need to maintain a viable quantum of development.
- 9.57 In this regard, it is acknowledged that the previous 9 storey development has not progressed to implementation because it is not viable. It is also of interest to note that when assessing the appeal against the Council’s refusal, the Planning inspector commented that “ *whilst the proposed (9 storey) building would be prominent and large, it would not be overly large compared to the existing tall buildings within the vicinity, including the 8 storey Silverpoint development between Alpha Road and Cowper Road. The architectural design would also make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area*”.
- 9.58 The Planning Inspector also commented that *while the development would be significantly taller than nearby historic buildings, including the two locally*

listed buildings and would add to the enclosure of the southernmost part of the conservation area. The heritage assets would be more hemmed in by tall modern development which would add to the sense of an isolated remnant of historic development along Fore Street. However, this harm would be tempered by the separation provided by width of Claremont Street and the variation in heights and materials provided by the development. Views into the conservation area along Fore Street to the south would not be greatly impeded and the prominence of the County Court and no. 58 would remain. Furthermore, the extent and scale of existing modern development in the vicinity of the most southernmost part of the conservation area and the two local listed buildings means that the introduction of an additional tall building would not be particularly out of keeping. Therefore, the harm to significance would be less than substantial and no greater than moderate.

- 9.59 Nevertheless, this is a taller building and there remain concerns about the height and design articulated by the Design Review Panel which reiterate urban design and heritage comments. Throughout, the Design Review Panel has acknowledged positive elements of the scheme including the terraced form / design of Claremont Street / Clive Avenue properties and the materiality and articulation of elements. However, the conclusion of the recent DRP was that although there are positives about the development, in respect of the tower, it was felt to be too tall and out of scale for the context and damages the heritage of the area. There is also concern that the proposal will set a precedent for height along the east side of Fore Street that undermines the height strategy being promoted at Joyce and Snell's estate (across the street) and in the councils emerging local plan. Notwithstanding, the DRP recognised that *the proposals are balanced between a need for affordable housing in the Borough and the need for high quality design that works with the local context and heritage. The panel's comments are focused on the design aspects of the scheme and are intended to add to the information that the LPA is considering in the determination process*"
- 9.60 Since this DRP in October, the scheme has further evolved and although the height remains unaltered, the developer has introduced revisions which seek to address many of the comments that were made at the DRP. These are discussed in the following sections of the report.

Impact on Character of Area (Tall Building)

- 9.61 The NPPF at Para 119 states Planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land. Para 124 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, 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.
- 9.62 The proposed development represents a tall building 18 storeys in height (= 73.99metres). The remaining development is 3 storey in height fronting Claremont Street and Clive Avenue. However, the tower would be a significant addition to the townscape.
- 9.63 The London Plan advises that while high density does not need to imply high rise, tall buildings can form part of a plan-led approach to facilitating regeneration opportunities and managing necessary future growth, contributing to new homes and economic growth, particularly in order to make optimal use of the capacity of sites which are well-connected by public transport and have good access to services and amenities. Tall buildings can help people navigate through the city by providing reference points and emphasising the hierarchy of a place such as its main centres of activity, and important street junctions and transport interchanges. It is also considered that tall buildings that are of exemplary architectural quality and in the right place, can make a positive contribution to London's cityscape. Many tall buildings have become a valued part of London's identity. However, they can also have detrimental visual, functional and environmental impacts if in inappropriate locations and/or of poor quality design.
- 9.64 In fact, the Report on Location of Tall Buildings and Important Local Views in Enfield (2012) prepared in support of the current Core Strategy states within the general considerations: 'As a general rule buildings significantly taller than their surroundings are unlikely to be appropriate within or in close proximity to conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, listed buildings and ancient monuments
- 9.65 London Plan Policy D9 states that Boroughs should determine through their local plan 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. Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans. The current development plan for the Borough does not identify suitable locations for tall buildings pursuant to the requirements of London Plan Policy D9. It can be noted that the Council's draft Reg18 local plan does make proposals and identifies land on the western side of Fore Street focused on the Joyce and Snell's residential estate, as an appropriate location for tall buildings. In so doing it suggests a height of up to 15 metres as being appropriate.
- 9.66 While the application site is located outside of this area, the boundary for the "appropriate location" extends to the opposite side of Fore Street. It should also be noted that there are tall buildings at 22 and 20 storeys to the south across the Borough boundary with Haringey in addition to the 9 storey Silverpoint building to the north. The urban contexts requires consideration when assessing the appropriateness of height and the impact of the proposed tall building needs to be balanced against to the need for housing the presumption in favour of approving sustainable (tilted balance).

- 9.67 DMD Policy 43 (Tall Buildings) is a criteria-based policy for considering tall buildings, which justifying text (para. 6.4.1) defines as those “that are substantially taller than their surroundings, cause a significant change to the skyline or are larger than the threshold sizes set for the referral of planning applications to the Mayor.” It states that tall buildings will not be acceptable in areas classified as inappropriate which includes sites in the immediate vicinity of conservation area unless it can be demonstrated how the proposal avoids the negative impacts associated with the sensitive classification
- 9.68 Both the London Plan and DMD tall building policies are relevant to the proposed development. The policies can be distilled into two questions:
i) is the proposal in the right location,
ii) is it of high quality?
- 9.69 Acceptability of a taller building in a particular location will be dependent on the detailed local context including the design of the building, the relationship to neighbouring properties, the relationship with any heritage assets and the impact on any views including those to and from historic buildings over a wide area. This requires careful consideration should be given to the potential negative impact that the introduction of a taller building might have. As always, it is necessary to assess and evaluate the merits of individual proposals and exceptionally it may be possible for an applicant to demonstrate that an exemplary designed taller building is acceptable within or close to nationally or locally designated heritage assets.
- 9.70 While the site is located in a town centre and has good public transport accessibility, the location of a tall building has generated a range of views and from an urban design perspective, there are strong concerns about whether this location for a tall building is appropriate questioning the justification on the basis of townscape legibility and its role as a focal point for development at the gateway to the Borough. In this regard, the concerns relate to the height of the tower as proposed would have a negative impact on the legibility of the Borough, particularly in medium and longer views when experienced as part of the Borough’s existing townscape. This is because the proposed scheme would be visually prominent and indicate a level of importance in the Borough which is not appropriate to the particular site
- 9.71 In addition, the height analysis demonstrated in the D&S indicates that in the locality of the site, the average height of the taller buildings is 9 storeys. There are 10 tall buildings identified with 3 of the 10 buildings exceeding the height of 9 storeys, two of which are in the Borough of Haringey (20 + storeys).
- 9.72 Bridport House (College Gardens, Upper Edmonton N18 2TB) is one of the 9 storeys identified. It is located on the Joyce and Snells Estate further along Fore Street and is identified in The Report on Location of Tall Buildings and Important Local Views in Enfield (2012) as a ‘Yellow’ rating, meaning it is an appropriate location for a tall building but is an inappropriate existing tall building. The location of this building is closer to the boundary of Enfield and Haringey and can be considered as a ‘gateway’ location into the Borough rather than this site.
- 9.73 In support of the scheme, the applicant has provided a townscape analysis which considers the impact of the proposed development on the townscape and heritage assets. The townscape assessment analyses the character of the surrounding townscape, assessing the effect of the proposed

development on views from locations around the site. This draws on the design quality and references the proposed height in the context of other tall buildings in the vicinity to conclude the development would be appropriate and would not harm the existing townscape. In particular, it has assessed the proposed development in a number of key views including that identified as Local View 10: a view from the pedestrian bridge over Meridian Way (A1055) and the railway line at Ponders End. Tall buildings within the Borough and beyond towards the City of London are visible and although the new tower is apparent, it is not considered to be a significant feature detracting from established views.

9.74 In considering the issue of height, the recent Design Review Panel (October 2021) considered that:

- the building is still too tall and out of scale for the context and damages the heritage of the area.
- the proposal is overdevelopment. This results in an incongruous height and massing which is not appropriate for the context.
- the design does not represent a bespoke response or relate to the character of the conservation area; both in terms of the materiality and also the vertical, on the street design of the tower, which is more appropriate for a city centre location than an outer London Borough town centre on a linear route.
- The design of the tower has improved since the previous review, having a more elegant form but is still bulky and would benefit from further improvement. This could involve exploring a set back from the street, so the tower does not sit directly on the edge of the site but rather presents a 3-4 storey frontage to the street.
- The colonnade was not supported
- The proposal will set a precedent for height along the east side of Fore Street that undermines the height strategy being promoted at Joyce and Snells (across the street) and in the councils emerging local plan.

The Panel did acknowledge however that the proposals are balanced between a need for affordable housing in the Borough and the need for high quality design that works with the local context and heritage.

9.75 Overall, there remained concerns that the design of the tower did not support the proposed height in this location. In response, the scheme has been further revised.

- i) the colonnade has been removed so that the tower interacts better with the street scene;
- ii) new materials have been introduced using warmer brick tones
- iii) improved articulation of the crown element of the tower
- iv) introduction of a strong coping line to articulate the distinction between the base and tower elements
- v) introduction of curved balconies to create a softer form and improved appearance

It is considered these alterations substantially improve the design and appearance of the development and now make the scheme acceptable.



9.76 With reference to DMD 43 and taking the view this is an appropriate location, the policy acknowledges that the actual suitability of a proposal will always depend on the context of the site and details of the proposed building but must:

- a. Have good access to public transport, and/or;
- b. Contain existing and appropriate clusters of tall buildings, and/or;
- c. Are within designated town centres, activity hubs or regeneration areas.

The policy states that in the majority of cases more than one or all of the above criteria and in this case, criterion a and c are met

9.77 The assessment has also had regard to the criteria set out in London Plan Policy D9 including :

- i) development should have regard to the long range, mid-range and immediate views when assessing visual impact
- ii) development should reinforce spatial hierarchy
- iii) architectural quality and materials should be exemplary
- iv) development should have regard to and avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets
- v) development should incorporate a high standard of functional design
- vi) the location must have the transport capacity and network to support the development
- vii) development should be designed to minimise environmental impact including noise, wind, daylight, sunlight penetration and temperature conditions
- viii) the cumulative visual, functional and environmental impacts of proposed, consented and planned tall buildings in an area must be considered when assessing tall building proposals a

Against these criteria, the proposal is on balance considered acceptable in terms of the introduction of height in this location.

Tall Buildings Conclusion

- 9.78 It is acknowledged there are concerns about the suitability of this site to accommodate a tall building. These needs to be weighed against the benefits in terms housing delivery and 100% London Affordable rent
- 9.79 There is a pressing need for housing, and a London Plan requirement to optimise use of land. The site is in the town centre where policy seeks to optimise development especially where sites have excellent PTAL. Although there is a less than substantial heritage impact (discussed in the next section), no significant local views would be adversely affected by a tall building. It is also considered important that there are other existing tall buildings in the area, and the wider area is undergoing significant change, given proposed estate regeneration schemes nearby. There are also existing consents for a large building on the site; a part 4 part – 7 storey scheme has consent, and there is a resolution to grant for a part 2 – part 9 storey scheme.
- 9.80 Nevertheless, Officers do have concerns that the height of the tall building as proposed would have a negative impact on the legibility of the Borough, when experienced as part of the Borough's existing townscape. In addition, the DRP has expressed concerns about proposed building heights. However as acknowledged by the Design Review Panel this is a finely balanced assessment to be weighed against the delivery of new housing and 110 residential units at London Affordable Rent which must be given significant weight in light of the Housing Delivery Test and the tilted balance. Taking this into account and referencing the recent design improvements to the development, the harm arising from the development is outweighed by the benefits and it is considered the proposed height is acceptable in terms of the townscape character of the area.

Impact on Setting and Appearance of Conservation Area

- 9.81 The application site is not situated in a Conservation Area nor is it locally listed. However, it constitutes a non designated heritage asset which lies adjacent to the southern boundary of the Fore Street Conservation Area. There are designated and non designated heritage assets in close proximity as identified in this report and the effect of the proposed development on the significance of these designated and non designated heritage assets needs careful consideration to assess the harm.

Relevant Policy and Legislation

- 9.82 In respect of conservation area, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (The Act) 1990 require that all planning decisions 'should have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. If harm is identified, it should be given considerable importance and weight in any planning balance in accordance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Chapter 16 of the NPPF (Para 194) 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 the 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.

9.83 The NPPF also states that when considering the impact of the proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Significance is the value of the heritage asset because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic, and may derive from a heritage asset's physical presence or its setting.

9.84 Para 197 of the NPPF also states:

"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness".

9.85 Furthermore, Para 199 states:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

9.86 Where a development will lead to 'less than substantial harm', the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. This does not mean there is no harm but acknowledges there may be public benefits that outweigh this identified level of harm

9.87 London Plan Policy HC1 'Heritage conservation and growth' states that development should conserve heritage assets and avoid harm, which also applies to non-designated heritage assets. Furthermore, Enfield Core Policy 31 (Built and Landscape Heritage) requires that special regard be had to the impacts of development on heritage assets and their settings, Enfield Core Policy 30 supports high quality and design-led public realm. DMD 44 (Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) requires that developments should conserve and enhance the special interest, significance or setting of and heritage asset while DMD 37 (Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development) requires that Development must be suitable for its intended function and improve an area through responding to the local character, clearly distinguishing public and private spaces, and a variety of choice. Making Enfield: Enfield Heritage Strategy 2019-2024 SPD (2019) is also relevant.

9.88 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 provides information on good practice in relation to assessing impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Of 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. Furthermore, 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]*

Heritage Context & Assessment

- 9.89 The application site is not situated in a Conservation Area nor is locally listed. However, it constitutes a non designated heritage asset which lies adjacent to the southern boundary of the Fore Street Conservation Area. It also lies within the Upper Edmonton Archaeological Priority Area. The character, appearance and special interest of the Conservation Area is analysed in the associated Character Appraisal (2016). By virtue of its height and consequential widespread visibility, the proposed redevelopment has the potential to impact upon designated and non-designated heritage assets within a wider area. This includes a number of non-designated heritage assets in close proximity to the site: The Phoenix Pub (former); Edmonton County Court; 60 Fore Street; 79 Fore Street; St James’s Church (former); and the Parsonage (former).
- 9.90 The Church Street (Edmonton) and Fore Street Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies the following to be of special interest:
- The sense of time depth, which comes primarily from the survival of both the medieval church of All Saints and a significant number of 18th and 19th century buildings
 - The inherent architectural quality of the landmark commercial and public buildings of around 1900, when Fore Street became the ‘high street’ for extensive suburban development in its hinterland
 - The diversity of historic styles and materials represented, although with a strong emphasis on yellow stock and red brick, with slated or tiled roofs, as the dominant materials
 - The open green spaces around All Saints Church, as a foil to the heavily trafficked streets
 - By contrast, the vitality of Upper Fore Street as a diverse and multi-cultural shopping centre.
- 9.91 In addition, the special interest of the Fore Street CA relates to the retail vibrancy of Fore Street, the surviving pockets of 19th century buildings, and corners marked by landmark buildings. Views up and down Fore Street also contribute to its special interest with the existing tall buildings visible along Fore Street being an established part of that setting.
- 9.92 Of note is that the CAA identifies as a focal point the concentration of historic buildings either side of Fore Street – the LT’s Bar (the former Phoenix Public

House, late 19th century) and the Magistrates' Court (early 20th century). It marks the gateway to the section of Fore Street that has buildings (mostly, but not exclusively, both historic and retail) to pavement edge both sides of Fore Street. Views of the focal point are of more significance than views from it. A number of buildings along Claremont Street are also identified as making a positive contribution.

9.93 A further consideration in the assessment of harm is that the Fore Street Conservation Area has been identified as being in 'very bad' condition in Historic England's annual Heritage at Risk Register. The purpose of the register is to identify heritage assets at risk of being lost through neglect, decay or deterioration. With regards to Conservation Areas, loss would be defined as neglect, decay or deterioration to the extent that its special interest, character and appearance were to be compromised so that it no longer justifies designation. As such, the character, appearance and special interest of the Fore Street Conservation Area can be considered extremely fragile.

9.94 In accordance with its statutory obligations, a Management Plan (2016) has been published which identifies key issues and management proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area. A number of the issues identified relate to new development:

- *The poor quality of many new buildings and their lack of positive relationship to context,*
- *The need to achieve a higher standard of new-build contextual design in infilling gap sites and in redevelopment,*
- *The need to ensure that investment in commercial enterprises results in good standards of building design.*

To address this, Enfield Council has proposed:

- *The poor quality of new building design has been a major factor in the erosion of the character of the areas. New buildings within and forming the setting of the conservation areas should only be allowed if they are be carefully designed to reflect the historic character, use, scale, grain and appearance of the conservation areas.*

9.95 When assessing which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, the cumulative impacts of development may also need to be considered.

9.96 The quality of the design is therefore important to the assessment of harm to the setting and appearance of the heritage assets. The scheme has produced differing opinions concerning the appropriate response to the development of this site having regard to the statutory tests outlined above regarding the harm to the heritage assets which have had to be balanced to be balanced against policy and the objective of delivering sustainable development and new homes.

9.97 The DRP considered that:

- i) that the proposals will inevitably cause harm by virtue of the sheer and massing of the proposals and their proximity to existing heritage

assets and conservation areas. The level of harm is assessed as most likely to be 'less than substantial'

- ii) a tower is not deemed an appropriate design response to this site because of the detrimental impact on the area's heritage assets. If this site were to be developed according to parameters defined by the local heritage, a much lower building would be proposed.
- iii) Night as well as daytime views should be considered. At night the proposed building will have a large, illuminated presence, which will cause greater impact on the setting of the conservation area than may be apparent from the daytime views.
- iv) Edmonton County Court and Lt's Bar, two landmark buildings mentioned in the conservation area appraisal, will be detrimentally affect by the proposed development because of its height, scale and proximity.
- v) The colonnade is not working to tie the building into the conservation area and is more appropriate for a city centre location.
- vi) The use of materials does not suggest a bespoke response to either the heritage assets nearby, the setting of the conservation area or the local palette of materials.

9.98 Notwithstanding the above points, it must be noted that the DRP are of the opinion that the level of harm is assessed as most likely to be 'less than substantial' harm opening up an ability to weigh the harm against the public benefit of the scheme

9.99 The Heritage officer's assessment of this development has also identified concerns. While the level of harm to the Fore Street Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset is concluded to be 'less than substantial', the harm is considered to be at the higher end of less than substantial and would result in harm to the setting and character of the Conservation Area. Nevertheless, it is possible this harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (Para.202). In so doing, it is important to reiterate that whilst the scale of harm may be 'less than substantial', it is considered at the higher end of this scale. In accordance with national planning advice, great weight must be given to the heritage asset's conservation as part of the weighed balancing exercise (Para.199) and clear and convincing justification provided for any level of harm (Para.200). Consideration must be given to past harm caused by previous poor quality interventions which has resulted in the Conservation Area being 'at risk' and the cumulative impact of this proposal alongside others such as Silvermere. Mindful of this, the Heritage Officer considers this development would be contrary to the Conservation Area Management Plan p.10 which are not consistent with local design guidance:

The poor quality of new building design has been a major factor in the erosion of the character of the areas. New buildings within and forming the setting of the conservation areas should only be allowed if they are be carefully designed to reflect the historic character, use, scale, grain and appearance of the conservation areas.

9.100 From a heritage perspective, it is considered the scheme fails to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (Para.197c). Instead the proposal would significantly erode local character and cause a high degree of harm albeit within the less substantial level. The design is also felt to be inconsistent with aims of the Framework (Para.130) regarding decisions on new development. In particular, a number of elements are of concern:

- Colonnades are not typical of the Fore Street CA whereas a strong back of pavement building line is a positive characteristic. The colonnade, being a double height space, is also out of scale with the prevailing pedestrian experience and which does not reinforce the strong linear retail character at ground floor in the CA. This should be removed
- Improved quality of shopfronts should be introduced so that they relate to the proportions and quality of positive examples in the area. This would include breaking up the double height glazing; increasing the bay widths; defining a signage zone; and, using alternative materials.
- Refining the proportions of the façade above the shopfronts to avoid a monolithic character and establish a finer grain;
- Removing 'grey spandrel panels' which are an unsympathetic material. Contrasting details in the conservation area are generally stone or brick/terracotta;
- Refine massing of Fore Street mansard roof to avoid bulky appearance and change materiality to terne-coated steel;
- Removing the 'grey brick'. Whilst it is acknowledged that brick has been chosen to reflect the tonal qualities of stone in the conservation area, this material prevents the building visually assimilating into the streetscape. Stock brick and stone are used sparingly in the Conservation Area as a complimentary material or for high status buildings. The introduction of such a large expense of this material will undermine this balance;
- Stepping the tower back further behind the Fore Street building line;
- Removing corner balconies which are highly prominent;

9.101 In response to these comments and the conclusions of the DRP, the development has been further revised. These changes include the removal of the colonnade, alterations to the ground level elevations and articulation with the tower element, alterations to the balconies and a change to the materials removing the render / grey colours and introducing orange/red brickwork and materials. It is considered these changes represent a significant enhancement of the proposal.



- 9.102 It is also considered, having regard to the objection from Haringey, that the relationship to the North Tottenham High Road Conservation Area would cause less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 9.103 The Applicant has submitted a Heritage Assessment as part of the Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment in accordance with NPPF and adopted policy requirements DMD 44, which sets out a clear understanding of the historic environment and background to the heritage-led design development.

Heritage Conclusions

- 9.104 Overall, this proposal replaces a tired building which, according to the Conservation Character Appraisal, has a negative impact on the Conservation Area with a high quality new building, providing much needed homes. The conclusion of the heritage assessment is that there is less than substantial harm to the heritage assets and although there are reservation about elements of the proposed development, these are outweighed by the public benefits of delivering 110 residential units at London Affordable Rent. This balance is reinforced by the presumption in favour of approving sustainable residential development.

Design – Claremont Street / Clive Road frontages

- 9.105 The development comprises new 3 storey elements which front both Claremont Street and Clive Road frontages. At three storeys, the design of these element which provide family homes, is considered acceptable. The activation of the Clive Road frontage and associated public realm improvements are a particular public benefit given the current anti-social activities associated with this location.
- 9.106 It is recognised that from a design perspective, the residential frontages are not set back from the pavement by the recommended 1.5 metres. However, the set back is considered sufficient and not a ground to object to the benefit.
- 9.107 Overall the 3 storey terraces approach in and Claremont Street and Clive Road is supported and welcomed with the DRP also commenting that the

inclusion of the townhouse typology is welcome and that these relate well to the low-rise context and are high quality

Conclusion of Design

- 9.108 On balance, and this is finely balanced given the issues raised, it is considered the proposed design to be acceptable. The conclusion that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets albeit at the upper end of that assessment, allows the consideration of the public benefits to be taken into account. The need for housing and favourable offer of all units being delivered at London Affordable Rent is extremely beneficial and supported by the Housing team of the Council.
- 9.109 The Housing Delivery test has introduced the presumption in favour of approving sustainable residential development and this means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. It does not outweigh the protection of heritage assets where there is a clear reason for refusing planning permission but in this case, it is considered the negatives of this development and harm to the heritage assets do not outweigh the significant public benefits.
- 9.110 The relationship to the setting and appearance of the conservation area is therefore accepted.

The Commercial/Community Space

- 9.111 It is proposed to provide 267 sqm of flexible commercial/community space within the ground floor and mezzanine level that fronts on to Fore Street. Although the initial plans proposed involved the complete loss of the pub use, following negotiations with the applicant, the proposal has been amended and floorspace is now identified within the development with frontage onto Fore Street that could be used to provide a new public house should this be economic. The floorspace is otherwise flexible so that it could be used for alternative uses within the A1/A3 and D1 use class to facilitate the most suitable use for the local area, which is welcomed.
- 9.112 The approach is considered acceptable against Policy HC7 of the London Plan and is also considered reasonable given the proximity of an alternative public house on the opposite side of the Claremont Street / Fore Street junction.

Residential Quality and Amenity

- 9.113 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;
- 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.

9.114 Meanwhile Policy D6 of the London Plan 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.

9.115 Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan also 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.

Accessible Housing

9.116 Policy D7 of the London Plan 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'. The Proposed Development meets relevant criteria in relation to accessible housing and is considered acceptable in this respect.

Housing quality

9.117 All of the units either meet or exceed internal floorspace standards required by the London Plan and comply with the qualitative design aspects to be addressed in housing developments as required. All units would meet residential space standards and would include sufficient private outdoor amenity space. The community spaces also include a range of external amenity opportunity. All ground floor units have defensible space at the front – where they front onto more public areas.

9.118 The Proposed Development would comprise 74% of dual aspect units, with no north facing single aspect units. Within the constraints of the site this is considered to represent a high-quality response. Significantly, all proposed family housing (offered as affordable homes) will be dual aspect, as will all 2-bed homes.

Fire safety

9.119 London Plan Policy D12 requires development proposals to achieve the highest standards of fire safety, embedding these at the earliest possible stage: "In the interests of fire safety and to ensure the safety of all building users, all development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire

safety...” Policy D5 requires proposals to ensure safe and dignified emergency evacuation for all building users. The London Fire Brigade were consulted on the application who confirmed that the fire safety approach for the scheme is satisfactory and the dry risers proposed on each floor of the building will be discussed further during the building consultation. Access for the any fire brigade would be where the proposed loading bay would be sited which is a distance of less than 45m and the positioning of a water hydrant would be near to the loading bay.

Secure by Design

- 9.120 Local Plan DMD Policy 37 require all developments to demonstrate and apply the principles and practices of the Secured by Design Scheme. The Metropolitan Police’s Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO) has reviewed the scheme and provided that a suite of further detail is required to ensure the safety of residents, visitors and other users of the space. It is recommended that a planning condition be attached to ensure Secured by Design certification for the development or alternatively for the scheme to achieve Crime Prevention Standards.

Residential Amenity Space

- 9.121 Policy DMD9 is of most relevance to amenity space, stating that all new development must provide good quality private amenity space that is not significantly overlooked by surrounding development, and that meets or exceeds the standards listed in the policy. In addition to the internal space proposed there is also a sufficient level of on site amenity space.
- 9.122 Overall, it is considered the private amenity proposed is acceptable. Each of the proposed flats would be served by its own self-contained amenity areas either via a terrace/balcony which complies with DMD9 and regional standards set out in the London Plan and London Housing SPG. Furthermore, the residential units onsite would have access to communal amenity space to the rear of the site.

Accessibility

- 9.123 London Plan Policy D7 Requires 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.’ Local Plan DMD Policy 8 has similar policy objectives.
- 9.124 The London Plan and Enfield Local Plan require all future development to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion. A condition would be attached to any permission to ensure the scheme complies with the Building Regulation requirements.

Relationship to Neighbouring Residential Properties

- 9.125 New development should not adversely impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties. Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan set out the importance of ensuring buildings are well designed to ensure against prejudicing neighbouring amenity. Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new developments have appropriate regard to their

surroundings, and that they improve the environment in terms of residential amenity.

- 9.126 The Mayor's Housing SPG (2016) Standard 28 reinforces the need for privacy, providing that planning guidance for privacy has been concerned with achieving visual separation between dwellings by setting a minimum distance of 18-21m between facing homes (between habitable room and habitable room as opposed to between balconies or terraces or between habitable rooms and balconies/terraces). These can still be useful yardsticks for visual privacy but cautions against adhering rigidly to minimum distance requirements.
- 9.127 To maintain a sense of privacy, avoid overshadowing and ensure adequate amounts of sunlight are available for new and existing developments, Policy DMD10 requires new development to maintain certain distances between buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the proposed development would not result in housing with inadequate daylight/ sunlight or privacy for the proposed or surrounding development.
- 9.128 The nearest residential properties are situated on the opposite side of Clive Avenue to the east and south. There would be a distance of approximately 19 - 31 metres between the side and rear elevations of the new houses on the application site and the front elevations of the houses along Clive Avenue to the east. To the south, there would be approximately 11 metres between the side elevation of the dwellings of the new houses positioned to the rear of the site and the front elevation of the houses to the south of the site located along Clive Avenue. There would be a minimum distance of approximately 26 metres between the rear elevation of the main building sited along Fore Street and the rear boundary of the site, and there would be a 9 – 12 metre distance between the 18 storey element and the southern boundary line of the site. With regard to the properties along Claremont Street there would be a distance between the proposed 18 storey building and existing building (public house on the corner of the site that would exceed 17 metres. With regard to the distance between the row of terraced houses along Claremont Street and the proposed development this would exceed 20 metres.
- 9.129 Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed development would be of a large scale, given the spatial relationship of the development to its surroundings and the distance from neighbouring properties, it is considered the proposed development would not significantly harm residential amenity. A daylight and sunlight report in accordance with BRE guidelines accompanies the application which demonstrates no significant harmful impacts on residential amenity.
- 9.130 In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely affect the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, through reduced daylight and sunlight conditions, overlooking and loss of privacy, having regard to relevant London Plan policies, Enfield policies, BRE guidelines and the NPPF and the presumption in favour of approving sustainable development.

Traffic and Transportation

- 9.131 The site has a PTAL of 5, which indicates good access to public transport services and supports flexibility in parking requirements in accordance with

London Plan policy. There are bus stops within walking distance from the site. The subject site is on a classified road and the existing pub car park has capacity for vehicles onsite.

Car Parking

- 9.132 The London Plan 2021, Core Strategy and DMD encourage and advocate sustainable modes of travel and require that each development should be assessed on its respective merits and requirements, in terms of the level of parking spaces to be provided for example. Policy DMD45 requires parking to be incorporated into schemes having regard to the parking standards of the London Plan; the scale and nature of the development; the public transport accessibility (PTAL) of the site; existing parking pressures in the locality; and accessibility to local amenities and the needs of the future occupants of the developments.
- 9.132 The parking standards within the new London Plan states that for areas with a PTAL 5-6, development should be car free. It should also be noted that most recent data shows that 56.5% of households own or have access to a vehicle. This is based on census data from 2011 and is before the Matchday CPZ was introduced.
- 9.133 Traffic and Transportation have reviewed the proposal along with information provided within the Transport Assessment which included information to support the proposed level of car provision proposed in light of London Plan maximum standards, Overall it is considered that a car free development in this location is acceptable, subject to residents being excluded from owning a parking permit for the CPZ, and the developer making a contribution to mitigating the impact of residents not owning vehicles i.e. an increase in cycling, walking, and public transport trips.
- 9.134 Although the proposal is car free, there will be provision of 4 on street disabled parking bays along Clive Ave. No parking spaces are proposed for the commercial unit

Cycle Parking

- 9.135 Cycle parking is shown on the plans to be sited within the building and to the front of the site. A total of 224 spaces are proposed which complies with London Plan standards. However, a condition will be secured to ensure that cycle parking is provided in accordance with London Plan standards.

Access and Servicing

- 9.136 Policy DMD47 states that new development will only be permitted if the access and road junction which serves the development is appropriately sited and is of an appropriate scale and configuration and there is no adverse impact on highway safety and the free flow of traffic.
- 9.137 There is no vehicular access to the development but the proposal has been designed to ensure there is clear and safe access for both pedestrians and cyclists. All deliveries and servicing will take place from Fore Street, Claremont Street and Clive Avenue

- 9.138 Servicing and deliveries to the commercial space expected to take place from the existing loading bays on Fore Street and Claremont Street. Further details concerning the loading bay will need be discussed with Highways, and as this involves works to the highway will also require a section 278 agreement.
- 9.139 The nature and location of the proposal means the development does require the provision of a Construction Traffic Management Plan to minimise its impacts on the local road network. This will be secured by condition. Refuse storage is shown within the building however full details of the storage will be secured through a condition.

Clive Avenue

- 9.140 Clive Avenue is an adopted highway, and is outside of the applicants ownership. Therefore, the works proposed to improve this highway would need to be undertaken via a Section 278 Agreement. The redesign allows what is existing footway to be repurposed as 4xdisabled bays, achieved by bringing the site boundary in slightly and enabling a wider footway. This would require the land offered up to be dedicated as public highway and then adopted. The proposed alterations are welcomed and are an improvement over the existing situation. As well the parking layout the carriageway will be raised, and the surfacing will be upgraded.
- 9.141 The highway works will need be secured via a Section 278. This obligation could be included in the Section 106 (detail to be discussed). Traffic Orders will also be required in order to change the existing waiting restrictions. It is noted that the design is a suggested design at this stage is subject to alterations and agreement with LBE Highways.

S106

- 9.142 In order to mitigate the impacts of the development, in addition to the aforementioned s278 highway works, Traffic and Transportation have sought s106 contributions comprising of, Cycle Enfield and sustainable transport (up to £85k and CPZ permit exclusion).
- 9.143 In summary, the development is considered likely to have a negligible impact on vehicular traffic flows in the local area, subject to conditions and planning obligations. The transport impacts of the proposal are acceptable and in this respect the scheme complies with the relevant London Plan and Enfield policies and the guidance within the NPPF.

Energy and Sustainability

- 9.144 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.
- 9.145 Policy SI2 of the London Plan adds Be Seen to the Mayor's energy hierarchy. It 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) and calls on Boroughs to establish an offset fund (with justifying text referring to a £95/tonne cost of carbon). Policy

SI3 calls for major development in Heat Network Priority Areas to have a communal low-temperature heating system, with the heat source selected from a hierarchy of options (with connecting to a local existing or planned heat network at the top).

- 9.146 Local Plan Policy DMD Policy 51 calls for energy efficient buildings as the first step in applying the energy hierarchy, DPD Policy 52 requires connection to a decentralised energy network where possible, DMD Policy 53 requires the use of zero carbon green technologies and DMD Policy 54 requires financial contributions to off-set carbon where specific targets are
- 9.147 All new development must achieve the highest sustainable design and construction standards having regard to technical feasibility and economic viability. All development will be required to include measures capable of mitigating and adapting to climate change to meet future needs having while regard to technical feasibility and economic viability.
- 9.148 London Plan states that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:
- Be Lean: use less energy;
 - Be Clean: supply energy efficiency; and
 - Be Green: use renewable energy.
 - And also: Be Seen.
- 9.149 A detailed Energy Statement supports the application, this seeks to demonstrate how the proposed scheme complies with the above aspects of both the London Plan and the Development Plan. The proposed energy strategy seeks to reduce energy demand, and CO₂ emissions.
- 9.150 It is noted that PV panels are shown on part of the flat roof of the new building and the energy statement refers to the use of a ground source heat pump to serve a communal heating system for the dwellings.
- 9.151 The building achieves a 10.9% reduction in CO₂ emissions without any renewable technologies implemented. This is due to passive measures such as the high thermal-efficiency of the building fabric, along with 100% low energy lighting specified throughout. The energy statement sets out that with the addition of a ground-source heat pump system to serve a communal heating system for the dwellings, along with a 0.5 kWp PV array to serve each residential unit (27.5kWp total) and an 8kWp array to serve the commercial areas (35.5kWp site total), the CO₂ emissions would be reduced by a further 29.1%. This results in total site CO₂ emissions of 78.2 tonnes CO₂/annum for the site, and a total 40.0% reduction in CO₂ emissions compared to Building Regulations Part L.
- 9.152 The energy strategy is targeting carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures and improvements to the building fabric. Further detail should however be provided and this shall be secured through condition to demonstrate the location and specification of the Low and Zero Carbon Technologies selected as feasible for this site, and how this will provide for no less than a 40% improvement in total CO₂ emissions arising from the

operation of a development and its services over Part L of Building Regulations 2013.

- 9.153 The site is within an area that could connect to a Decentralised Energy Network in the future and this connection would need to be secured through a s106 legal agreement. The carbon neutral shortfall will be addressed via Carbon Offset Contributions Payments, secured by legal agreement.
- 9.154 Several conditions relating to climate change and sustainable design and construction have been suggested to address relevant policies within section 8 – Tackling Climate Change of the DMD.

Waste Management

- 9.155 The NPPF refers to the importance of waste management and resource efficiency as an environmental objective. London Plan Policy SI7 encourages waste minimisation and waste prevention through the reuse of materials and using fewer resources. The policy also requires referable schemes to promote circular economy outcomes and aim to achieve net zero-waste.
- 9.156 Local Plan Core Policy 22 encourages the inclusion of re-used and recycled materials and encourage on-site re-use and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste while Local Plan Policy DMD 57 sets out detailed criteria and standards. The Council has also prepared Waste and Recycling Storage Planning Guidance. Appropriate conditions will be attached to any permission.

Biodiversity, Trees and Landscaping

- 9.157 The application is supported by an Ecology Report, Tree Constraints Appraisal and landscape plans.
- 9.158 London Plan Policy GG2, G6 and G14 require development to protect and enhance designated nature conservation sites and local spaces, secure net biodiversity gains where possible and incorporate urban greening. Developments resulting in the creation of 100m² of floorspace or one net dwelling or more should provide on-site ecological enhancements having regard to feasibility and viability. Policy DMD79 seeks the provision of on-site ecological enhancements.
- 9.159 The submitted Ecology Report indicated that the existing site is of limited value ecologically given that the majority of it is currently covered by either buildings or hardstanding. The existing buildings were also assessed for the presence of bats and it was concluded that there is limited potential to support roosting bats and no evidence of such roosting taking place. The report included a number of recommendations for further work such as scheduling vegetation and building clearance works between the months of September and February inclusive to avoid impacts on breeding birds.
- 9.160 If approved, conditions/informatives must be attached to ensure details of ecological enhancements such as bat/bird boxes and appropriate landscaping are planted and the recommendations set out in the ecology report are followed.

- 9.161 London Plan Policy G5 supports urban greening and introduces the concept of an Urban Greening Factor and Policy G7 requires existing trees of value to be retained, and any removal to be compensated by adequate replacement. DMD81 sets out that developments must provide high quality landscaping that enhances the local environment and should add to the local character, benefit biodiversity, help mitigate the impacts of climate change and reduce water run-off.
- 9.162 A tree survey was submitted with the application and provides details of the four existing trees on the site which include a Flowering Cherry, two Ash and a small Elder tree. None of the trees are subject to or worthy of protection by tree preservation order nor are they subject to protection through location in a designated conservation area.
- 9.163 The survey sets out that the cherry tree which provides some spring colours through its flowering, is weakened by extensive trunk decay which will only progress. The remaining trees are of poor to low quality and do not make a significant contribution to amenity. The proposed development would include the removal of all four of these trees. However, there is space to the west and south for new tree planting and landscaping. The report sets out that suitable tree species, such as London Plane (which can be pruned), Maple and Alder could be planted at a size to provide immediate visual impact. Trees planted less than 20cm girth for example will appear insignificant in the landscape.
- 9.164 In addition, proposed improvements to the public realm involve new tree planting: details of which are yet to be finalised. However, a condition to this effect is considered appropriate to address siting and specification.
- 9.166 As a result, although all the trees at the site will be removed as part of the development, subject to replacement tree planting of a size to contribute to amenity from the planting stage, the impact of the scheme upon the treed landscape will be low.
- 9.167 In summary, the ecological and landscaping elements of the proposal are acceptable subject to conditions. The new landscaping proposals represent a betterment as the existing site is lacking in any landscaping. In this respect the scheme complies with the relevant London Plan and Enfield policies and the guidance within the NPPF.

Contaminated Land

- 9.168 Environmental Health officers have advised that a pre-commencement condition for further investigation and remediation measures is required to safeguard the amenity of future users.

Air Quality

- 9.169 The proposal would introduce additional residential units to an area already acceptable for residential accommodation. In this respect the proposal is considered acceptable. Local policies CP32 and DMD64 seek to resist developments that would adversely impact on air quality, unless suitable mitigation measures can be achieved.

- 9.170 Environmental Health does not raise any concerns that the proposal would have a negative impact on existing air quality subject to a condition being attached requiring, construction dust and non-road mobile machinery.

Sustainable Drainage / Flooding

- 9.171 London Plan Policy SI16 requires the consideration of the effects of development on sustainable drainage. Policy DMD59 states that new development must avoid and reduce the risk of flooding, and not increase the risk elsewhere. DMD policy 61 states that all developments must maximise the use of and, where possible, retrofit Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Any proposed SuDS measures should be appropriate for the site conditions, seek to achieve greenfield run off rates as well as maximise the use of SuDS.
- 9.172 The site is located in flood zone 2. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted with the application. The EA were consulted and raised no objections.
- 9.173 Following discussion and the receipt of additional information on flood risk assessment and surface water drainage drainage, it is now considered appropriate to secure further details through the imposition of conditions .

Health Impact Assessment

- 9.174 This HIA has reviewed the Proposed Development at 50-56 Fore Street, Enfield to identify potential health impacts, demonstrate how health considerations have been incorporated into the proposals, and to identify opportunities for securing measures that could bring health and wellbeing enhancements in the future delivery of development. The method and scope of the HIA has been tailored to be proportionate to the scale and nature of the Proposed Development. The assessment makes use of the matrix of the HIA HUDU Tool to identify health impacts. The completed matrix also cross references other documents submitted with the planning application that are relevant to the HIA, and that contain greater detail on technical assessment and/or proposed mitigation.
- 9.174 The HIA found that development will predominantly result in beneficial health effects including in relation to housing quality and design, accessibility and active travel, crime reduction and safety, access to healthy foods, work and training, social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods and minimising the use of resources. Potential negative effects were identified in relation to health care service and social infrastructure, due to increased number of residents using local services and infrastructure, however these effects will be mitigated through the provision of CIL contributions.
- 9.175 Potential negative effects were also identified in relation to the comfort of resident when balancing overheating and noise levels when opening windows during warmer periods. To help future residents manage impacts of overheating, the general guidance on managing the risk of overheating (as outlined in the Energy and Sustainability Statements) should be made available to residents (e.g. as part of welcome pack).

10 Public Sector Equalities Duty

10.1 Under the Public Sector Equalities Duty, an equalities impact assessment has been undertaken. It is considered the proposal would not disadvantage people who share one of the different nine protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010 compared to those who do not have those characteristics.

11. S106 Contributions

11.1 Regulation 122(2)(a) of the 2010 CIL Regulations requires that any planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Having regard to this, and the content above Having regard to the content above, it is recommended that should planning permission be granted, the following obligations / contributions should be secured through a s106 legal agreement:

- Affordable Housing – 100% (110 units) London Affordable Rent;
- An early stage viability review;
- Improvements to Conservation Area public realm including £10k to War Memorial
- Local Employment and Skills Strategy - strategy to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of development;
- Highways contributions – £32,364 toward sustainable transport measures and Cycle Enfield;
- Public footway access amendments applicant to maintain and provide public access – S73 works
- Implementation of the loading bay would be at a cost of approximately £15,000 and would be completed through a S73. Contribution to Future CPZ
- Car Club
- Connection to a DEN
- Education Contribution
- Carbon neutral offset
- Architects Retention Clause
- Monitoring fee for the financial contributions.

12. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

12.1 As of the April 2010, new legislation in the form of CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) came into force which would allow 'charging authorities' in England and Wales to apportion a levy on net additional floorspace for certain types of qualifying development to enable the funding of a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development.


12.2 The new GIA proposed as part of the development would be liable to a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution for both Mayoral CIL (£60 per sqm) and Enfield CIL (£140 per sqm for residential and £60 per sqm for A1-A5 uses).

13.0 Conclusion

- 13.1 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is the development plan and the need to determine planning application in accordance with the development plan. It is clear this is a development in a sensitive location wherein the relationship to a number of heritage assets and the wider townscape needs to be carefully assessed in accordance with relevant legislation, guidance and policy.
- 13.2 Members have previously expressed concerns regarding the harm arising from the development on designated and non designated heritage assets, effect arising from the height of the development and the residential mix not providing enough family homes. This prompted the applicant to improve the number of family homes to 20% (an increase from 14 to 22 units) but there have been no changes to the height or design of the development.
- 13.3 The matter to be considered therefore is whether the improved family housing officer as a public benefit, is sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area.
- 13.4 Designated heritage assets are listed as areas or assets of particular importance. In making this assessment of planning balance therefore, Members need to consider the advice on the weight to be given to harm to heritage assets in Paragraphs 9.81- 9.104 of this report. However, the application also has to be considered in the light of the Housing Delivery Test and the need for housing to meet the Council's strategic housing targets, triggering the tilted balance in any assessment and the presumption that planning permission should be granted unless "any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole" (Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF). Furthermore, Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, acknowledges that planning permission should be granted unless "the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed".
- 13.5 Having regard to the assessment in this report and the improved residential mix, it is concluded the development would cause 'less than substantial harm' to identified heritage assets.
- 13.6 Where there is 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the public benefits of the development include:
- i) 110 new residential homes
 - ii) 100% of the residential units being genuinely affordable and provided at London Affordable Rent
 - iii) replacement multi use commercial space
 - iv) enhancement of Clive Avenue to address anti-social activity
 - v) employment opportunities during construction
 - vi) investment into Fore Street

It is considered that these public benefits especially the fact that the all the residential units would be provided at London Affordable Rent, outweigh the 'less than substantial harm' identified.

- 13.7 Consequently, it is considered the application of policies in the Framework which protect areas or assets of particular importance do not provide a clear reason for refusal. As mentioned above, Limb ii. of paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is therefore engaged, whereby planning permission should be granted unless *“any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”*.
- 13.8 It is acknowledged and as is recognised throughout this report, that consideration of this proposal has involved finely balanced judgements. Compromises have been made in the consideration of the proposal in order to optimise the development potential of this highly sustainable brownfield site and thus contribute to the Boroughs challenging housing targets. It is recognised that sites such as this need to be optimised in order to contribute to housing delivery and minimise encroachment into the Borough’s Green Belt and other protected designations.
- 13.9 It is also considered that the social benefits of the proposal carry significant weight in favour of the proposed development. Further economic and social benefits include employment during construction, as well as the continued and improved use of local services and facilities.
- 13.10 It is considered that the conflicts identified with other Development Plan policies, as identified in the analysis section of this report, would not on their own or cumulatively significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.
- 13.11 Overall therefore, it is considered the application proposes a high-quality residential development on existing underutilised, highly sustainable brownfield land. It is acknowledged that due to the quantum of homes proposed and the resultant extent of site coverage there are shortcomings to the proposal as identified in the analysis section of this report. However, it is also recognised that there is a pressing need for housing, including affordable housing within the Borough, and Enfield has an extremely challenging 10-year housing delivery target. In this context the provision of 110 homes all of which would be delivered at London Affordable Rent represents a significant contribution and weighs heavily in favour of the development despite the acknowledged deficiencies with the proposal.
- 13.12 In conclusion, and giving weight to the need for development which provide new homes, it is concluded that the development for reasons set-out within this report, to broadly accord with the adopted policy framework as well as relevant emerging policy. Subject to the appropriate mitigations as set out within the recommended condition schedule, and within the Section 106 Agreement, the application is recommended for approval.





56-66 Fore Street

Claremont Street

50-56 Fore Street
Site Boundary

48-42 Fore Street

1 Existing Elevation - Fore Street
Scale 1:100





Clive Avenue


50-56 Fore St
Site Boundary

Fore Street

2 Existing Elevation - Claremont Street
Scale 1:100



Site Location
1:500






Site Location Plan
1:1250



1 Proposed Elevation - Claremont St & Grove St
Scale 1:200



2 Existing Elevation - Claremont St & Grove St
Scale 1:200

Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	29.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend

Note:
Highways works shown indicatively only

Existing & Proposed Elevations Claremont FSE 105
drawing title drawing number

Social Capital Partners
Fore Street, Enfield
client / project

1:200 scale @ A1
1:400 scale @ A3

SHP-FSE project number




P01 revision

AMR originated by

FOR PLANNING
status

HTA Design LLP
www.hta.co.uk
London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol






Site Location Plan
1:1250



1 Proposed Elevation - Fore Street
Scale 1:200



2 Existing Elevation - Fore Street
Scale 1:200



Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	29.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend



Existing & Proposed Fore St Elevations
drawing title
Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
Fore Street, Enfield
client / project

FSE 104
drawing number

1:200 scale @ A1
1:400 scale @ A3

SHP-FSE
project number

P01
revision

AMR
originated by

HTA Design LLP
www.hta.co.uk

London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol

FOR PLANNING
status







Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	28.05.20	AMR	Planning Application


Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

- Legend
- Site boundary
 - Roof Level - No General Access
 - Private Outdoor Amenity
- Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



<p>Proposed 03-16 Floor Plans</p> <p>client / project Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited Fore Street, Enfield</p> <p>FOR PLANNING</p>	<p>HTA-AP03</p> <p>drawing number</p> <p>1:100 @ A1 1:200 @ A3</p> <p>HTA Design LLP www.hta.co.uk London Edinburgh Manchester Bristol</p>	<p>P01</p> <p>revision</p> <p>SHP-FSE</p> <p>project number</p> <p>RSH</p> <p>originated by</p>
---	--	--





Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	03.04.23	ZAB	Draft Issue

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.
 This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

- Legend**
- Site boundary
 - Roof Level - No General Access
 - Private Outdoor Amenity

Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Basement Floor
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

HTA-AP00
 drawing number

1:100 1:200
 scale @ A1 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number

P01
 revision

RSH
 originated by

DRAFT
 status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol







Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	23.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.


This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend
 — Site boundary

Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed First Floor Plan <small>drawing title</small> Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited <small>client / project</small> Fore Street, Enfield	HTA-AP01 <small>drawing number</small> 1:100 1:200 <small>scale @ A1 @ A3</small> SHP-FSE <small>project number</small> RSH <small>originated by</small> hta	P01 <small>revision</small>
FOR PLANNING <small>status</small>	<small>HTA Design LLP</small> <small>www.hta.co.uk</small> <small>London Edinburgh Manchester Bristol</small>	



Rev Date Drawn Description
 P01 03.04.23 ZAB Draft Issue


Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend

- Site boundary
- Roof Level - No General Access
- Private Outdoor Amenity

Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Ground Floor Plan HTA-AP01
 drawing title drawing number

Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

1:100 1:200
 scale @ A1 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number

RSH
 originated by

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol

DRAFT
 status

P01
 revision

hta





Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	29.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend
 — Site boundary

Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Mezzanine Plan
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

HTA-AP00-M
 drawing number

P01
 revision

1:100 **1:200**
 scale @ A1 @ A3


SHP-FSE
 project number

RSH
 originated by

FOR PLANNING
 status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol







Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	29.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

- Legend**
- Site boundary
 - Roof Level - No General Access
 - Outdoor Private Amenity
- Note:**
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Roof Plan
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project


HTA-AP04
 drawing number
 1:100 @ A1
 1:200 @ A1

P01
 revision
 SHP-FSE
 project number
 RSH
 originated by

DRAFT
 status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol







Rev Date Drawn Description
 P01 03.04.23 ZAB Draft Issue

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend
 Site boundary
 Roof Level - No General Access
 Private Outdoor Amenity

Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Second Floor Plan HTA-AP02
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

1:100
 scale @ A1

1:200
 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number

HTA
 originated by



HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol

DRAFT
 status

P01
 revision




- ▽ Top of Lift Overrun
- ▽ Top of Parpet
- ▽ Finished Roof Level
- ▽ Level 16 FFL
- ▽ Level 15 FFL
- ▽ Level 14 FFL
- ▽ Level 13 FFL
- ▽ Level 12 FFL
- ▽ Level 11 FFL
- ▽ Level 10 FFL
- ▽ Level 09 FFL
- ▽ Level 08 FFL
- ▽ Level 07 FFL
- ▽ Level 06 FFL
- ▽ Level 05 FFL
- ▽ Level 04 FFL
- ▽ Level 03 FFL
- ▽ Level 02 FFL
- ▽ Level 01 FFL



- Legend**
- Brickwork - Off-white brick, light coloured mortar, running bond (spec TBC)
 - Glazed brick, stacked bond tosetback wall and colonnade soffit, dark bronze colour (spec TBC)
 - Window frames & curtain wall, Granite Grey (RAL colour TBC)
 - Aluminium pressed metal spandrel panels, Granite Grey (spec TBC)
 - Reconstituted stone string course, off-white colour (spec TBC)
 - Railings, copings and reveals, PPC Aluminium (RAL colour TBC)
 - Standing seam mansard roof, anthracite colour (spec TBC)

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.
 This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.



Proposed Section AA - East-West FSE 260
 drawing title drawing number
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 client project number
 Scale
 1:100 @ A1 1:200 @ A3
 SHP-FSE
 project number
 P01
 revision
 ZHL
 originated by

FOR PLANNING
 Status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol



▽ Top of Lift Overrun

▽ Top of Parpet

▽ Finished Roof Level

▽ Level 16 FFL

▽ Level 15 FFL

▽ Level 14 FFL

▽ Level 13 FFL

▽ Level 12 FFL

▽ Level 11 FFL

▽ Level 10 FFL

▽ Level 09 FFL

▽ Level 08 FFL

▽ Level 07 FFL

▽ Level 06 FFL



▽ Level 05 FFL

▽ Level 04 FFL








▽ Level 03 FFL

▽ Level 02 FFL

▽ Level 01 FFL




Legend

-  Brickwork - Off-white brick, light coloured mortar, running bond (spec TBC)
-  Glazed brick, stacked bond tosetback wall and colonnade soffit, dark bronze colour (spec TBC)
-  Window frames & curtain wall, Granite Grey (RAL colour TBC)
-  Aluminium pressed metal spandrel panels, Granite Grey (spec TBC)
-  Reconstituted stone string course, off-white colour (spec TBC)
-  Railings, copings and reveals, PPC Aluminium (RAL colour TBC)
-  Standing seam mansard roof, anthracite colour (spec TBC)

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.

This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.



Proposed Section BB - North-South FSE 261
 drawing number

Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 client / project

Scale
 1:100 @ A1 1:200 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number

P01
 revision

ZHL
 originated by

FOR PLANNING
 status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol






Rev Date Drawn Description
 P01 29.05.20 AMR Planning Application

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.
 This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

Legend
 — Site boundary
 Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Proposed Site Plan
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

FSE 103
 drawing number

P01
 revision


1:200 1:400
 scale @ A1 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number
 AMR
 originated by

FOR PLANNING
 status

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol






Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	03.04.23	ZAB	Draft issue

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.


This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.



- Legend
- Site boundary
 - Roof Level - No General Access
 - Private Outdoor Amenity
- Note:
 Highways works shown indicatively only



<p>Proposed Third Floor Plan</p> <p>Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited Fore Street, Enfield client / project</p> <p>DRAFT <small>status</small></p>	<p>HTA-AP05</p> <p>drawing title drawing number</p> <p>1:100 1:200 <small>scale @ A1 @ A3</small></p> <p>HTA Design LLP www.hta.co.uk London Edinburgh Manchester Bristol</p>	<p>P01</p> <p>revision</p> <p>SHP-FSE</p> <p>project number</p> <p>RSH</p> <p>originated by</p> <p>hta</p>
---	--	--

Legend

 Site boundary



P01 29.05.20 AMR Planning Application
 Rev Date Drawn Description
 08/05/20

FOR PLANNING
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 50-56 Fore Street
 drawing title
Site Location Plan

drawing number
FSE 100
 scale W A3
 1:1250
 HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk

revision
P01

originated by
 ECH
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol







Rev	Date	Drawn	Description
P01	28.05.20	AMR	Planning Application

Notes:
 Do not scale from drawings unless by agreement with HTA. Use figured dimensions only. Check all dimensions on site prior to commencing the works. Drawing to be read in conjunction with other relevant consultant information.
 This drawing is the copyright of HTA Design LLP and must not be copied or reproduced in part, or in whole, without the express permission of HTA Design LLP. Drawing to be read in conjunction with specification.

- Legend**
- Site boundary
 - Roof Level - No General Access
 - Private Outdoor Amenity
- Note:**
 Highways works shown indicatively only



Typical Upper Floor
 drawing title
 Social Housing Plus Fore Street Limited
 Fore Street, Enfield
 client / project

HTA-AP03
 drawing number

P01
 revision

1:100 1:200
 scale @ A1 @ A3

SHP-FSE
 project number

RSH
 originated by

HTA Design LLP
 www.hta.co.uk
 London | Edinburgh | Manchester | Bristol

FOR PLANNING
 status

hta