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LOCATION: Commercial Premises, 179 Hertford Road, Enfield, EN3 5JH

APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/04020/FUL

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of site and erection of 6 storey building with basement level to provide 38 self-contained residential units (C3) and 2 commercial units on the ground floor.

## Applicant Name \& Address:

Mr H Gholizadeh
White Gold Properties Ltd

## Agent Name \& Address:

Mr Francis Caldwell Aragon Land \& Planning Ltd

## RECOMMENDATION:

1.That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the obligations set out in this report, the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT full planning permission subject to conditions.
2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to agree the final the wording of the conditions to cover those matters recommended in this report

Ref: 21/04020/FUL LOCATION: Commercial Premises, 179 Hertford Road, Enfield, EN3 5JH
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## 1. Note for Members

1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee as it comprises a 'major' development, involving more than 10 residential units.
2. Recommendation:
2.1 That the Head of Development Management be authorized to GRANT full planning permission subject to the following planning conditions:

1. Time limit.
2. Accordance with plans
3. Details of surfacing materials
4. Landscaping details
5. Construction Methodology
6. Commercial unit customers not to use undercroft parking
7. Details of external lighting
8. Compliance with submitted Energy Statement
9. Installation of approved cycle storage
10. Contamination investigation/remediation
11. Electric Vehicle Charging Points ( $20 \%$ active, $20 \%$ passive)
12. Piling method statement
13. Details of service road to be adopted as public highway
14. Submission of a Travel Plan
15. Details of building elevation materials, windows and reveals
16. No pipes or vents to the external elevations
17. Details of noise of any plant to be installed
$18.10 \%$ wheelchair accessible units
18. Emissions standards for construction/demolition machinery
19. Noise insulation for residential units
20. BREEAM "Excellent" certification
21. Considerate constructors scheme
22. Water consumption
23. Submission of sustainable drainage strategy
24. SUDS verification report
25. Protection of retained trees
a. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the Section 106 Agreement and conditions to cover those matters recommended in this report

## 3. Executive Summary

3.1 This redevelopment application seeks the grant of planning permission for a residential led mixed use scheme comprising of 2 commercial units at ground
floor with 38 residential units above to a total of six storeys.
3.2 The application follows a previous consent for mixed use redevelopment of the site granted in April 2019 for the erection of a part four, part five storey building to provide 3 commercial units at ground floor level and 25 self-contained flats above comprising ( $1 \times$ studio, $6 \times 1$ bed, $9 \times 2$ bed, $9 \times 3$ bed with balconies and terrace together with associated parking, landscaping and amenity space.
3.3 Although a more intensive development of the site the current proposal successfully amplifies the scale of the previous scheme and delivers a height, scale and massing that would be appropriate in the street scene without adversely impacting upon the amenity of existing nearby residents.
3.4 The planning application satisfies overarching planning policy aims to increase the housing stock of the borough and is considered to be acceptable subject to appropriate planning conditions.
3.5 The proposal would deliver a viability tested $29 \%$ of units as affordable housing (25.6\% by habitable room).
3.6 The Government prescribes a "tilted balance" in favour of housing delivery to the Council's planning decision-making as a result of Enfield's current inability to demonstrate a 5 -year housing land supply as well as the Council's shortfall in meeting housing delivery targets. This means that applications for new homes should be given greater weight, and Councils should grant permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the housing proposal. Officers consider that there are no adverse impacts of the scheme that would outweigh the benefits of the proposed housing.
3.7 It is recognised that small and medium windfall sites such as this need to be optimised in order to minimise encroachment into the Borough's Green Belt and protected Strategic Industrial Locations. It is considered that the current application that seeks to provide 38 new good quality residential units on the site, a larger amount than the previously approved 25 units scheme, is an example of such optimisation and carries significant weight in favour of the proposed development.

## 4. Site and Surroundings

4.1. The application site is located on the eastern side of Hertford Road and is a vacant cleared site situated within the middle of an existing commercial parade. The Black Horse pub previously existed on site prior to its demolition.
4.2. The surrounding area comprises a mixture of commercial and residential uses. To the north and south are commercial uses, predominantly threestoreys,
some with residential uses on the upper floors. This is also the case on the opposite side (west) of Hertford Road. To the rear of the site (east) are playing fields and grounds associated with St James Church of EnglandPrimary School.
4.3. The site is not located in a Conservation Area, and does not relate to a Listed Building but is located within the Enfield Highway Large local Centre.
4.4. The site has a public transport accessibility (PTAL) rating of 2.

## 5. Proposal

5.1. Application is made for the construction of a 6 storey building with basement level to provide 38 self-contained C3 residential units ( $12 \times 1$ bed, $15 \times 2$ bed, $11 \times 3$ bed) and 2 commercial units on the ground floor together with associated parking, landscaping and amenity space.
5.2. The top floor is of a reduced footprint, with setbacks on each side. The upper floors (1-5) will comprise of 38 self-contained flats, with a green roof.
5.3. The proposal includes 11 units of affordable housing, equating to $29 \%$ on site affordable provision. The affordable units would comprise $\times 8$ social rented ( $3 \times$ 1 -bed, $3 \times 2$-bed and $2 \times 3$-bed) and $3 \times 1$-bed shared ownership units. Following a review of the Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) by an external consultant on behalf of the Council, this level of affordable housing provision has been agreed as the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that can viably be delivered in this scheme.
5.4. Long stay residential cycle parking is proposed internally (70 spaces), as well as 8 short stay cycle spaces ( 6 commercial and 2 residential spaces) on the frontage. Dedicated refuse storage is provided for at ground floor, with easy access gained from the existing service access that is adjacent. The ground floor undercroft area to the rear will accommodate 14 residents parking spaces including 2 disabled bays, 1 car share space and 2 commercial spaces. Short stay parking spaces can be accommodated within the slip road, along the site frontage. Access to the site will continue to be from Hertford Road.
5.5. The existing slip road to the front of the site is within the applicant's ownership, however this is being offered to the Council to help facilitate the development, by being dedicated as highway and provide a service road for the development, whilst also allowing cycling improvements planned for the area as part of the Cycle Enfield project and will also allow for improved pedestrian access. This offering up of land to the Council will be secured through the Section 106 agreement.

## 6. Consultations

Neighbours/Public
6.1 A number of site notices directly outside and in the vicinity of the site were
displayed on 24 November 2021, and the proposed development advertised in the Enfield Independent on 24 November 2021
6.2 Consultation letters were sent to 136 adjoining and nearby residents on 05 November 2021. In response, no objection comments were received at the conclusion of the 21 day consultation period.

Internal

### 6.3 Traffic and Transportation

Hertford Road itself is well protected by parking restrictions and it is considered unlikely that the development would adversely impact on this key corridor. There are a number of streets nearby (such as Cedar Avenue) that could experience additional parking pressure to the detriment of the amenity of existing residents. This risk could potentially be mitigated by a future CPZ and a contribution towards the cost of a future resident permit parking scheme would be appropriate, along with an obligation that future residents of the new development would not be eligible to apply for permits.

Consultees advise they are mindful of paragraph 111 of NPPF, which states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'. In addition, Policy T6(C) of the London Plan directs that: 'An absence of local on-street parking controls should not be a barrier to new development, and boroughs should look to implement these controls wherever necessary to allow existing residents to maintain safe and efficient use of their streets'.

Whilst the level of on-site parking is less than ideal, this alone is not considered sufficient to warrant a recommendation for the refusal of the application.

It is requested that any consent be subject to conditions requiring the submission and approval of, further details of parking layout (including slip road parking), service road/slip road layout details, provision of electronic vehicle charging points (EVCP) and a Construction Logistics Plan.

Any permission should also secure the following contributions through Section 106 agreement:

- £15,835 for sustainable transport mitigation measures and/or a contribution to a future controlled parking zone in the area;
- $£ 5,455$ for Travel Plan monitoring; and
- Developer to enter into an agreement with the Council to secure the adoption of the new service road as a highway, maintainable at public expense.


### 6.4 SuDS Officer

Objection is raised as it is considered that the groundwater FRA provided is not sufficient for the proposed basement. More information is requested around the existing basement on whether this has flooded before. In light of planning approval ref: 17/02599/FUL it is considered that subject to appropriate SuDS conditions, including the submission and approval of a detailed Sustainable Drainage Strategy, and Verification report that this alone should not be a reason to refuse the scheme.

### 6.5 Environmental Health

No objections, subject to conditions relating to mitigation against external noise sources (i.e. road noise), detailed site investigation for possible contamination and a Construction Management Plan.

### 6.6 Urban Design Officer

It is noted that considerable pre-application discussions have been undertaken with respect to the scale and massing of the proposals, with the application scheme reflecting previous advice to ensure the parapet height of the front elevation sat in line with the consistent and predominant ridge height of neighbouring buildings. Although the top floor extends above the predominant height of surrounding buildings, the further set back and reduction in footprint of the upper floor that has been undertaken significantly reduces its visibility from Hertford Road.

The simple, contemporary architectural approach is supported in principle. As is the use of two high quality contrasting bricks across elevations, with the topfloor set back clad in a material to reflect its status as a recessive element within the overall proposal.

It was recommended that:

- The top floor set back, including the lift overrun, should be clad in anatural metal cladding e.g. standing seam zinc. This has been incorporated into the scheme.
- More planters are needed. This has been incorporated into the scheme.
- Samples of all external materials, with a lighter material used for the proposed brick, should be conditioned as part of anyapproval, with sample brickwork panels to be constructed on site to confirm the mortar finish and colour. This has been incorporated into the scheme.
- Additional Dual aspect windows proposed. With the initial pre-app the scheme achieved $54 \%$ dual aspect apartments, through the process of design development this has been increased closer to 75\%
- In addition to the above, details of the shopfronts (including signage), glass
balustrades, privacy screens, canopies, soffits and parapets should be conditioned as part of any approval.

External

### 6.7 Crime Prevention Officer

Insufficient information provided around doors/windows, access control, postal strategy, landscaping, boundary treatments, emergency treatments, emergency services egress, refuse and cycle storage, parking, under-croft area, security, roof access, balcony details, airlock. CCTV and lighting. A condition is recommended around security measures has been suggested.

### 6.8 Thames Water/Waste

No objections in relation to sewerage or water infrastructure, subject to a condition detailing any piling works.

The consultee comments have been duly taken into consideration in weighing up the planning merits of the scheme.

## 7. Relevant Planning History

7.1 22/01383/CND - Details pursuant to ref: 17/02599/FUL: Construction Methodology (5), ground investigation (11), electric vehicle charging points (12), service road details (14), Considerate Constructors Scheme (23), Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (27), for the redevelopment of site and erection of a part four, part five storey building to provide 3 commercial units at ground floor level and 25 self-contained flats above comprising ( $1 \times$ studio, 6 $\times 1$ bed, $9 \times 2$ bed, $9 \times 3$ bed with balconies and terrace together with associated parking, landscaping and amenity space. Refused 14.07.2022.
7.2 17/02599/FUL - Redevelopment of site and erection of a part four, part five storey building to provide 3 commercial units at ground floor level and 25 self-contained flats above comprising ( $1 \times$ studio, $6 \times 1$ bed, $9 \times 2$ bed, $9 \times 3$ bed with balconies and terrace together with associated parking, landscaping and amenity space. S106 Granted with conditions. 26.04.2019.
7.3 16/03853/PADE (Prior Approval Not Required) - Demolition of detached 2 storey building.

## 8 Relevant Policy

8.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Committee
have regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application: and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
8.2 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area comprises the Enfield Core Strategy (2010); the Enfield Development Management Document (2014); and The London Plan (2021).

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
8.3 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, 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; 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."
8.4 The related footnote(8) advises that "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 ...... 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.
8.5 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.
8.6 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".
8.7 The Council's recent housing delivery has been below its increasing housing targets. This 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 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. Under the NPPF paragraph 11(d) the most important development plan policies for the application are deemed to be 'out of date'.
8.9 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 200 requires, in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
8.10 Key relevant policy objectives from the NPPF that relate to this scheme include:

- Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes Para $60-77$;
- Section 11 - Making effective use of land Para 119-125; and
- Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places, Para 126-136
8.11 The policies listed below are considered to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore it is considered that due weight should be given to them in assessing the development the subject of this application.


### 8.11.1 London Plan (2021)

Policy GG1 Building Strong and Inclusive communities
Policy GG2 Making the best use of land
Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need
Policy G7 Trees and woodlands
Policy SD6 Town Centres
Policy SD8 Town Centres: Development Principles \& Development Plan
Policy D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
Policy D4 Delivering good design
Policy D5 Inclusive design
Policy D6 Housing quality and standards
Policy D8 Public Realm
Policy D12 Fire Strategy
Policy D14 Noise
Policy H1 Increasing housing supply

Policy H6 Affordable housing tenure
Policy H7 Monitoring Affordable Housing
Policy H10 Housing size mix
Policy SI 1 Improving Air Quality
Policy SI 2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
Policy SI 5 Water Infrastructure
Policy SI 7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
Policy SI 8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
Policy SI12 Flood risk management
Policy SI13 Sustainable Drainage
Policy TR2 Healthy Streets
Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
Policy T5 Cycling
Policy T6 Car Parking

### 8.11.2 Enfield Core Strategy (2010)

CP2 Housing Supply and Locations for New Homes
CP3 Affordable Housing
CP4 Housing Quality
CP5 Housing Types
CP9 Supporting community cohesion
CP17 Town Centres
CP18 Delivering shopping provision across Enfield
CP19 Offices
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
CP32 Pollution
CP46 Infrastructure Contribution
8.11.3 Enfield Development Management Document (2014)

DMD1 Affordable Housing-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
DMD30 Floorspace above Commercial Premises
DMD32 Managing the Impact of Food \& Drink Establishments
DMD37 Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development

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

### 8.11.4 Other relevant policy/guidance

Enfield Climate Action Plan (2020)
Enfield Housing and Growth Strategy (2020)
Enfield Biodiversity Action Plan
National Planning Practice Guidance
Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
LBE S106 SPD
London Councils: Air Quality and Planning Guidance (2007)
TfL London Cycle Design Standards (2014)
GLA: Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition (2014)
GLA: London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014)
GLA: Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (2014)
GLA: Social Infrastructure SPG (2015)
GLA: Homes for Londoners: Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017)
GLA: Mayor's Transport Strategy (2018)
GLA: Mayor's Housing SPG (2016)
GLA: Mayor's Affordable Housing \& Viability SPG (2017)
Healthy Streets for London (2017)
Manual for Streets 1 \& 2, Inclusive Mobility (2005)
National Planning Practice Guidance
National Design Guide (2019)
Technical housing - nationally described space standards
The Environment Act 2021
The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Mayor's Housing SPG (2016)
Mayor's Affordable Housing \& Viability SPG (2017)
Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

## 9. Analysis

9.1 This report sets out an analysis of the issues that arise from the proposals inthe light of adopted strategic and local planning policies. The main issues are considered as follows:

- Principle of mixed-used development
- Housing provision, including affordable and tenure mix
- Design
- Siting, layout and massing
- Quality of proposed accommodation
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Parking, access and servicing
- Sustainability credentials
- Landscaping, biodiversity and trees
- Environmental considerations


## Principle of mixed use development

9.2 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out 'core planning principles', including that planning should "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been developed previously, provided that it is not of high environmentalvalue". These principles also include to "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes ..." The NPPF goes on to state that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.
9.3 The existing site has a nil use now that the previous pub building has been demolished.
9.4 Policy H1 of the current London Plan recognises the need for more homes in London to promote opportunity and choice in ways that meet their needs at a price that is affordable. Policy D3 promotes the optimisation of housing output within different types of location. Policy H10 of the London Plan also encourages the Council to provide a mix of housing choices in order to takeaccount of the various different groups. Housing should be provided across a range of different sizes and types taking account of the requirements ofdifferent user groups. Policy H6 seeks that the "maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing" be sought when negotiating on schemes.
9.5 Officers give significant weight to the planning merits of providing new homes (including a significant proportion of affordable homes), new commercial floorspace to enhance the vitality and viability of Hertford Road, to an enhanced public realm and to making efficient use of the land by providing these homes at a reasonably high density.
9.6 In addition, previous planning decisions are a material planning consideration. In this instance, under regd no: 17/02599/FUL, the redevelopment of the site and
erection of a part four, part five storey building to provide 3 commercial units at ground floor level and 25 self-contained flats above (comprising $1 \times$ studio, $6 \times 1$ bed, $9 \times 2$ bed, $9 \times 3$ bed with balconies and terrace together with associated parking, landscaping and amenity space) was previously granted planning permission on 26.04.2019. The principle of residential-led mixed use development is therefore established.
9.7 Planning merits must be balanced against all other relevant planning considerations which seek to ensure that appropriate regard is givento design, impact on the character of the area, impact on neighbour amenity and residential amenity, traffic generation and highway safety and acceptability with regards to sustainability and flooding.

## Residential led mixed-use development:

9.8 London Plan Policy H1 'Increasing Housing Supply' recognises the pressing need for new homes in London and Table 4.1 gives an annual monitoring target of 1246 new homes per year in Enfield between 2019/20 and 2028/29. Finding available and suitable sites to accommodate this housing growth is a challenge across the Borough, and the proposal for 38 units, on this previously developed site would make a welcome contribution tothe Borough's housing targets, including meeting affordable housing need ( $29 \%$ of the units affordable). Additionally, the Council has not met the most recent Housing Delivery Test and is therefore in the presumption in favour of sustainable development category. The tilted balance would therefore be applied in assessing and weighing up the benefits of the scheme.
9.9 The proposals would make effectiveand efficient use of previously developed land, in a sustainable location, which is consistent with National and local policy, and the residential element of this proposal is supported in principle.

## Commercial units:

9.10 It is proposed that two commercial units (Use Class E) be provided, sized at 112sqm and 127sqm. These would front onto Hertford Road and will complement the existing commercial offer along this part of Hertford Road. Whilst changes to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 has meant that possible changes of use under permitted development within town centres does not fully align with the current Core Strategy and DMD policies, the location of the new commercial floorspace proposed within the Enfield Highway Large Local Centre would be in line with long established sequential test principles that seek to maintain the vitality and viability of exiting centres.
9.11 To summarise, in broad terms, the principle of a mixed-use development that includes new residential units (with $29 \%$ affordable) to help meeting housing needs, and new class $E$ units would be appropriate in this location and is consistent with the policies within the London Plan, the Core Strategy and the Development Management Document which seek to support development that contributes to the strategic housing needs of the Borough and Greater

London.

## 10 <br> Housing Mix

10.1 The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of high-quality homes and to plan for a mix of housing in terms of size, type, tenure and range based on local demand.
10.2 The London Plan reinforces this, Policy GG4 states that Londoners should have access to affordable homes, and which meet their requirements for different sizes and types of dwellings in the highest quality environments. New developments are required to offer a range of housing choices in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types. The London Plan sets a clear priority to create communities that are mixed and balanced by way of tenure, fostering social diversity, responsibility and identity (Policy GG4). The London Plan goes on to seek to maximise affordable housing provision, with a60/40 housing tenure split between social/affordable rent and intermediate rent or sale to create a balanced and affordable housing sector, with priority to be given to affordable family housing. The need for an appropriate housing mix to address local needs is further reinforced in Enfield policies CP3, CP5 and DMD3.
10.3 Enfield Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy (2010) seeks to provide the following boroughwide mix for market housing:

- 20\% 1 and 2 bed units (1-3 persons);
- 15\% 2 bed units (4 persons);
- $45 \% 3$ bed units, (5-6 persons); and,
- $20 \% 4+$ bed units ( $6+$ persons
10.4 Policy DMD3 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) states that sites capable of accommodating 10 or more dwellings should meet these dwelling mix targets. However, this is based on the assumption that larger schemes are sited on larger sites and are more capable of accommodating a mix of different house sizes and associated amenity space than smaller and more constrained parcels of land.
10.5 In this case, the application site is a constrained parcel of land, and the increase of 13 units over the previously approved scheme is achieved by extending the approved building footprint upwards and to the rear.
10.6 The proposal would create 38 residential units with a mix of:
$12 \times 1$ bed;
$15 \times 2$ bed; and, $11 \times 3$ bed.
10.7 This includes eleven affordable housing units (29\%), and eleven (29\%) of units will be family sized ( 3 bedroom) units.
10.8 In view of the physical constraints of the site, the constraints of the site, and mindful of the tilted balance, the overall mix of units is considered acceptable.


## 11 Affordable Housing

11.1 Affordable housing comprises of social rented/affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to eligible households whose needs are notmet by the market housing (London Plan Policy H6). Policy DMD1 confirms that development should provide the maximum amount of affordable housing, having regard to the borough-wide affordable housing target of $40 \%$; and with a target tenure mix of $70 \%$ social / affordable rent and $30 \%$ intermediate, and that this should be subject to scheme viability.
11.2 London Plan Policy H6 require that boroughs maximise affordable housing provision, set an overall target in local plans for the amount of affordable housing provision needed over the plan period, and seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes. Enfield's Core Strategy Policy CP2 sets out that the Council will plan for the provision of approximately 11, 000 new homes for the period 2010-2025 and sets a target that 40\% of new homes should be affordable on sites over 10 units, subject to scheme viability. Developers are required to provide development appraisals to demonstrate that each scheme maximises affordable housing output.
11.3 The proposal for 38 residential units ( $12 \times 1$ bed, $15 \times 2$ bed, $11 \times 3$ bed) is supported by a Financial Viability Assessment, carried out on behalf of the applicant. The conclusions of this FVA were that the scheme could not viably support a policy compliant level of affordable housing.
11.4 This position has been independently assessed on behalf of the Council by an external consultant who has provided viability advice in relation to the original FVA submitted. The review undertaken raised some questions around comparable average sales values for residential units; breakdown of development costs and the Benchmark Land Value (BLV). It was concluded by the Council's consultant, that with CIL contributions, and a developer profit of $20 \%$ on GDV, the scheme could viably support a maximum of 11 affordable housing units on site. The affordable units would have the following mix:

- $8 \times$ social rented ( $3 \times 1$-bed, $3 \times 2$-bed and $2 \times 3$-bed) and,
- $3 x$ shared ownership units ( $3 \times 1$ bed).
11.5 The applicant's consultant accepted the findings of the Council's review of the development costs and that the scheme can viably support 11 affordable housing units, based on the mix set out above.
11.6 At $71 \%$ ( 8 units) social rent to $29 \%$ ( 3 units) intermediate units (shared ownership), the affordable housing split broadly complies with policy on mix of tenure which requires a $70 \%$ to $30 \%$ split. The emphasis on securing a significant proportion of units on site as affordable, with $29 \%$ family units has been given weight.
11.7 On balance, the proportion of affordable units (29\%) is welcomed as this will help make a valuable contribution to the Borough's housing needs. The public benefit of this much needed affordable housing must be given appropriate weight when balancing the planning merits of the scheme, and any harmful impacts.
11.8 Given the proposed affordable housing level (29\%) falls below the Local Plan $40 \%$ target, as well as the London Plan target, and the inherent uncertainly associated with FVAs, it is recommended that an early and late stage review mechanism be secured in the Section 106 agreement. Such review would examineactual costs and values closer to practical completion of the scheme. Any surplus or uplift generated could be used to secure additional contributions towards affordable housing in order to get closer to the $40 \%$ target required by Policy DMD1.


## 12 Design

12.1 Policy DMD37 of the DMD encourages achieving a high quality and designled development that should be suitable for its function and appropriate in its context with appropriate regard to its surroundings. Additionally, Policy D3 and D4 of the London Plan specifies the need to respect the character of the surrounding area but also make a positive contribution to the places identity. This policy is reiterated by CP30 of the Core Strategy which requires new development to be of a high-quality design and in keeping with the surrounding area, as well as the fundamental aims of the NPPF.

Siting and layout:
12.2 A six-storey high contemporary building is proposed. This will have a frontage directly onto Hertford Road, and this new building will respect the established building line.
12.3 At ground floor this is set on the back edge of the pavement, and behind the sliproad, which is no different to other buildings along this side of Hertford Road. A number of openings are proposed at ground floor which is to include large sections of glazing serving the new commercial units, and residential entrance. This will provide interest and activate the ground floor. Further details of the shopfront designs (including advertisements) will be secured through a general materials condition.
12.4 The building footprint and projection into the site is broadly in keeping with the existing neighbouring patterns of development and deemed appropriate in this location.

## Scale and Massing:

12.5 The now demolished pub was a two-storey building set back from Hertford Road. The surrounding context is predominantly three stories, with pitched roofs.
12.6 The proposed scheme would be over six floors (including ground floor) and the top floor would be set in from all sides. The proposed fourth floor terminates at the same height as the neighbouring terraces ridge line, and the top floor ( $\left.5^{\text {th }}\right)$ is proposed to be on a reduced footprint, with setbacks on all sides which helps reduce its bulk, scale and massing. Additional set-backs have been undertaken on the top floor and further recessing of the west elevation. It is considered that this respects the scale of buildings in the vicinity of the site.
12.7 The building does project rearwards off neighbouring properties either side, where residential uses exist above ground floor level. It has been demonstrated on plans submitted that the building footprint above ground floor level would not exceed a line taken from the mid-point of the nearest residential windows at an angle of 30 degrees. This test, is borrowed from policy DMD11 and used to limit the impact of rearward extensions upon nearby residential properties. As a consequence the proposal would not be harmful in terms of loss of light or outlook for existing neighbouring residential occupiers.
12.8 The height, scale and massing proposed means this will be visible from the adjacent school grounds to the east, and the proposed building will be higher than surrounding buildings fronting Hertford Road.
12.9 In view of the site's location, the existing surrounding building heights and the detached nature of the building the site is considered appropriate for accommodating a building of the height and scale proposed, subject to an acceptable impact on neighbour amenity being maintained.
12.10 In order to further justify the proposed height, high standards of design and architecture are required so that the building makes a positive contribution to its environment; this is reinforced through London Plan policy D3 \& D4. It is considered that this would be achieved with the current contemporary design, through its simple, yet well considered palette of materials, fenestration and the architectural detailing which helps to articulate the building and break down the scale and massing.

## Materials:

12.11 A simple and well considered palette of materials is proposed so that this building sits comfortably in its setting. That is achieved through a predominantuse of brick which reflects the local vernacular. The top floor, which is setback is to be treated in a different material in order to appear subservient to the rest of the building. Details of materials for this top floor appear as zinc cladding, and this will be subject to condition. To help this appear sub-ordinate to the building below articulation of the building is achieved through the inclusion of recessed and projecting elements, external balconies, glass balustrades and window reveals.
12.12 Officers recognise the need to utilise sites to their optimum and this scheme does so whilst providing an attractive setting for future occupiers. Officers are supportive of the proposed design; the use of materials and articulation is well considered, and would result in a high-quality and sustainable development,
subject to conditions to ensure thequality and detailing would be delivered.

## 13 <br> Quality of Residential Accommodation

13.1 All residential units 38 in total meet or exceed the minimum space standards as set out in the London Plan, and the more recent nationally describedspace standards. This complies with London Plan policy, National Described Space standards and Enfield planning policies.
13.2 London Plan policy D5 seek to ensure that new developmentachieves the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. The proposal will provide a minimum of $10 \%$ wheelchair accessible or adaptable units, whilst the remaining $90 \%$ of units will meet accessible and adaptable standards set out in Part M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings', and part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. This provision will be secured by condition.
13.3 The layout and arrangement of units has allowed for the majority of units tobe dual aspect units, ensuring good cross ventilation, daylight, sunlight and internal standards of accommodation,
13.4 In accordance with the Mayor's Housing SPG (2016) it has been confirmed that a minimum ceiling height of 2.5 metres for at least $75 \%$ of the gross internal area of the residential units can be achieved for all units.

## Window Distancing:

13.5 Policy DMD10 sets out the minimum separation distances required between rear facing windows. The rearward facing windows within the developmentwill be some 15 m off the boundary. As these are directed towards the adjacent school grounds then there would be no impact on residential amenity. The proposed side facing windows (floors 1-4) are secondary windows only, and face onto flank walls of neighbouring buildings. As such these do not give riseto loss of privacy or overlooking concerns.

## Residential Amenity Space/Play space:

13.6 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. Each unit is afforded access to a private balcony ranging in size between 6sqm and 24sqm. All balconies are sized to comply with the Mayor's Housing SPG. On balance the quantum, quality and combination of private and communal amenity space would be sufficient to meet the likely demands of future residents.
13.7 Considered against the policy compliant standard of accommodation and the tilted balance, the development would accord with London plan (2021) policies, Housing standards SPD (Adopted March 2016), Enfield Core Strategy 4 (Housing quality) and Enfield Development Management Document policies DMD8,

DMD9, DMD37 and DMD72.

## 14 Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

14.1 New development should not impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. CP30 of the CoreStrategy seek to ensure that new developments have appropriate regard to their surroundings, and that they improve the environment in terms of residential amenity.
14.2 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 developmentwould not result in housing with inadequate daylight/ sunlight or privacy forthe proposed or surrounding development.
14.3 The nearest residential properties are those immediately to the south, situated at first floor level and above, within the commercial parade. Plans demonstrate that the proposed building footprint will meet the 30-degree test from these rearward facing windows, as such it is not considered that outlook would be unduly affected. There are no residential neighbours sited directly to the east, and those situated opposite the site to the west will be a sufficient distance away, with a busy principal road in between. On balance the proposal would not unduly harm the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers.
14.4 In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would not be unduly harmful to 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.

## 15 Parking access and servicing

15.1 The site has a PTAL of 2, which indicates 'poor' access to public transport services.
15.2 The subject site is on a classified road but is not within an operational Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), though there are parking and loading restrictions along Hertford Road.
15.3 The applicant has confirmed that a strip of land at the front of the site will be offered to the Council for adoption, at no cost. Transportation are supportiveof this, and this is a welcomed benefit of the scheme that will allow theCouncil to provide a new service/slip road to serve the development, whilst also permitting cycling improvements proposed for the area as part of the Cycle Enfield project. The adoption of this slip road will also improve pedestrian access.
15.4 The residential component of the site will generateadditional vehicular traffic in
the peak hours, it is not thought that the overall increase in traffic generation will significantly affect the smooth flow of traffic on Hertford Road and the surrounding local highway network. Hertford Road itself is well protected by parking restrictions and it is considered unlikely that the development would adversely impact on this key corridor.
15.5 However, there are a number of streets nearby (such as Cedar Avenue) that could experience additional parking pressure to the detriment of the amenity of existing residents. This risk could potentially be mitigated by a future CPZ and a contribution towards the cost of a future resident permit parking scheme would be appropriate, along with an obligation that future residents of the new development would not be eligible to apply for the Council's on-street parking permits.
15.6 A revised parking statement has been submitted in support of the application. Although the surrounding area is fairly well built up, the proposed development (both commercial and residential) will increase traffic by various travel modes in the local area. A Travel Plan should establish existing trip generation by various travel modes, estimate the additional trips generated by the scheme and set out how to influence a shift in travel behaviour, to more sustainable travel modes. Targets should be set for the 1st, 3rd and 5th years post-occupation and show how a reduction from vehicular trips to more sustainable means of travel is achieved. Prior tocommencement of the scheme, a Framework Travel Plan with defined targets should be provided, and will need to be reviewed following occupation, and this will be secured by condition.

## Parking:

15.7 The London Plan, Core Strategy and DMD policies 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.
15.8 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.
15.9 London Plan policy T5 sets out maximum residential parking standards. Upon reviewing the 2011 Census data for the local area (E02000282: Enfield 006) suggests that flats typically generate 0.5 cars per household. A development comprising 38 flats might therefore be expected to generate demand for 19 parking spaces.
15.10 With 14 spaces being provided within the curtilage of the site, including 2 disabled bays, 1 car share space and 2 commercial spaces short stay visitor parking spaces can be accommodated within the slip road, along the site frontage a further 5 vehicles may be displaced into the surrounding streets. It is considered
that this level of parking will meet likely demand.

## Cycle Parking:

15.11 The proposed development makes an allowance for 70 cycle bikes, as well as 8 short staycycle spaces and 2 commercial spaces on the frontage as shown on the "Proposed Ground Floor Plan" layout. This is an acceptable number and accords with residential standards, and the location is secure and covered.

Access, Delivery and Servicing Arrangements:
15.12 Vehicular access currently exists direct from Hertford Road, where the access serves the existing shared service road. This will continue to serve the proposed development.
15.13 Pedestrian access to the residential units and the commercial uses will be from Hertford Road and will enable step free access. Part of the works to the new slip road will also incorporate pedestrian crossing points at either end.
15.14 Servicing and deliveries to the site which will primarily be for the commercial units are expected to take place from the shared slip road that will be provided directly outside the site, on Hertford Road. Transportation officers are satisfied that the slip road is large enough to accommodate vehicles servicing the commercial uses. Further details concerning the slip road works will need be discussed and agreed with Transportation as this involves works that are to be adopted, and therefore will require a Section 38 agreement.
15.15 The nature and location of the proposal means the development does requirethe provision of a Construction Logistics Management Plan to minimise its impacts on the local road network. This will be secured by condition.
15.16 Refuse storage is shown in two separate locations for the residential and commercial uses. As set out above, Transportation officers would prefer tosee the refuse storage located towards the front of the site so that it can be collected from Hertford Road. However, to do this and make the necessary internal/external alterations would have a detrimental impact on other aspectsof the scheme. It would reduce the size of the commercial units, affecting their viability and attractiveness to prospective occupiers. It would also result in 'dead' frontage at ground floor. In urban design terms, it is far more preferableto have active ground floor frontages, and this would be reduced if the scheme were amended to incorporate an internal refuse store at the front of the site.
15.17 The proposed refuse collection arrangement would see collection vehicles using the existing shared access. Collection vehicles would either reverse into the access road, from Hertford Road, or drive in forward gear and reverseout. Either way, this is no different to the existing servicing arrangement utilised by a number of existing commercial units in close proximity to the site. A Refuse Collection Strategy has been submitted, and this sets out further details, and compliance with this would be secured by condition.
15.18 In order to mitigate the impacts of the development, in addition to the aforementioned Section 38 highway works, Transportation seek Section 106 contributions comprising of $£ 15,835$ for sustainable transport mitigation measures and/or a contribution to a future CPZ and $£ 5,455$ for Travel Plan monitoring.
15.19 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.

## 16 Energy and Sustainability

16.1 London Plan Policy SI states that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:

1. Be Lean: use less energy;
2. Be Clean: supply energy efficiency; and
3. Be Green: use renewable energy.
16.2 Enfield's DMD policy 49 requires the highest sustainable design and construction standards, having regard to technical feasibility and economic viability. These policies require new developments to address the causes and impacts of climate change by minimising energy use, supplying energy efficiently and using energy generated from renewable sources (Core Strategy Policy 20 and DMD51), seeking zero carbon developments (DMD50), using decentralised networks where feasible (DMD52), and providing on-site renewable energy generation to make-up any shortfall where feasible (DMD53).
16.3 A detailed Energy and Sustainability 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.
16.4 The proposed energy strategy seeks to reduce energy demand, and CO2 emissions through the following:

- Energy efficiency measures
- Efficient heating systems
- Low air permeability
- Heat recovery system
- Energy efficient lighting
- Renewable technologies (solar PV panels)
16.5 The energy strategy, based on the London Plan principals of Be Lean, Be Clean and Be Green, combined with highly efficient boilers and PV panels results in a $35 \%$ reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.
16.6 The proposal broadly complies with the energy and sustainability requirements, subject to planning conditions that will agree the final measures needed to achieve the necessary savings.


## 17 Biodiversity, Trees and Landscaping

17.1 Policy DMD79 seeks the provision of on-site ecological enhancements and DMD81 sets out that developments must provide high quality landscapingthat enhances the local environment and should add to the local character, benefit biodiversity, help mitigate the impacts of climate change and reduce water runoff.
17.2 The submitted Ecology Report indicates that the existing site is of limited value ecologically. It concludes that the site offers no foraging, commuting, resting or breeding habitat for any protected species or habitats.
17.3 Trees on site have been removed, these were removed at the time the pub was demolished. Details of replacement planting will be secured through a landscape condition. Opportunities for landscaping are limited on site. Planters along the site frontage will assist in providing screening and defensible space from Hertford Road. There are third party trees outside of the site, and conditions are attached to ensure there are measures in place to protect these during construction.

## 18 Noise / Construction Dust

18.1 Potential noise and construction dust impacts associated with the proposed uses are a material consideration. London Plan Policy D14 aims to reduce noise and enhance soundscapes. DMD 68 states that developments that generate or would be exposed to an unacceptable level of noise will not be permitted. It states that developments must be sensitively designed, managed and operated to reduce exposure to noise and noise generation.
18.2 Environmental Health officers consider the development's location on a busy road has potential for construction dust to be harmful to prospective resident's amenity. To address this a condition would be attached.

## 19 Contaminated Land

19.1 The requirement to deal with contaminated land is set out in London Plan and is reinforced by the NPPF. It is considered that there is potential for the site to include some contaminated ground. To address this, and ensure the site is suitable for end users pre-commencement conditions are recommended

## 20 Air Quality

20.1 The proposal would introduce additional residential units to an area already comprising residential accommodation. In this respect the proposal is considered
acceptable. Enfield policies CP32 and DMD64 seek to resistdevelopments that would adversely impact on air quality, unless suitablemitigation measures can be achieved.
20.2 Environmental Health does not raise any concerns that the proposal would have a negative impact on existing air quality, subject to pre-commencement conditions being attached including the requirement for a Construction Management Plan, this must set out measures to mitigate against dust and emissions impacts and must be in accordance with the Mayor's SPG 'The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition'.

## 21 Sustainable Drainage / Flood Risk

21.1 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 runoff rates as well as maximise the use of SuDS.
21.2 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) supports the application. This confirms the site as being within Flood Zone 1, meaning it is at the lowest risk of a flood event from fluvial or tidal flooding. It is classified as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding.
21.3 An objection is raised by SUDS Officers as it is considered that the groundwater FRA provided is not sufficient for the proposed basement. In light of planning approval ref: 17/02599/FUL it is considered that subject to appropriate SuDS conditions prior to occupation a verification report would need to be submitted to and approved in writing, demonstrating that the approved drainage/SuDS measures have been fully implemented. The details submitted shall also confirm what depth the water table is with respect to the basement floor level; this may be covered as part of the site investigation condition.
21.4 Thames Water have not raised concerns in relation to surface water drainage, or sewerage infrastructure capacity. A condition is recommended requiring further details of any piling works prior to commencement.

## 22 Section 106 Contributions

19.1 Regulation 122(2)(a) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (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 it is recommended that should planning permission be granted, the following obligations / contributions should be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement:

- Affordable Housing - provision of a minimum of 11 units as Affordable Housing dwellings
- Early and late stage viability review mechanisms;
- Local Employment and Skills Strategy
- Highways contributions;
- CPZ permit exemption;
- $5 \%$ monitoring fee for the financial contributions and $£ 350$ for monitoring any non financial obligations.


## 23 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

23.1 The CIL Regulations also 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.
23.2 The new GIA proposed as part of the development would be liable to a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution for both Mayoral CIL ( $£ 20$ per sqm) and Enfield CIL ( $£ 40$ per sqm for residential and $£ 60$ per sqm for class $E$ uses).
23.3 This would result in a CIL contribution of $£ 171,420.00$ (subject to indexation).

## 24 Equalities Implications

24.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 places obligations on local authorities with regard to equalities in decision making. In accordance with the Public Sector Equalities Duty, an equalities impact assessment has been undertaken. it is considered that the proposal would not disadvantage people who share one of the different nine protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act compared to those who do not have those characteristics.

## 25 Conclusion

25.1 The starting point for the determination of any planning application is the development plan. Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, states that planning permission should be granted unless "the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or 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".
25.2 The Government prescribes a "tilted balance" in favour of housing delivery to the Council's planning decision-making as a result of Enfield's current inability to demonstrate a 5 -year housing land supply as well as the Council's shortfall in meeting housing delivery targets. This means that applications for new homes should be given greater weight, and Councils should grant permission unless any
adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the housing proposal. Officers consider that the adverse impacts of the scheme, are not sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed housing.
25.3 It is recognised that sites such as this need to be optimised in order to minimise encroachment into the Borough's Green Belt and protected Strategic Industrial Locations. It is considered that the social benefits, both in respect of the provision of high-quality new housing stock, and the delivery of affordable housing carry significant weight in favour of the proposed development.
25.4 The proposed development would deliver the following wider planning benefits:

- The delivery of both affordable (29\%) and private housing in a sustainable location, which makes effective and efficient use of land, optimises the housing potential, helping to meet the Borough's housing needs;
- A high-quality residential environment for all future occupiers. All of the new dwellings have been designed to meet the Mayor's London Housing Design Guide in terms of accessibility, size and layout, and achieve Lifetime Homes Standards;
- Redevelopment of existing vacant site, which will make a positive contribution to Hertford Road;
- Public realm improvements along Hertford Road, including new slip road;
- New commercial units to increase the offer along Hertford Road, and add to the vitality and viability of the area;
- High standards of urban design and architecture; and
- Sustainable design which will result in low levels of carbon emissions; and
25.5 Officers consider that on balance the scheme would make a positive contribution to the locality. It would deliver much needed additional homes and much needed affordable housing. The development would be in general compliance with Council policy and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would suggest that the application should be refused. Officers are therefore recommending approval of the scheme in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).


## 26 Recommendation

26.1 It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to securing the measures set out above through the Section 106 legal agreement, and the conditions outlined in section 2 of this report.
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