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PLANNING COMMITTEE Date: 1st May 2018

Report of Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning
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Ray Reilly Tel: 020 8379 3579

Ward: Bush Hill Park

Application Number: 17/01864/FUL

LOCATION: Capitol House, 794 Green Lanes, London, N21 2SH

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of site involving demolition of existing building to provide a part 6-part 7 storey block of 91 residential units comprising (49 x 1 bed, 32 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 beds) involving balconies together with parking at basement level, landscaping, private and communal amenity space. (Amended Description)

Applicant Name & Address: Capital House Developments Ltd C/O Agent.

Agent Name & Address:
Mr John Richards
KD Tower
C/o Dandra LTD
Cotterells
Hemel Hempstead
Herts
UK
HP1 1FW

RECOMMENDATION: 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 the following conditions.
1. Site and surroundings

1.1 The application site is addressed as Capitol House, 794 Green Lanes, London, N21 2SH. At present the site is occupied by a 5 storey B1 Office building with a parking undercroft area at ground floor level and 4 storeys over the upper floors laid out as offices.

1.2 The site is located on the eastern side of Green Lanes just north of the junction with Green Lanes, Fords Grove and Station Road. It is principally a rectangular flat site that is bounded by the Green Lanes thoroughfare to the west, the New River Canal to the rear/ east and the Paulin Sports ground further beyond the river. To the north the site is bounded by a three storey block of flats with associated garages and outside amenity area and to the south sits an attractive 2 storey red brick building that accommodates the Coffee Break coffee shop on the ground floor and residential flats over the upper floor levels.

1.3 The surrounding area is mixed in character. Green Lanes by its nature is predominantly commercial especially to the south of the site although there is a residential element over the upper floors. The character of the area is predominantly 2 to 3 storey buildings with hipped and gable end roofs. The existing 5 storey Capitol House office building is the most obvious exception to this in the surrounding area.

1.4 The site has a PTAL rating of 3, and has an area of approximately 2750sqm of 0.275ha. The area is classed as suburban/ urban. The frontage of the site along Green Lanes has a length of approximately 87.5m and an average depth of 32m.

1.5 There are no specific planning constraints affecting the site with the exception of standard wildlife and other general constraints to not build within an 8m distance of the New River to the rear. The site is outside of any identified commercial or local parades on Green Lanes.

2. Proposal

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of site involving demolition of existing building to provide a part 6-part 7 storey block of 91 residential units comprising (49 x 1 bed, 32 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 beds) involving balconies together with parking at basement level, landscaping, private and communal amenity space.

2.2 On the Green Lanes frontage the building would measure 69m in width with an average depth of 18m in a stepped nature on the site. The overall height would be 21.5 metres to the top of the recessed 7th floor level and 18.5m to the 6th storey level. The building would be set between 3.5 and 8 metres back from the Green Lanes frontage due to the stepped nature of the proposed front elevation and distances of between 3m to 8m from the rear boundary line along the New River. It would be set 10.5m from the northern boundary with Carlton House and 9.6m from the southern boundary with 792 Green Lanes.

2.3 Due to discussions in relation to scheme viability and the council seeking a greater level of affordable housing on the site, the application now proposes
91 flats an increase from the original 84 with a unit mix of (49 x 1 bed, 32 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 beds) with associated rear gardens, balconies or terraces on all elevations to serve as private amenity space for each respective flat. Five of the units would be accessed directly from Green Lanes with their own front door with the rest of the flats accessed via communal halls, stairwells and lift access.

2.4 The vehicular access to the site would be maintained at the northern end of the site as existing, which will lead vehicles down into the basement car park and allow for servicing and refuse access to the refuse storage area at the northern end of the building.

2.5 A total of 51 car parking spaces (9 disabled spaces), representing a parking ratio of 0.56. The basement area to the rear would also accommodate communal cycle storage where 107 cycle parking spaces would be provided. There is a communal refuse storage area along with further cycle storage areas split over both basement and ground floor level.

3. Relevant planning history

3.1 14/02872/PREAPP: Conversion of existing offices to provide 100 residential units. Pre-Application Advice Given.

3.2 15/05853/PREAPP: Proposed conversion of existing offices to provide 100 residential units. (Follow up to 14/02872/PREAPP)- Pre-Application Advice Given.

3.3 17/01080/PRJ: Change of use from offices (Class B1 (a)) to residential (Class C3) creating 65 self-contained units (5 x studio, 52 x 1-bed, 8 x 2-bed) - Granted- Prior Approval not required.

4. Consultation

4.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Traffic and Transportation

4.1.1 Traffic and Transportation initially considered there was an insufficient number of car parking spaces on site to accommodate the development. However due to the amended proposal and greater number of smaller 1 and 2 bed flats along with shared ownership units, on balance the parking numbers are considered acceptable. It is also considered that other issues such as the access, cycle parking and pedestrian access to be acceptable subject to conditions.

Environmental Health

4.1.2 Environmental Health raise no objection to the development subject to necessary conditions.

Housing

4.1.3 The Housing team advise that Enfield’s Core Policy 5 requires 40% of new housing to be affordable and a mix of tenures and sizes. On this basis 40% of the units to be affordable would equate to 36. This would then be further split
70:30 between rent and shared ownership, which equates to 25 units for rent and 11 for shared ownership. The Council's policy also requires 10% of the units, in this case 10, to be built to Stephen Thorpe/Habinteg wheelchair design standard.

Environment Agency

4.1.4 No objections.

Thames Water

4.1.5 No objections subject to conditions in relation to piling and surface drainage.

Fire Brigade

4.1.6 No objections subject to the scheme complying with Building Regulations approved document B B5.

Metropolitan Police

4.1.8 There have been a number of concerns raised in relation to the security and designing out crime elements of the scheme principally items in relation to boundary treatments, details of security gates and basement elements. However it has been agreed that these issues would not constitute refusal of the application and further details of these elements can be secured by condition.

4.2 Public Consultations

4.2.1 690 neighbouring properties were consulted with the 21 day public consultation period started on the 12th of May 2017 and concluded on the 7th of June 2017. 3 Site notices were posted close to the site on 20th of May 2017 and the application was also advertised in the local paper.

4.2.2 11 objections have been received from local residents. Their concerns are summarised as below:

- Overdevelopment and out of character with the surrounding area.
- The building dwarfs the attractive coffee house building next door. Object to the loss of the local community public house and beer garden.
- This simply looks like a central London tower block. It might be cheap to build in this style, but it does nothing for the area.
- Not enough parking space proposed for the number of flats.
- Developer should be encouraging more people to cycle.
- There will be a knock on effect to parking particularly in the evening periods on street.
- Too much parking proposed and too much traffic as a result. Based on the sites accessibility to public transport, buses and rail and the new cycle lane, then on site car parking should be reduced to encourage sustainable travel.
- Increased congestion to the Station Road- Green Lanes junction.
- New building will be too close to Carlton House and impact upon outlook, levels of light and general amenity.
- Direct overlooking onto Carlton House.
This development will have an impact onto local schools and services such as doctors etc.
A lot of noise created from the additional residents and also the construction/demolition works.
Height of proposed development is excessive and out of keeping with existing buildings in the local area.
Agree to the demolition of the current building but the proposed building by comparison is excessively high and dominant to the surrounding area.
The loss of jobs is part of an overall trend that will intensify as more offices are converted to residential use under permitted development rights. This is a trend that the London Borough of Enfield should monitor carefully and on which it might need to make representations to Government.
School capacity in the area needs to be increased to accommodate this development or request contributions from the developer to cover this.
Transport Assessment is outdated and clearly shows a lack of parking provision.
The development site suffers from Japanese Knot weed. The development and extraction of this dangerous weed must be conducted in a manner so as to protect local property and the fragile ecology of the New River, which includes protected species.
Fords Grove is used weekdays by commuters and local businesses and has been further negatively impacted by the recent loss of Fords Grove car park, introduction of passing bays and the refusal of Enfield to introduce resident parking, despite a majority of residents being in favour.

4.2.3 Winchmore Hill Residents Association

- Encouraged by the removal of the existing office building that is out of scale with the area, but the proposed building is considered more out of scale and would be more dominant.
- The façade of the proposed building is articulated which provides greater interest and helps to break down the length of the building but the “rhythm” bears little relation to any of its surroundings. The buildings containing the shops along The Broadway have a very distinct rhythm. We are concluding therefore that The Broadway is and should remain the dominant “place” but the proposed building bears no correlation to it. The scale and size of the proposals compete with and will tend to overwhelm The Broadway.
- Accept the principle of “change of use” from office to residential, to assist in reducing the housing shortage, but there doesn’t appear to be any positive numerical statement regarding “affordable” housing.

4.2.4 Southgate District Civic Trust

- It has a more interesting façade than the existing block and we note the green roof areas. The amenity space is difficult to evaluate but it includes a play area for children which is unusual and a good amenity idea if indeed there are going to be children of a suitable age to use it living in the flats. The riverside at the rear of the block will no doubt be used as a visual attribute to that area.
• The group had reservations regarding the increase in height from the existing, which would give it bulk and more prominence in that position.

• This is the result of permitted development rights allowing conversion as exemplified by this scheme. It is a cumulative loss of local employment. This is a trend that we consider Enfield Council should bear in mind when seeking to create balanced communities with mixed uses in the borough.

5. **Relevant Policy**

5.1 **London Plan 2018 (Text to consider draft London Plan)**

| 3.3 | Increasing housing supply |
| 3.4 | Optimising housing potential |
| 3.5 | Quality and design of housing development |
| 3.6 | Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities |
| 3.8 | Housing choice |
| 3.9 | Mixed and balanced communities |
| 3.10 | Definition of affordable housing |
| 3.11 | Affordable housing targets |
| 3.12 | Negotiating affordable housing on schemes |
| 3.13 | Affordable housing thresholds |
| 4.1 | Developing London’s economy |
| 5.1 | Climate change mitigation |
| 5.2 | Minimising carbon dioxide emissions |
| 5.3 | Sustainable design and construction |
| 5.7 | Renewable energy |
| 5.8 | Innovative energy technologies |
| 5.10 | Urban greening |
| 5.11 | Green roofs and development site environs |
| 5.12 | Flood risk management |
| 5.13 | Sustainable drainage |
| 5.14 | Water quality and wastewater infrastructure |
| 5.15 | Water use and supplies |
| 5.16 | Waste self sufficiency |
| 5.18 | Construction, excavation and demolition waste |
| 5.21 | Contaminated land |
| 6.3 | Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity |
| 6.9 | Cycling |
| 6.10 | Walking |
| 6.12 | Road network capacity |
| 6.13 | Parking |
| 7.1 | Building London’s neighbours and communities |
| 7.2 | An inclusive environment |
| 7.3 | Designing out crime |
| 7.4 | Local character |
| 7.5 | Public realm |
| 7.6 | Architecture |
| 7.8 | Heritage Assets and archaeology |
| 7.19 | Biodiversity and access to nature |

5.2 **Core Strategy**

CP2 Housing supply and locations for new homes
CP3 Affordable housing
5.3 Development Management Document

DMD1 Affordable Housing on site capable of providing 10 or more units.
DMD3 Providing a Mix of Different Sized Homes
DMD6 Residential Character
DMD8 General Standards for New Residential Development
DMD9 Amenity Space
DMD10 Distancing
DMD17 Protection of community facilities
DMD37 Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development
DMD47 New Roads, Access and Servicing
DMD49 Sustainable Design and Construction Statements
DMD50 Environmental Assessment Methods
DMD51 Energy Efficiency Standards
DMD64 Pollution Control and Assessment
DMD68 Noise
DMD69 Light Pollution
DMD77 Green Chains
DMD78 Nature Conservation

5.4 Other Relevant Policy

- National Planning Policy Framework

5.5 Other Material Considerations

- The Mayors Housing SPG (2012)
- Affordable housing SPG
- Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document (Nov.2015)
- Enfield Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2010)
- Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG

- Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG;
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPG;
6. **Analysis**

6.1 The main issues for consideration regarding this application are as follows:

- Principle of the Development
- Scale and Density
- Design and Impact on the Character of the Surrounding Area
- Neighbouring Amenity
- Standard of Accommodation and Proposed Mix of Units
- Private Amenity provisions
- Traffic, Parking and Servicing Issues
- Affordable Housing and other S106 Contributions
- Sustainability
- Tree Issues

6.2 **Principle of the Development**

6.2.1 The proposal would be compatible with Policies 3.3 and 3.4 of the London Plan and Core Policy 2 of the Local Development Framework insofar as it provides an addition to the Borough’s housing stock which actively contributes towards both Borough specific and London-wide strategic housing targets.

6.2.2 As identified within the updated London Plan 2016 and emerging London Plan (2018), there is a significant need for additional housing in the borough and in this case this application is considered to be an efficient use of a previous developed brownfield site, proposing a mixed use development providing 91 additional homes incorporating 10 x 3 bed family units and 24 x 2 bed 4 person units all of which could feasibly provide for viable family accommodation; a 37% ratio of the total units proposed. There has also been significant discussion and negotiation of the affordable housing element on the site with officers and this has been reviewed by an independent appointed viability consultant and it has been agreed provisionally by officers and allowing for other relevant costs such as CIL and other Section 106 monies that the scheme can viably provide for 18 Affordable Units as Shared Ownership which equates to 20% of the overall scheme.

6.2.3 Consideration must also be given to the loss of the existing office use on the site. Regardless of policy considerations to protect office space in the borough, due regards must be given to the fact that under current Permitted Development legislation Class O (which allows for the conversion of offices into residential accommodation without the need for planning permission this office building can be converted into residential flats. Under application 17/01080/PRJ the applicant has already obtained prior approval to convert...
the current office building onto 65 flats. Therefore this a significant material consideration with regards the protection of the existing office use on the site.

6.2.4 Core Strategy policies CP13 Promoting Economic Prosperity and CP16 Taking part in economic success and improving skills are specific policies that promotes jobs and economic prosperity in the borough with specific focus on job creation in Enfield Town Area, Southgate Town Centre and the Eastern industrial areas of the borough. Policy 19 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to protect existing office provision in Enfield and Southgate town centres but recognises that elsewhere, they will “support the conversion of surplus offices in other centres to other uses, where it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for offices in this location”. Paras. 6.73 and 6.74 recognise the findings of both the GLA ‘London Office Policy Review’ (2007) and ‘Enfield’s Retail and Town Centre Study’ (2007) which conclude that “Enfield Town and Southgate can be promoted as locations for office provision, as part of wider mixed use schemes, and that other centres in the Borough should not be actively promoted for office development”.

6.2.5 In addition to inform the preparation of the DMD, following adoption of the Core Strategy, the Council commissioned an ‘Employment Land Review’ (2012). The review recognises that there are very few concentrations of office accommodation in the Borough, focused primarily at Southgate, Edmonton, Enfield Town and Enfield Lock / Innova, to a degree that “Enfield has not established itself as an office centre, even in previous office market booms and there has been limited or no speculative development” (para. 4.51). This view was echoed by the 2009 London Office Policy Review (LOPR) which noted that office development in Enfield in recent years has been very low, with “none of the commercial centres in the Borough showing any signs of real life”.

6.2.6 Policy 22 of the adopted DMD supplements Core Policy 19 and explains that proposals involving a change of use that would result in a loss or reduction of employment outside of designated employment locations will be refused, “…unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable and viable for continued employment use”. To demonstrate whether an existing employment site remains suitable and viable for continued employment use, an Applicant is expected to have regard to Appendix 13 of the adopted DMD which sets out requirements for preparing market demand and viability reports to accompany planning applications.

6.2.7 To justify the loss of the office building the applicant has prepared 2 marketing reports one prepared by Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) considers the suitability and viability of Capitol House from a national and regional office market perspective whilst the report prepared by Bowyer Bryce considers a more localised office market context.

6.2.8 These reports have raised a number of conclusions summarised as follows:

- The HMRC previous occupants of the office building have moved out of the building as part of a rationalisation of HMRC office spaces nationally to relocate from 170 offices spread around the country to 13 regional centres.

- Capitol House is an isolated office building in this area of Enfield not in an established office location and outside of the main centralised areas that the Council itself is looking to establish office employment.
The size of Capitol House at almost 4000sqm is not a particularly sought after office space in Enfield where the main office demand is for small businesses. The applicants have also argued that the existing building does not particularly lend itself to been easily broken up into smaller offices.

In addition the building is dated and tired with a number of problems with services etc. Significant investment would be needed to address concerns bring it back to a reasonable standard for letting of which it is claimed there is no significant demand. There would be a need for significant external and internal improvements in order for it to compete against existing vacant stock in more sought after commercial locations in the borough, including wholesale recladding, installation of air-conditioning, communications / IT upgrades, improved floor-to ceiling heights and thermal efficiency upgrades.

6.2.9 Officers have taken all of these arguments on board and on balance it is considered that the principle of the development involving the loss of the office use is acceptable. Notwithstanding the fact that the applicant has permitted development rights to convert the existing office building into 65 residential flats and result in the loss of the office use in any event, it is considered that there is also a justifiable planning policy argument. The office use is historic on site, but in accordance with latest planning policy in relation to office/ employment sites were it to come forward as a new office use, it is in a location that the council would not naturally encourage. In addition to this the applicants argument in relation to the current condition of the building and associated costs appear reasonable. However, the main benefit is the net gain in housing proposed including 18 affordable housing units in a relatively sustainable location and this is considered to override the retention of the office building. Weight should also to the removal of an unattractive building from the streetscene to be replaced by a building of significantly better architectural quality.

6.2.10 In conclusion with all factors considered the principle of the development should be encouraged.

6.3 Density

6.3.1 Density assessments must acknowledge guidance outlined in the NPPF and particularly the London Plan, which encourage greater flexibility in the application of policies to promote higher densities, although they must also be appropriate for the area.

6.3.2 Policy 3.4 (Table 3.2) of the London Plan sets standards for appropriate density levels with regards to location, existing building form, massing, and having regard to the PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) score. The site has a site specific PTAL rating of 3 and is in an area that can be classed and a suburban/ urban location. The guidance in (Table 3.2) of the London Plan would suggest a density of between 150-450 hr/ha may be acceptable. The amended scheme proposes 91 units and 234 habitable rooms which would give a density of approximately 850 hr/ha. Therefore from a numerical standpoint these figures show a density significantly larger than that outlined in the London Plan.

6.3.3 However, it must be noted that this method of calculating density is not the sole basis of any assessment to determine if the quantum of development is acceptable on a site and should really be only an indicative guide. Consideration must, therefore also be given to the scale of development, (in this case to the scale of the existing building that is to be replaced on the
site), its relationship with the neighbouring development and the pattern and scale of development in the local area, the standard and quality of accommodation proposed and the impact onto neighbouring amenity. In addition with regards a development of such scale, the general day to day functionality of the site with regards to general activity, traffic generation and any perceived impact on car parking, particularly on street car parking in the area is a key consideration. Furthermore the latest draft iteration of the London Plan and the direction of travel from the Mayor of London seeking to remove density thresholds in order to promote higher scale housing on sites such as this with available space and suitable for higher quantum’s of housing in relatively sustainable location.

6.4 Scale, Design, Character and Impact on the Surroundings

6.4.1 Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan in particular policies 7.1 – 7.6. Policies CP4 (Housing Quality) and CP 30 Maintaining & Improving the Quality of the Built Environment are also relevant as well as Policy 37 of the Development Management Document. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 56 attaches great importance to the design of the built environment wherein it advocates good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

6.4.2 With regards to the suitability of the scale, massing and siting of the proposed building it is considered the most logical starting point would be to assess it against the scale and siting of the existing office building.

Existing Office Building

- 5 Storeys in height to a height of 16.8m from ground level with a height to roof level lift shaft of 19.7m.
- 64m wide and 14m deep on the site.
- Set 7.5m on average from Green Lanes Public Highway, 13.5m from Carlton House to northern boundary, 9m from southern boundary with 792 Green Lanes and between 6m and 11m from the rear boundary of the site next the New River.

Proposed Residential Building

- Part 6 to Part 7 storeys in height ranging between heights of 18.5m to 21.5m.
- 69m Wide and average depth of 18m in a stepped nature on the site.
- Set on average between 3.5 to 8 metres back from the Green Lanes frontage due to the stepped nature of the proposed front elevation.
- Set 10.5m from Carlton House to northern boundary, 9.6m from southern boundary with 792 Green Lanes and between 3m and 8m from the rear boundary of the site next the New River bank/ pathway.

Key Differences to current office building.

- The proposed building is approximately 1.5 storeys higher than the current office building and between 1.7m to 4.5m higher.
- It is on average 6m wider and 4m deeper.
- Set 3m closer to northern boundary and on average 3m closer to Green Lanes frontage with a stepped elevation and on average 3m closer to the rear site boundary with the New River.
Figure 1 Comparison Image of Proposed Elevation overlapped by existing elevation footprint.
Figures 2 and 3 Comparison Images on North Bound Approach
Figures 4 and 5 Comparison Images on Southbound Approach
Figures 6 and 7 Comparison Images from Queens Avenue
6.4.3 The application proposes the demolition of the current building and the redevelopment of the site through the erection of a part 6 and part 7 storey building. It would have a generally rectangular form with stepped front and rear elevation aligning with the site’s shape and would form a new frontage onto Green Lanes. The frontage of the building on Green Lanes would be 69m wide and consists of a part 6 storey building with a recessed cladded 7th floor.
6.4.4 The building would have a contemporary appearance with a mixed material palette. The predominant material would be brick with a combination of red-multi bricks on the outer face of the elevations and a recessed complementary element of a mixed dark brown stock brick and white bricks at the lower ground level. The front elevation would also be broken up by two main staircore sections that would be clad with a dark grey metal cladding. The elevation would also be interspersed and broken up with a series of glazed balconies and terraces along with each storey level being broken up and split by reconstituted stone stringcourses. The recessed 7th floor level is proposed in a lighter off white terracotta metal cladding in an attempt to make it more recessed and subservient to the main 6 storey building below.

6.4.5 It should be noted that the proposed scheme has evolved significantly over the course of two pre-application periods as well as during the course of the life of this application.

6.4.6 The applicant has sought to address concerns raised at pre-application stage, in relation to the overall scale, massing, layout and elevational treatment and layouts of the building when a larger development was proposed. It is now considered that the scale and massing of the building is appropriate for this urban setting and having regard to the existing building and the surrounding context of the site. Officers are obviously mindful of the high density that is and the fact that it is a large building. However taking into account the revised design and the benefits of additional housing and quality of the housing above that which could be achieved by the implementation of the PRH scheme the quantum of development is considered acceptable.

6.4.7 It also has to be noted that the application site is a relatively large plot in excess of quarter of a hectare on a section of Green Lanes which is also a relatively busy traffic thoroughfare in both north and south direction with a wide public highway including wide public footpaths to the side especially on this eastern side of Green Lanes. In addition with the existing office building separated from the neighbouring buildings on either side of the site, within the context of the streetscape there is a notable sense of space as one walks or drives through this particular section of Green Lanes. As such it is considered that the site can suitably accommodate the scale, height and associated massing of the building proposed. Due regard is given to the fact the proposed development is higher than the current office building however this is only by a perceived height of 1.5 storeys and due regard must be given to the fact that the 7th floor would be slightly recessed back to appear subordinate on the building and it is only certain angles on the approach to the building that this seventh floor would be seen. This additional visual impact is not considered to cause any harm sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.

6.4.8 It is also acknowledged that the building would come forward towards Green Lanes and be more prominent than the existing office building by an average additional depth of 3m. Originally at pre-application stage the development was proposed as one straight rectangular block set a standard distance to the back of the public footpath. This massing was considered to be too dominant but also the frontage in particular lacked sufficient detailing and articulation in the design elements to break up the elevation. Officers advised the application to apply a stepped approach along this main front elevation along with introducing a second staircore to help break up the massing and bulk of the building. This has been applied to the application submission and it is considered that the combination of this stepped approach setting the building back at variable distances from the public footpath along with the 2 staircores breaking up the massing of the main front elevation is successful and has
assisted in the proposal appearing much less bulky and dominant with the streetscene.

6.4.9 From the perspective of design and appearance, the elevational treatments and material palette have been simplified since the pre-application submissions which were considered too busy, with too much of a contrast in materials. The design now proposes a crisper, cleaner appearance with two main brick materials a red multi stock and dark grey/brown multi brick complemented by grey metal cladding breaking up the elevations through the 2 staircore. The 7th floor due to its lighter cladded colour and recessed siting, is also considered to complement the main 6 storey section at the front. The appearance of the building is also enhanced with the use of the fenestration and glazed balconies along with the stringcourses of constituted stones, that assist in breaking up the elevations vertically. Overall it is considered that the proposed materials and how they are used across the elevations provide the development with an attractive and interesting visual appearance. The main red brick frontage synonymous with Green Lanes is continued through the elevations and the stringcourses of constituted stone help to resemble the elevation treatment of the retail parades to the south along with the architectural features of 792 Green Lanes adjacent.

6.4.10 In conclusion for all the reasons outlined as above the design, scale, appearance and impact on the character of the area associated with this proposed development is considered acceptable. It would integrate acceptably into the surroundings having regard to policies DMD6, 8, 37 and, CP30 of the Core Strategy and London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

6.5 Neighbouring Amenity

6.5.1 From the perspective of neighbouring amenity, it is considered the proposal should be assessed with relation to the following properties.

- 1-10 Carlton House (Block of Flats to the Immediate North)
- 792 Green Lanes (Coffee Shop building with flats overhead to the immediate south).

It is considered that all other properties including those opposite on Green Lanes and further south at the crossroads junction with Station Road and Ford’s Grove are sufficiently separated from the proposal to not be affected. The occupants of these property will obviously visibly notice the development.
but with regards to other matters such as unduly loss of outlook and access to daylight and sunlight, they are sufficiently separated to not be affected.

1-10 Carlton House

6.5.2 Number 1-10 Carlton House is a 3 storey block of 10 flats that sits to the immediate north of the site. The north end of the building would be set 10.5m from the boundary with this building and 21.3m from to the closest south facing elevation of Carlton House itself. Originally at pre-application stage, there were windows and balconies that faced into Carlton House. This was considered unacceptable on grounds of privacy and overlooking. The applicant has since changed the design and there are no longer habitable rooms windows facing north with the exception of high level slotted windows that would be above eye level. In addition to this the balconies at the front and rear of the development at the northern corners have been secured with louvered metal screens to avoid undue overlooking onto the occupants of Carlton House.

6.5.3 It is noted that there are habitable room windows on the south elevation of Carlton House facing the development. The proposed block is 1.5 storeys higher and on a wider footprint and is also set 4m closer to these windows than the current Capitol House office building. This relationship has been analysed on site and whilst the proposed building will obviously create an additional sense of bulk once viewed from these windows it is considered that there is adequate separation distance in excess of 21m from facing elevations to ensure that the proposal would not appear unacceptably dominating when viewed from these windows.

6.5.4 The Daylight and Sunlight survey has been reviewed by officers and it is considered that there would no negative impact to this property as a result of the development.

492 Green Lanes

6.5.5 Number 492 Green Lanes is a part two, part three storey building on the south side of the application site. There is a coffee shop “Coffee Break” at the ground floor level with residential flats over the upper floor level. The south end of the building would be set at an average distance of 9.6m from the side boundary and on average 11m from the north facing side elevation of No. 792. This would in fact be moving the building 0.5m further way from No. 792, but obviously the development would appear bulkier when viewed from these side windows on No.792 due to the increase height and depth.

6.5.6 Similar to the relationship with Carlton House originally there were windows on the south elevation facing directly into No. 792 that would have caused unacceptable privacy and overlooking issues. These have also been removed and replaced with high level windows above eye level and with the balconies provided with louvered screens to avoid overlooking.

6.5.7 It is noted that there are habitable room windows on the north elevation of No. 792 facing the development. The proposed block is 1.5 storeys higher is on a wider footprint and is set marginally further away from these windows than the current Capitol House building. This relationship has been analysed on site by officers and whilst the proposed building will obviously create an additional sense of bulk officers consider that the proposed building would not result in an additional sense of bulk and dominance over the existing situation to warrant refusal. It is considered that there remains enough separation
distance between both facing elevations to ensure that the proposal would not appear unacceptably dominating when viewed from these neighbouring windows.

6.5.8 Similar to the situation with Carlton House, the Daylight and Sunlight survey has been reviewed and it is concludes that there would no negative impact to this property at No 792 as a result of the development.

6.5.9 In conclusion all factors considered the proposal has an acceptable impact in terms of neighbouring amenity to all adjoining occupiers.

6.6 Site Layout, Standard of Accommodation and Proposed Mix.

   Standard of Residential Accommodation

6.6.1 The application now proposes 49x1 bed, 32x2 bed and 10x3 bed flats, 91 residential units in total.

6.6.2 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan specifies that 1 bed flats should have a minimum floor area of 50sqm, 2 bed flats should have a minimum internal floor area of 61 square metres, with 2bed 4 persons at 70sqm, 3b4p flats at 74 sqm or 3b6p flats at 86 sqm.

6.6.3 All units have been measured and verified and are above the required London Plan standards for the respective units. Furthermore all units would have useable and accessible layouts and all room sizes are acceptable with specific regards to living/diners and single and double bedrooms. Amended plans have been submitted with the application and approximately 60% of the units would be dual aspect with no sole north facing flats, therefore it is considered all of the units would have an acceptable level of outlook. The stepped nature of the front and rear elevations has assisted with significantly increasing the number of dual aspect units which allow for the creation of side facing windows from a number of the flats. All flats would be readily accessible via the 2 main access staircores and communal hallways all accessed from the Green Lanes frontage and each floor is also accessible via a lift.

6.6.4 At street level the building would be set back between 3.5m to 8m from the back edge of the public footpath separated by low level boundary walls and front gardens and terraces which will provide an acceptable level of defensible space to the ground floor front facing units. To the rear there is a Thames Water and EA requirement to keep the footprint of the building back 8m from the edge of the New River. The applicant is currently in discussions to include the land up to the river bank as part of the site to enlarge the rear ground floor gardens, however this is only pending at present and does not form part of the application. However it is considered these rear facing ground floor units with an outlook and backdrop onto the New River and trees behind would be attractive and provide an acceptable level of amenity space for future occupiers. It should also be noted the flats over the upper floor levels and the associated balconies would have nice views over the New River and the Paulin Ground further behind.

6.6.5 9 of the 91 flats would be wheelchair accessible which complies with the London Plan 10% requirement of the total number of units on the site.
Housing Mix

6.6.6 DMD 3 and Policy 5 of the Core Strategy seeks new development to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet housing needs in the Borough with family sized accommodation (3 bed or larger) is identified as the greatest area of need. The mix of individual developments does however have to reflect the nature of the development particularly where high use development is proposed.

6.6.7 The Council’s dwelling mix ratios are as follows:

- 1 and 2 person flats - 20%
- 2 bed flats - 15%
- 3 bed houses - 45%
- 4 + bed houses - 20%

6.6.8 The development provides the following dwelling mix:

- 49 no.1b 2p (53.8%)
- 32 no.2b 3p (and) 4p (combined 35.3%)
- 10 no.3b (10.9%)

6.6.9 As part of the application process, the mix of residential units along with the appropriate levels of affordable housing have undergone considerable discussion. The application was originally submitted for 84 units with a unit mix of 29 x 1 bed, 37 x 2 bed and 18 x 3 beds, but with a much lower affordable housing offer of only 3 units. Through discussions with the applicant and in order to get a higher level of affordable units (20% ratio) on the site, the mix has had to change along with an increase of 7 units overall on the site.

6.6.10 It is therefore accepted that the scheme can viably provide 10 family 3 bedroom units. Whilst this percentage of family units is not policy compliant it is acknowledged that it is all the scheme can viably provide and priority has been given to try an maximise affordable housing on the site. Notwithstanding this due regard should be given to the fact that 10 of these 3 bed units would accommodate 5 persons along with the fact that there are 24 x 2 bed 4 person flats proposed as part of the scheme which could feasibly accommodate smaller or start up young families.

6.6.10 In conclusion all factors taken into account it is considered that the proposed mix of units and overall standard of accommodation is considered acceptable in this instance.

6.7 Private Amenity

6.7.1 Policy DMD9 now specifies the requirements for private and communal amenity space for such developments. A 1 bedroom flat should have at least 5sqm of amenity space with an additional 1sqm of amenity for every additional person. In addition to this dwelling houses should have on average 38sqm per house but a minimum 23sqm of amenity space.

6.7.3 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 or self-contained garden that complies with DMD9 and regional standards set out in the London Plan and London Housing SPG. It is noted that the front facing flats at ground floor level would
have amenity spaces facing directly onto Green Lanes, however they are all set back well from the street along with being at slightly raised levels above street level and they would be surrounded and secured by glazed screens. Therefore it is considered that they would have enough privacy from the street at ground level in a similar manner to many of the flats over the upper floor levels.

6.7.4 At ground floor level at the southern end of the site the application provides an area of approximately 270sqm that would operate a communal playspace /sitting area. It is considered this would provide for a decent communal play facility for occupants of the development. Finalised details of how this play space will be laid out will be secured alongside a landscaping condition. It should also be noted that Paulin Ground is directly around the corner from the site and there are also a number of other parks and playspaces within the area, therefore residents of the proposed development would be well accommodated both on and off site with regards to neighbouring amenity.

6.7.5 All factors taken into account it is considered that the amenity provisions proposed is acceptable and in accordance with DMD9.

6.8 Traffic and Transportation

6.8.1 Green Lanes is a principal road in the Winchmore Hill area of the borough. The PTAL is 3 (moderate) which indicates that the area has some connections to public transport services. The site is not in a CPZ. However, it is located east of the Queens Avenue CPZ and Winchmore Hill CPZ. There are no parking controls in the immediate vicinity of the site. There is a bus stop directly in front of the site. The existing site is an office building with 3,797sqm gross internal floorspace and 62 car parking spaces. There are 2 exiting points of access for vehicles, both of which are controlled by barriers.

6.8.2 To justify the application on transport grounds the application has submitted a Transport Statement- supported by a Travel Plan.

Parking Provision

6.8.1 Traffic and transportation initially provided comments on the original submission for 84 flats with a mix of (29 x 1 bed, 37 x 2 bed and 18 x 3 beds). The advice was as follows:

6.8.2 According to the 2011 Census data for the Borough of Enfield, across all tenures, the following parking ratios shown in Table 1 have been derived.

Table 1: Parking requirements for residential units based on 2011 Census Data for Enfield:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Total Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed unit</td>
<td>0.4 spaces per unit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed unit</td>
<td>0.7 space per unit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed unit</td>
<td>1.1 spaces per unit</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8.3 According to the table above a minimum of 58 spaces will be required for the residents. A further 10% of the total parking provision should be added to cater for visitor parking. This equates to 6 spaces and minimum of 64 spaces
will be required. The original proposed basement plan shows a parking layout with 60 car parking spaces. However, the proposals included a tandem parking layout. The spaces at the back row nearest the rear wall will not be able to access the spaces easily and therefore this form of parking is unacceptable. Those spaces should be removed from the basement. There will effectively be 52 spaces on site which is considerably less than the parking required. Additional parking will be required. The site has a PTAL of 3 which indicates that the site has some access to public transport services. The area is however not located in a CPZ which means that there is no way of controlling/managing parking in the area. Therefore car free development cannot be accepted in this location.

6.8.4 However since these initial comments there has been significant discussions with the applicant in relation to the development principally surrounding unit mix and affordable. The scheme is now proposed as 91 units with a Unit mix (49 x 1 bed, 32 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 beds) and based on this the following parking space numbers would be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Total Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bed Unit</td>
<td>0.4 Spaces per unit</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bed Unit</td>
<td>0.7 Spaces per unit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bed Unit</td>
<td>1.1 Spaces per unit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8.5 Whilst there are more units in total numbers there are significantly more 1 bedroom flats which would derive lower levels of car ownership along with 18 shared ownership units, which typically also have a lower level of car ownership. The required on site figure of parking spaces for the development would be 53 with an additional 10% (5 spaces) for visitors totalling 58 spaces. The amended scheme has removed the tandem parking and now proposes a total of 51 parking spaces in the basement area, therefore this represents a shortfall of 7 car parking spaces.

6.8.4 To assess whether the shortfall would cause harm officers have reviewed the transport statement submitted with the application and a parking survey carried out on streets within 200m of the site over a two night period based on the Lambeth Parking Survey Methodology. It is considered the survey area for the parking survey is reasonable and within an acceptable walking distance of the site where prospective future occupiers could park, obviously acknowledging that future residents would seek to park as close as possible to the site. The parking beat survey and the actual road inventory provided does show that there was on average 25-30 car parking spaces available within the surveyed area on the surrounding streets. This outlined a parking stress of an average of 75%. Whilst it is acknowledged this was carried out some time ago as part of the earlier process of formulating the development proposal it is nonetheless considered relevant and it is considered that it conveys that there is capacity for overspill parking in the area from the development should it occur.

6.8.5 Although it would be desirable to have more parking spaces on site, this cannot be achieved with the limited site area available unless podium parking were provided for at ground floor level. This would have a detrimental design impact whilst also impacting number of flats provided, thereby having a negative impact on the viability of the scheme, its ability to provide affordable housing and other S106 contributions associated with the scheme.
6.8.6 Taking a holistic and balanced approach the application and the benefits it provides towards providing additional residential accommodation, including affordable housing, in a sustainable location, ultimately it is considered on balance that the scheme can be supported. The concerns raised by Traffic and transportation officers have been acknowledged in relation to the cumulative impact. However the parking survey and supporting transport statement does show, that whilst parking stress is reasonably high there is on street capacity in the area. Whilst the census data is now 6 years old it is acknowledged that car ownership in this area is generally lower than the borough average. In addition the site is located in a reasonably sustainable location with a PTAL of 3 with good access to public transport including buses and rail. There has been a significant investment by the Council to install the new cycle lane on Green Lanes and along with encouraging more sustainable modes of public transport, more cycling should be encouraged. There is therefore a sound argument to actually have lower levels of car parking on this site than would normally be provided. The scheme would be providing a policy compliant level of cycle parking on site, which will encourage sustainable travel and the applicant has agreed to sustainable travel incentives as part of a S106 package.

6.8.7 In addition whilst the site is not located in a Controlled Parking Zone, there are CPZ’s in the area. It is proposed that the development will be exempt from any CPZ permits for current local CPZ’s or any that may be introduced in the in the future. This will be secured via the S106 Agreement.

6.8.8 There are 8 disabled parking spaces proposed which is considered acceptable.

6.8.9 In conclusion taking all of the above factors into account and the overall planning merits of the scheme, it is considered a refusal of the scheme on parking grounds can not be substantiated.

**Vehicular Access**

6.8.10 The proposed access arrangements include the extension of the existing western access and the creation of a ramped access to a basement car park which will serve the development. The principle of this arrangement is acceptable. The new crossover will be approximately 10m wide and will include a separate access for refuse collection and a 6m ramped access to the basement. The proposed new crossover is much wider than would be acceptable. However, in this instance, with the Cycle Enfield project and servicing requirements for the development etc. the access arrangements would be accepted on balance.

6.8.11 Details of the operation of the gates into the development and details of the width of access, gradient of ramped access to the basement, distance of the ramp, operation of the basement car park and the ramps are to be subject to conditions. The second existing access on the eastern end of the site is to be removed and reinstated as part of the highway. This is deemed acceptable. Officers have taken all of this information into account. Based on the acceptability of the principle of the access it is considered the finer details of these access requirements can be secured via a planning condition.

**Pedestrian Access**

6.8.12 The pedestrian access into the site will be via the existing pedestrian footway along the frontage of the site and through footpaths to be provided to the front
door of the main blocks and the private flats. The arrangement is considered to be acceptable and details of the proposed hard landscaping materials and levels will be secured by planning conditions.

**Servicing Arrangements, Refuse & Recycle Storage/Collection**

6.8.13 Policy 47 (access, new roads and servicing) of the DMD and Manual for Streets states that new developments will only be permitted where adequate, safe and functional provision is made for:

- Refuse collection (using 11.0m freighters) and any other service, and delivery vehicles required to serve part of the normal functioning of the development; and
- Emergency services vehicles, (following guidance issued by the London Fire Brigade & Building Regulations).

Policy 47 of the DMD also indicates that, new access and servicing arrangements must be included in the detailed design of the scheme from the outset and must ensure that vehicles can reach the necessary loading, servicing, and parking areas. Layouts must achieve a safe, convenient and fully accessible environment for pedestrians and cyclists. New developments will only be permitted where adequate, safe and functional provision is made for refuse collection, emergency service vehicles and delivery/servicing vehicles.

6.8.14 According to the Manual for Streets (MfS), Planning Authorities should ensure that new developments make sufficient provision for waste management and promote designs and layouts that secure the integration of waste management facilities without adverse impact on the street scene. The proposed refuse and recycle storage should blend in with the proposed layout and landscaping; complementing the street scene. The standards require the design to ensure that residents are not required to carry waste more than 30m (excluding any vertical distance) to the storage point, waste collection vehicles should be able to get to within 25 m of the storage point and the bins should be located no more than 10m from kerbside for collection. Detailed designs of the refuse and recycle storage should therefore comply with these standards and the Refuse and Recycle Storage Guide Enfield (ENV 08/162).

6.8.15 Having assessed the proposed plans it is considered that the development is well catered for with regards to access and servicing. In addition the bin storage facilities appear adequate to accommodate the needs of the proposed development. The final details of these waste storage facilities will be secured by a condition.

6.8.16 Tracking plans for an 11m vehicle has been provided in the TS. The plans show that the development will be serviced safely by this size vehicle with no significant changes to the existing servicing arrangements.

**Traffic Generation & Impact**

6.8.17 The survey information provided indicates that the traffic generation associated with the proposed development will be significantly reduced as compared to the office use of the site. The development proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable. It is therefore not thought that proposed change of use will generate significant levels of traffic which will adversely affect traffic flows in the local area.
Cycle Parking

6.8.18 According to the Transport Statement (TS), a total of 139 cycle parking spaces are proposed for the residents and 4 spaces for visitors. Whilst this is acceptable and in line with the minimum standards set out in the London Plan 2016, it is recommended that 2 Sheffield stands be provided along the frontage of the individual blocks. This will ensure that there is adequate level of cycle parking for visitors which will be secured because they will be overlooked. Details of cycle stores should be provided. The design of the bike stores should ensure that they are big enough to accommodate cycles with stands/racks, lockable (by an access fob/card or BS mortice lock), allowing both the frame and at least one wheel to be secured. The plans provided should include detailed designs of the bike store, including dimensions, materials of the bike racks and materials of the bike store and also showing the proposed racks/stands in the store. A convenient and safe access to and from the stores, building and the street must be provided. The cycle parking should be attractive lit, benefit from good natural surveillance, easy to use and must not damage cycles. It is considered the final details of the cycle parking spaces can be provided via a planning condition since there is sufficient space allowed for within the development to accommodate.

Travel Plan

6.8.19 A Travel Plan (TP) has been submitted as part of the development proposals. The identified targets will not result in a significant change in travel patterns for future residents. The identified targets should therefore be revised and agreed with the Council as part of the baseline TP. Once the final TP is agreed, it will be monitored over a 5yr period and the applicant will contribute £3,620 secured via S106 to monitor the Travel Plan.

Sustainable Transport Package

6.8.20 As part of the redevelopment of the site, each new unit shall be entitled to a sustainable transport package up to the value of £315 which shall include car club membership for 3 years and £50 driving credit, an Oyster card per bedroom and 3 years of London Cycling Campaign Membership per bedroom. The applicant will be responsible for promoting the sustainable transport package and managing delivery. Confirmation will be required that the package has been offered to all first occupiers of residential units. This should be via an independent audit undertaken at the applicant’s cost. Where there is evidence that the package has not been offered, the applicant will be required to make a £315 per unit contribution to the Council to support delivery of sustainable transport measures. The total sustainable transport contribution which will be sought via S106 is £28,665.

6.8.21 The subject site is also located along a major Cycle Enfield route and will benefit directly from the new cycle infrastructure currently being built. A financial contribution of £19,908 is therefore required towards the provision of the requisite cycling facilities and infrastructure as part of the Cycle Enfield Project.

6.8.22 Therefore the total transport contribution associated with the development will be £52,193.

6.8.23 In conclusion subject to the conditions outlined in this section of the report and completion of the S106 agreement the application on balance of all other material planning considerations is acceptable on planning grounds.
6.9 Trees and Landscaping

6.9.1 The proposal does result in the loss of some smaller minor trees to the back of the site. This is considered acceptable to accommodate the development and the applicant has submitted a landscaping plan that will involve a tree replanting programme along with what appears to be a relatively attractive hard and soft landscaping scheme. These details will be secured by a planning condition.

6.10 S106 Contributions and Affordable Housing

Affordable Housing

6.10.1 Having regard to policies DMD1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy as the site is proposing 10 or more units (91) it should be complying with borough wide target of achieving 40% affordable housing and a mix of tenures to reflect a borough wide target of 70% social rent and affordable rent and 30% Intermediate. This would reflect 36 units on this site as affordable housing.

6.10.2 As part of the original submission consisting of 84 flats, the applicant has submitted a Viability Assessment that originally concluded that the scheme would only be viable to contribute 3 on-site affordable units.

6.10.3 This was not deemed acceptable or reasonable taking into account the scale of the development. The Councils own independently appointed Viability Assessor has reviewed the viability assessment and provided advice. The RICS ‘Financial Viability Appraisal in Planning Decisions: Theory and Practice‘ (2015) makes clear that “if market value is based on comparable evidence without proper adjustment to reflect policy compliant planning obligations, this introduces a circularity, which encourages developers to overpay for sites and try to recover some or all of this overpayment via reductions in planning obligations”

6.10.4 The Councils Viability Assessor has reviewed the original application submission that proposed 84 flats at a Unit mix of (29 x 1 bed, 37 x 2 bed and 18 x 3 beds). His conclusions once all figures were taken into consideration including purchase price of the site, development costs, GDV, professional costs, S106 Monies and CIL etc, that the scheme could viably provide for 21 affordable units, (25% ratio) 15 x social rented flats (9 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed and 6 x 1 bed shared ownership flats.

6.10.5 Although initially challenged by the applicant discussions have resulted in an increased offer equivalent to 20% of the units as affordable housing. As a result has increased to 91 with a varied mix of (49 x 1 bed, 32 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 beds), reducing the number of 3 bed flats and re-providing more 1 bed flats. This has altered the finances of the project and allowed for 18 shared ownership flats to be provided.

6.10.6 It is considered this is a now a reasonable compromised solution on the site in the interests of bringing the scheme forward for redevelopment and the net gain in housing. This would allow for 18 shared ownership units 15x1 bed and 3x2 bed (20%) out of the total 91 units proposed.

6.10.7 This affordable housing arrangement would be secured as part of a S106 legal agreement with the application. However as the proposed development fails to provide a policy compliant affordable housing offer, a review
mechanism is recommended to be included in the s106 agreement via an
overage clause to ensure that any uplift in value will be captured for the
Council once the development is completed.

Other S106 Contributions/ Head of Terms

6.10.8 The following education, transport and carbon tax contributions will be
required as part of the development. As part of the Viability Appraisal a S106
amount of £252,000 + Monitoring Fee has been agreed and allowed for. These
contribution will contribute to ensuring the development provides for
the necessary infrastructure associated with the development and the
increased number of people in the area.

- Restriction from occupiers of the development obtaining car parking permits
  for existing CPZ’s in the area and any future CPZ be implemented in the
  future.
- £3,620 towards Travel Plan monitoring
- £28,665 towards sustainable transport measures including car club vouchers
  and Oyster vouchers.
- £19,908 towards Enfield Cycle Road
- £58,000 offsite Carbon Tax Contribution
- £141,007 Education
- Monitoring fee @ 5%- £12,600.

6.11 Sustainable Design and Construction

Lifetime Homes

6.11.1 The London Plan and Core Strategy confirm that all new housing is to be built
to Lifetime Homes’ standards. This is to enable a cost-effective way of
providing adaptable homes that are able to be adapted to meet changing
needs.

6.11.2 The scheme appears to meet as much as possible the 16 criteria for Lifetime
Homes. However, confirmation of this should be secured by condition.

Energy / Energy efficiency

6.11.3 The London Plan adopts a presumption that all developments will meet
carbon dioxide emission reductions that will improve upon 2010 Building
Regulations, leading to zero carbon residential buildings from 2016. Policy
5.2 establishes a target for 2010-2013 to be a 25% improvement over Part L
of current Building Regulations. ‘Zero carbon’ homes are homes forming part
of major development applications where the residential element of the
application achieves at least a 35 per cent reduction in regulated carbon
dioxide emissions (beyond Part L 2013) on-site (in line with policy 5.2B). The
remaining regulated carbon dioxide emissions, to 100 per cent, are to be off-
set through a cash in lieu contribution to the relevant borough to be ring
fenced to secure delivery of carbon dioxide savings elsewhere (in line with
policy 5.2 E).

6.11.4 In line with the implementation date for previous increases in the London Plan
carbon dioxide targets and improvements to Part L of the Building
Regulations, ‘zero carbon’ housing was implemented from 1st October 2016.
The subject scheme was submitted after this deadline and hence is subject to
the provisions of this Policy.
6.11.5 The applicant has submitted an Energy Statement which confirms that a 37.4% improvement over Part L of current building regulations will be achieved. This is considered acceptable and compliant. In addition the applicant has further committed to offset the remaining carbon via a s106 contribution in accordance with the S106 SPD. This is considered acceptable subject to condition and S106. The contributed figure would be £58,000 and this has been worked into the overall Viability Assessment as part of the application.

6.12 **Mayors CIL**

6.12.1 The size of the proposed development would be liable to a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution as the size exceeds 100 sq.m. The net gain of the new created floor area is 4106 sq.m, inclusive of the 91 units, basement area and the communal halls and staircase area.

6.12.2 This would result in a Mayoral CIL contribution of 4106 sq.m x £20 x 319/223 (BCIS CIL Index Formula) = £117,472.10

6.12.3 This would result in a Borough CIL contribution of 4106 sq.m x £120 x 319/274 (BCIS CIL Index Formula) = £573,641.16.

6.12.4 The total Mayoral and Borough CIL would amount to **£691,113.26.**

7. **Conclusion**

7.1 It is recognised that this is a substantial development which, in certain areas, is not policy compliant. This is not uncommon when assessing development proposals and as always there is a need to balance the merits of the scheme against the requirements of adopted policy, the key policy objectives (in this case affordable housing) and the circumstances of the site taking cognisance of any local representations.

7.2 Mindful of this context officers have given significant weight to the delivery of new housing (including affordable housing) the maximisation of which has led to an acceptable trade off against Council policy for residential mix. The increase in affordable housing has prompted an increase in the number of units to improve viability and whilst the development proposed is larger than the existing building, it is considered the scheme proposed would have an acceptable relationship to the surrounding environment would consist of greater architectural merit and overall would not detract unduly from the character and appearance of the area.

7.3 The emphasis of delivering new and affordable housing is also informed by its location with the conclusion of Traffic and Transportation recognising this is a sustainable location, with the housing mix and measures outlined in the report, the policy deficit in parking is considered acceptable and desirable.

7.4 Overall it is considered the scheme is of merit and would deliver additionality and much better housing when compared to that which could have been delivered as permitted development. It is therefore recommended for approval.
8. **Recommendation**

8.1 That planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. **C51 Time Limited Permission-** 3 years.

2. **C61 Approved Plans- Revised.**

3. **C07 Details of Materials**

   The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details of the external finishing materials including the brick and cladding materials and details of the windows, balconies and winter gardens to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include specific details including 1:20 details (with 1:5 sections) of windows, doors and balconies. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

4. **C09 Details of Hard Surfacing**

   The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details of the surfacing materials to be used within the development including footpaths, access roads and parking areas and road markings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surfacing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail before the development is occupied or use commences.

   Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety and a satisfactory appearance.

5. **C10 Details of Levels**

   The development shall not commence until plans detailing the existing and proposed ground levels including the levels of any proposed buildings, roads and/or hard surfaced areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: To ensure that levels have regard to the level of surrounding development, gradients and surface water drainage.

6. **C11 Details of Boundary Treatments, Internal Plot Treatments and Site Enclosures**

   The site shall be enclosed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The means of enclosure shall be erected in accordance with the approved detail before the development is occupied. This should also include the following:

   1. Specific details of the all site boundary walls, gates and railings including heights and material finish.
   2. Details of the proposed method of separation between individual gardens and terraces at ground floor level.
3. Details of how the rear garden will be screened and secured from the New River in the interests of public safety.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance and safeguard the privacy, amenity and safety of adjoining occupiers, future occupiers and the public and in the interests of highway safety.

7. Details of Access and Highways Works

The development excluding demolition and groundworks shall not commence until details of the necessary highway alterations associated with the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These works shall be the following:

1. Details of the Stopping up of the Existing Crossover to the south side of the site and Associated alterations to the public highway.

2. Details of the New crossover/ vehicle access to the site and details and associated highways works.

3. Details of the Mechanism of the New Access gate opening inwards 5 metres clear of the public highway to ensure that it will be safe and create no impact to highway function and safety. Details of the width of access, gradient of ramped access to the basement, distance of the ramp, operation of the basement car park and the ramps should be provided.

They should be carried out in accordance with the approved details before development is occupied or the use commences and the applicant/developer will have to pay for these costs including any costs associated with amending and consulting upon any Traffic Regulation Orders required.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with Development Plan Policies and does not prejudice conditions of safety or traffic flow on adjoining highways.

8. C17 Details of Landscaping

The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details of trees, shrubs and grass to be planted on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season after completion or occupation of the development whichever is the sooner. Any planting which dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with new planting in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory appearance and ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety.

9. C19 Details of Refuse Storage & Recycling Facilities

The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details of refuse storage facilities including facilities for the recycling of waste to be provided within the development, in accordance with the London Borough of Enfield – Waste and Recycling Planning Storage Guidance ENV 08/162, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance and safeguard the privacy, amenity and safety of adjoining occupiers, future occupiers and the public and in the interests of highway safety.
Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or use commences.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and the recycling of waste materials in support of the Boroughs waste reduction targets.

10. C59 Cycle parking spaces

The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details of the siting, number and design of secure/covered cycle parking spaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of cycle storage where possible within the private garden areas on the ground floor in addition to an additional cycle parking storage to the front communal area. The approved details shall thereafter be installed and permanently retained for cycle parking.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking spaces in line with the Council's adopted standards.

11. C24 Obscured Glazing

The glazing to be installed on the north and south elevations shall be in obscured glass and fixed shut. The glazing shall not be altered without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties.

12. Construction Methodology

That development shall not commence until a construction methodology has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction methodology shall contain:

a. arrangements for wheel cleaning;
b. arrangements for the storage of materials;
c. hours of work;
d. arrangements for the securing of the site during construction;
e. the arrangement for the parking of contractors’ vehicles clear of the highway.
f. The siting and design of any ancillary structures.
g. A construction management plan written in accordance with the ‘London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emission from construction and demolition’.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved construction methodology unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of the development does not lead to damage to the existing highway and to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties and the environment.

13. External Lighting

The development excluding groundwork and demolition shall not commence until details of any external lighting proposed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved external lighting shall be provided before the development is occupied.
Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenities of adjoining occupiers and/or the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

14. Lifetime Homes Standards

All the units shall comply with Lifetime Home standards in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development allows for future adaptability of the home to meet with the needs of future residents over their lifetime in accordance with Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2011.

15. Energy Statement

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Energy Statement prepared by Ensphere Group Ltd dated April 2017.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development and to ensure that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that CO2 emission reduction targets are met in accordance with Policy CP20 of the Core Strategy, Policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 & 5.9 of the London Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

16. EPC’s

Following practical completion of works a final Energy Performance Certificates shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable development and to ensure that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that CO2 emission reduction targets are met in accordance with Policy CP20 of the Core Strategy, Policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 & 5.9 of the London Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

17. Contamination

The development shall not commence until a scheme to deal with the contamination of the site including an investigation and assessment of the extent of contamination and the measure to be taken to avoid risk to health and the environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Remediation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and the Local Planning Authority provided with a written warranty by the appointed specialist to confirm implementation prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: To protect public health from contamination.

18. On site Machinery

All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW used during the course of the demolition, site preparation and construction phases shall comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA’s supplementary planning guidance “Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition” dated July 2014 (SPG), or
subsequent guidance. Unless it complies with the standards set out in the
SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without
the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The developer shall
keep an up to date list of all NRMM used during the demolition, site
preparation and construction phases of the development on the online
register at https://nrmm.london/

Reason: To protect local amenity and air quality

19. Sound Insulation

The development shall be constructed/adapted so as to provide sufficient air-
borne and structure-borne sound insulation against externally generated
noise and vibration. This sound insulation shall ensure that the level of noise
generated from external sources shall be no higher than 35 dB(A) from 7am –
11pm in bedrooms, living rooms and dining rooms and 30 dB(A) in bedrooms
from 11pm – 7am measured as a LAeq,T. The LAF Max shall not exceed
45dB in bedrooms 11pm – 7am. A scheme for mitigation measures shall be
submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to
development taking place. The scheme of mitigation shall include mechanical
ventilation where the internal noise levels exceed those stated in BS8233:
2014 with the windows open. The approved mitigation scheme shall be
implemented in its entirety before any of the units are occupied/the use
commences.

Reason: To protect future occupants from noise and disturbance.

20. Electric Vehicle Charging Points

Prior to occupation, details of electric vehicular charging points (EVCPs)
including siting shall be provided in accordance with London Plan standards
(minimum 20% of spaces to be provided with electric charging points and a
further 20% passive provision for electric vehicles in the future) shall be
submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All
electric charging points shall be installed in accordance with the approved
details prior to first occupation of the development and permanently retained.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with sustainable
development Policy requirements of the London Plan.

21. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

Prior to commencement of the development a sustainable urban drainage
strategy shall be submitted. This should include:

- A plan of the existing site
- A topographical plan of the area
- Plans and drawings of the proposed site layout identifying the footprint
  of the area being drained (including all buildings, access roads and
car parks).
- The controlled discharge rate for a 1 in 1 year event and a 1 in 100
  year event (with an allowance for climate change), this should be
  based on the estimated greenfield runoff rate.
- The proposed storage volume.
- Information on proposed SuDS measures with a design statement
describing how the proposed measures manage surface water as
close to its source as possible and follow the drainage hierarchy in the London Plan.

- Geological information including borehole logs, depth to water table and/or infiltration test results.
- Details of overland flow routes for exceedance events.
- A management plan for future maintenance.

Reason: In the interest of Sustainable Urban Drainage measures and to reduce the potential of flooding associated with the development.

22. Thames Water- Surface Water Drainage

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

23. Piling

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

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

24. Secure By Design

The development excluding demolition and groundwork shall not commence until details to be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve full Secured by Design' Accreditation. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and public safety.