

Pre-Application Planning Advice Note PRE/2014/0045



Date of meeting: 15th April 2014

Site Address: 399-401 High Road Tottenham N17

Attendees:

Steve Andrews - LBH Planning Officer
John McRory - LBH Interim Majors Team Leader
Rhoda Hayashi - LBH Transport Planner
Nairita Chakraborty - LBH Conservation Officer
Richard Truscott - LBH Design Officer
Sandra Lawrence - LBH Housing Enabling Officer
Suzanne Johnson - Tottenham Regeneration Manager
Angelique Glata - Tottenham War Institute
Alto Property Investments Ltd - Developer
David Alton - Architect
Elizabeth Moore - Heritage Adviser
David Matzdorf - Affordable Housing Adviser

Site Description

The subject site is located on the western side of the High Road, Tottenham.

The site accommodates a building consisting of three elements. The main element is a part two part four storey building with flat roof; the second element is a grade II Listed part single, part two storey building attached to the western flank of the main building finished with a pitched roofs. The third and final element attached to the rear is single storey again finished with a pitched roof.

The building is set back approximately 17m from the back edge of the pavement with hard standing accommodating car parking to the northern side and front of the building. The site is accessed off the High Road via a crossover to the northern end of the site.

The current use of part of the main building is the provision of community facilities although up until recently the first and second floors of the main building were used as offices. Community facilities provided by the British Legion previously used the ground and first floors of the Listed Building with the large single storey building to the rear again as a community facility in the form of a function room.

Surrounding Area

The site is adjoined to the south and west by residential properties between 2 and 3 storeys in height and a 2/3 storey building to the north currently in community use.

The wider surrounding area is urban in character providing a mix of uses including residential houses, flats and a series of local shops and other local services.

The closest underground station is Seven Sisters and the closest overland station is Bruce Grove which is only a short walk to the east.

The site is also well positioned in relation to recreational and leisure facilities.

Description of the Proposal

Pre-application advice has been sought for the retention of the main and listed elements and the demolition of the single storey extension to the rear. This would be replaced by a five storey rear extension. The buildings would accommodate a mix of community and residential uses. The residential mix would comprise of 19 x 1 bed units and 4 x 2 bed units. The community facilities would be spread across the basement, ground, first and second floors of the main building.

A single storey extension to the northern side is proposed which would provide a separate entrance and foyer to the community area.

Relevant Planning History

OLD/1988/0572 - Listed Building consent for fire damaged building structure to match original in appearance and materials – GTD 14-09-1988

OLD/1989/0584 - Use of 1st and 2nd floors as offices – GTD 26-09-1989

OLD/1989/0585 - Use of 1st and 2nd floors as offices – GTD 26-09-1989

OLD/1989/0586 - Listed building consent for conversion of 1st and 2nd floors to offices – GTD 06-09-1989

OLD/1989/0587 - Listed building consent for conversion of 1st and 2nd floors to offices – GTD 06-09-1989

HGY/1996/0829 - Change of use of part of ground floor to a mini-cab office for the Legion cab and courier service – GTD 20-08-96

HGY/1998/0973 - Renewal of temporary planning permission HGY/51427 granted on 20/8/96 for use of part of ground floor to a mini-cab office and courier service - GTD 27-10-98

Relevant Planning Policy

National Planning Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

- Chapter 4 Promoting sustainable transport;
- Chapter 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes;
- Chapter 7 Requiring good design;
- Chapter 8 Promoting healthy communities; and
- Chapter 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

The London Plan, 2011

- Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all;
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply;
- Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential;
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments;
- Policy 3.8 Housing choice;
- Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing;
- Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes;
- Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds;
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation;
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions;
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction;
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy;
- Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity;
- Policy 6.9 Cycling;
- Policy 6.10 Walking;
- Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion;
- Policy 6.13 Parking;
- Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities;
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment;
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime;
- Policy 7.4 Local character;
- Policy 7.6 Architecture;
- Policy 7.14 Improving air quality;
- Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes;
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature; and

Haringey Local Plan, 2013

- Policy SP0 Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Policy SP1 Managing growth;
- Policy SP2 Housing;
- Policy SP4 Working towards a low carbon Haringey;

Policy SP5 Water management and flooding;
Policy SP6 Waste and recycling;
Policy SP7 Transport;
Policy SP11 Design; and
Policy SP14 Health and well-being

Saved Haringey Unitary Development Plan, 2013

Policy UD1 Planning statements;
Policy UD3 General Principles;
Policy UD7 Waste storage;
Policy HSG2 Change of use to residential;
Policy HSG11 Restricted Conversion Area
Policy EMP4 Non Employment Generating Uses
Policy M10 Parking for development;
Policy CSV4 Alterations and Extension to Listed Buildings

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a Design guidance;
SPG5 Safety by design;
SPG7a Pedestrian & vehicular movement;
SPG9 Sustainability statements
SPG10c Educational needs generated by new housing

Supplementary Planning Document

SPD Sustainable Design & Construction; and
SPD Housing

Other

London Borough of Haringey – Community Infrastructure Study; and
Mayor of London ‘London Housing Design Guide’

Key Issues

Continuation of community use

The use of part of the building as a community use would continue, which is considered acceptable and welcomed in principle.

Loss of existing building

The demolition of the single storey building to the rear, which is a later addition to the site, is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the buildings to the front or the surrounding area.

Loss of existing employment-generating use

Saved UDP Policy EMP4 reads, "Planning permission will be granted to redevelop or change the use of land and buildings in an employment generating use provided:

a) the land or building is no longer suitable for business or industry use on environmental, amenity and transport grounds in the short, medium and long term; and b) there is well documented evidence of an unsuccessful marketing/advertisement campaign, including price sought over a period of normally 18 months in areas outside the DEAs, or 3 years within a DEA; or c) the redevelopment or re-use of all employment generating land and premises would retain or increase the number of jobs permanently provided on the site, and result in wider regeneration benefits".

The Council's planning history shows that planning permission was granted for the use of the first and second floors for B1 office use in 1989 and a mini cab and courier service partly at ground floor level. Following discussions at the pre-application meeting, it would appear that the office use has recently ceased and these floors are being used partly for community use. However there was no discussion relating to the mini cab use at ground floor level.

Notwithstanding the above, part of the building has been an employment generating use and the above policy would apply in this instance. Whilst it is accepted that recent changes to Government policy means that existing B1 offices can be converted to residential units without the need for planning permission (subject to certain criteria) it would be necessary to provide an explanation in any planning statement submitted the history of this B1 use, the current situation and how the benefits of the proposed use would overcome this potential policy objection.

Furthermore, an explanation relating to the mini cab use would be pertinent to explain whether this use has ceased and when or if it is still existing whether this would be lost as part of the new proposal.

New residential use

The provision of housing would be principally supported as it would augment the borough's housing stock in accordance with Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2, London Plan Policy 3.3. However a change of use to housing would only be accepted if meets the policy criteria of under saved UDP Policy HSG2:

"a) the building does not fall within a defined employment area unless specified for housing in Table 4.1 and Schedule 1 or where a proposal satisfies the criteria in policy EMP4; or b) it does not involve the loss of protected open space; or c) it is not in a primary or secondary shopping frontage or d) the building can provide satisfactory living conditions".

The Council can confirm that the development site does not lie wholly within a defined employment area (part a), primary or secondary shopping frontage (part c) or involve the loss of protected open space (part b). However, the applicant would need to demonstrate that any proposed development incorporating new residential units provides acceptable living conditions for future occupiers in fulfilling part d) of the policy.

Affordable Housing

The proposal is required to provide 50% on-site affordable housing, based on habitable rooms to create mixed sustainable and cohesive communities and in line with Criterion 8 of Local Plan Policy SP2 for residential schemes over 10 units subject to viability. The Council's preferred affordable housing mix is set out in Housing SPD. Only in exceptional circumstances, where on-site affordable housing cannot be provided, the Council may consider an off-site provision or cash in lieu towards affordable housing provision. In the event of an affordable housing provision shortfall, then a viability assessment would be required to be submitted as part of any planning application, and will be considered by the Council. Any such report will be sent to an independent third party viability expert for assessment and the fee would need to be paid by the Applicant.

Dwelling Mix

The proposal is for 23 individual units comprising 1 and 2 beds. This housing mix would be unacceptable as it fails to accord with the Council's SPD 'Housing'. A broader range would be required including a number of family units. This document sets out the dwelling mix for private market and affordable housing to foster mixed, sustainable and cohesive communities.

In terms of the affordable housing provision of the 50% of the 23 units proposed, being in the east of the borough the Council would require all or the majority of the units as intermediate tenure.

In recognition to the housing tenure being markedly different between the east and the west of the borough, where there is a higher concentration of social housing in the area, 399 High Rd is no exception as it is encompassed by social housing managed by a variety of social landlords.

Further, to support this, the SPD 2008 and the 2006 UDP makes reference to areas of change. Tottenham High Rd Regeneration Corridor Policy AC3 advises that new housing should promote a more balanced, mixed sustainable less transient community and the affordable housing should in the main be intermediate forms of housing such as shared ownership and sub market home ownership.

The table below shows the expected mix by habitable room for the affordable which as stated will all be intermediate tenure and for the private units.

Affordable units

Unit	Hab room	No of units	HR total	SPG %
Studio	1	0.00	0.00	0.00%
1 bed	2	1.79	3.58	17.00%
2 bed	3	4.21	12.63	40.00%
3 bed	4	3.37	13.47	32.00%
≥4 bed	5	1.16	5.79	11.00%
Total		10.5	35.5	100.00%

Private units

Unit	Hab room	No of units	HR total	SPG %
Studio	1	0.00	0.00	0.00%
1 bed	2	2.37	4.74	19.00%
2 bed	3	3.24	9.73	26.00%
3 bed	4	3.37	13.48	27.00%
≥4 bed	5	3.49	17.47	28.00%
Total		12.5	45.4	100.00%

Finally, in keeping with policy, 10% of the units will have to be designated as wheel chair units with appropriate parking as discussed in the meeting.

Design, Layout and impact on Conservation Area and Listed Building

London Plan Policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' require development proposals to be of the highest design quality and have appropriate regard to local context. Haringey's Local Plan Policy SP11 and Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' reinforce this strategic approach.

Any proposed scheme would also need to comply with London Plan policy 7.8 'Heritage Assets and Archaeology' and which seeks to ensure that development does cause harm to the character and appearance of any listed building.

Section 66 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act sets out that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The importance of properly discharging the duty conferred by these provisions and the need to pay particular attention to potential harm was recently underlined by the decision of the courts in the Barnwell Manor and subsequent decisions that rely on it. NPPF (2012) chapter 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment and The London Plan 2011 Policy 7.8 '*Heritage Assets and Archaeology*' states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. Similarly Local Plan Policy (2013) SP12 seeks to ensure the conservation of heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment.

Any materials which are to be used on any proposed scheme for new buildings or its environs needs to be sensitive to the buildings proposed which includes whether the form, bulk and materials of the building proposed safeguards the appearance of adjoining and surrounding buildings and any distinctness in the local character of the surrounding area.

Given the sensitivity and importance of the statutory Grade II listed building any new development should respect the scale and massing of this building whilst contributing positively to the wider character of the area.

It is suggested that the height of the extension on top of the existing building be reduced as currently it is not possible to read the existing listed building, which therefore adversely impacts on its setting. The proposed extension appears top heavy and out of character and is not subordinate to the existing building and competes visually with it. In terms of the building to the rear the use of brick is considered acceptable but the rear extension is currently too high. Nothing at the rear should be higher than the building to the front.

Extensions should be considered to the right hand side of the building rather than adding an entire floor. There is an opportunity to be much more creative with the design. This extension would fill the gap to the right hand side of the existing building. The extension(s) could be independent of the main building structurally and could be joined by a modern link possibly lightweight such as glass. No extension should be proposed to the front as this would harm the character of the existing listed building.

Given the fact that there is a listed building on the site the argument could be put forward that where financial viability is a key issue the extension could act as an 'enabling development' in order to improve the character of the existing buildings. The document produced by English Heritage entitled '*Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places*' may be worth referring to. It is encouraged that the developer explores the possibility of acquiring more land which could result in a larger extension to the right hand side which may also address the financial viability issue. A clear

drawing showing ownership boundaries should also be submitted in order for the Design Officers to consider this opportunity.

The larger building should be renewed back to its original glory including the possible re-instatement of cornices. There appears to be scope for this to be undertaken. Any Heritage Statement should say what is new and what is old.

There is a current lack of amenity space on the site. The Mayor's Housing Design Guide should be referred to. There appears to be the possibility of a green roof space. A parapet could be used in order to accommodate this space.

Officers would also invite and strongly advise the applicant to present any scheme to the Councils Design Review Panel in order to obtain the Panels advice and feedback in relation to the proposal. For further details please contact the design officer whose details are included below.

Lifetime Homes, Inclusive Design and Access and Community Safety

Any scheme should seek to accord with London Plan Policy 3.8 and Haringey's Local Plan Policy SP2, which requires all units to be built to 'Lifetime Homes Standard'. This standard ensures that dwellings are able to be easily adapted to suit the changing needs of occupiers, particularly those with limits to mobility. Saved Policy UD3 "General Principles" of the Council's UDP, The Councils SPD on Housing (paragraph 8.7) and SPG 4 "Access for All – Mobility Standards" seeks to ensure that access to and around a site takes into consideration the access requirements of pedestrians and the less mobile members of the community.

10% of the number of residential units should be wheelchair accessible compliant and laid out in accordance to the GLA's guidance's note. Individual disabled parking spaces should also be provided for the designated accessible units.

A lift within the individual cores is strongly encouraged for able bodied and disabled users to ensure ease of access within the building.

Density

National, London and local policy seeks to ensure that new housing development makes the most efficient use of land and takes a design approach to meeting density requirements.

Table 3.2 of the London Plan suggest acceptable ranges for density according to the public transport accessibility (PTAL) of a site. This site is considered to be in the 'urban' context and has a PTAL rating of 6, thus any proposed development should obviously seek to optimise the site whilst using the density ranges of 200 to 700 habitable room per hectare (hr/ha) as set out in the London Plan. Any proposed scheme should seek to comply with these density standards and where these thresholds are exceeded, a full

justification supporting non compliance would be required in order to provide officer level support.

Quality of Accommodation

The proposed units should adhere to the unit and individual space standards prescribed within the London Housing Design Guide to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers of the residential units.

It would appear in this case that all of the units comfortably meet the minimum space standards applicable for the mix of one and two bed units.

In terms of room stacking, like-for-like rooms i.e. habitable over habitable and non-habitable over non-habitable rooms should be stacked over each other to avoid the vertical transmission of unwanted noise arising from general activities within the individual rooms.

There is a current lack of amenity space. The Mayor's Housing Design Guide should be referred to relating to this. Whilst currently given the lack of family units being provided there is greater justification for amenity space, the use of balconies should be explored where possible but balanced with the need to protect existing residential amenity.

Transportation/Parking

National planning policy seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion. This advice is also reflected in the Parking Policies of the London Plan 2011 and Haringey's Local Plan Policy SP7 and more generally in Policy UD3 of the Council's UDP. The following comments should be taken into consideration as part of any future scheme. This site is located in an area that has a high public transport accessibility level of 6. It is therefore considered that prospective residents would have good level of access to sustainable modes of transport.

The site is located on the edge of the Bruce Grove Ward and therefore falls within the Bruce Grove Restricted Conversion Area, which requires that a higher level of on-site parking spaces are provided in connection with the residential aspect of the development. Given that the site benefits from the highest level of public transport accessibility and that unrestricted on-street parking opportunities within the immediate vicinity of the site are very limited, it is suggested that the level of parking provision be set at 0.6 spaces per unit.

The proposal drawings indicate 2 parking spaces dedicated for the use of disabled blue badge holders. This level of provision is considered acceptable for this size of development. It should be noted that cycle storage will need to be provided in line with standards set out within the London Plan. We would also expect that the proposal be accompanied by a Transport Statement.

Subject to the provision of the above the highway and transportation authority are unlikely to raise an objection to the proposal should it be formally submitted to the Local Planning Authority. However, if necessary we will seek further mitigation measures and the imposition of further relevant conditions in connection with the development

Refuse and Recycling

Policy 5.17 'Waste Capacity' of the London Plan and Saved Policy UD7 'Waste Storage' of the UDP requires development proposals make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection.

Details of waste management arrangements would be subject to the imposition of conditions consistent with Policy SP6 of Haringey's Local Plan and saved Policy UD7 of the UDP.

The Council's Waste Management Officer should be contacted for further advice whose details are included below.

Impact of proposal on living conditions of surrounding residents

Policy 7.6 of the London Plan states that new development should be of the highest architectural quality, whilst also being of an appropriate proportion and scale so as not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, especially where these are in residential use. This is also reflected in Saved Policy UD3 of the UDP. Any proposed scheme should ensure that there is not material adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residents regarding loss of daylight/sunlight (in accordance with BRE guidelines), increase sense of enclosure, overlooking, and a loss of privacy and noise disturbance.

As such, professional reports would need to be submitted with any future planning application to illustrate how the development would safeguard the amenity of future occupants of the premises and existing occupiers of surrounding properties.

However an initial view from the plans considered there are two main blocks that could be potentially impacted upon and these are the residential units to the south along Library Court and the units to the west within Nicholson Court. A section drawing has been submitted showing lines of sight being compromised at fourth floor level. The impact on the occupiers of Nicholson Court has not been shown. Those closest to the rear extension may experience some sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and feel that the new structure would appear overbearing given that they are less than 10m from the proposed building.

In terms of loss of privacy the distance between the front windows of the existing dwellings along Library Court and the proposed windows would be

approximately 17.5m away and across a road so the impact would be little different to a typical residential street.

With regards to Nicholson Court, there would be views across into the southern windows of the existing closest wing but given the design of the existing block this level of overlooking already exists and appears too oblique to materially impact.

There is a 30m distance between the existing windows of Nicholson Court's western block and the proposed windows of the rear elevation so no material loss of privacy would occur.

It is considered that such a daylight/sunlight study be submitted with an application in order to address concerns relating to the potential impact on the living conditions of existing neighbours.

Trees/ Landscaping

Haringey's Local Plan Policy SP11 seeks to ensure that development proposals demonstrate that opportunities for soft landscaping have been taken into account. This is also reflected in Saved policy UD3 of the UDP. Any proposed scheme would need to accord with these policy criteria

Environmental & Sustainability Issues

Chapter 5 of the London Plan 2011 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to make the fullest contribution to minimizing carbon dioxide emissions. The pre-application scheme presented did not provide a level of detail which included sustainability issues, and is likely to form part of discussions later in the process. However, officers would advise that any future submitted scheme would need to take on board the Mayor's support for a more sustainable approach to the way housing is constructed and operated in London, seeking to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, water use and waste generation and it needs to meet the Mayor's target for 40 per cent reduction in CO2 emissions as set out in London Plan Policy 5.2. All aspects of sustainability should be considered and incorporated into the proposed scheme where possible (passive solar design, renewable energy, insulation, glazing, water efficient taps/showers, sustainable materials, local suppliers etc). The applicants are advised to start factoring these requirements in to any scheme early in the process.

Planning obligations

The Council will expect developers to enter in to a section 106 legal agreement to secure financial contributions and other community benefits in appropriate circumstances and in accordance with Circular 05/2005, to influence the nature of a development or mitigate for its potential effects. A planning obligation can be used in the following ways:

- To prescribe the nature of the development to achieve planning objectives;
- To mitigate the impact of a development;
- To compensate for loss or damage caused by a development.

As the scheme is in the very early stages of the pre-application process, section 106 contributions and other obligations will be discussed in more detail as pre-application discussions progress. However, below is a list, which is not exhaustive, of what would likely be required as part of any proposed scheme which may be submitted in the future:

- Transport and Highways to include;
 - Legible London
 - Section 278 works to the highways
 - Potential Traffic Orders and alterations to CPZ
- Education
- Open Space
- Affordable Housing
- Health
- Public Realm Works
- Public Art

Other obligations may be required and identified as discussions on the pre-application and any future planning application progresses.

Viability

Local Plan Policy SP2 requires developments of more than 10 units to provide a 50% of affordable housing to contribute to the boroughs affordable housing stock. Any proposed scheme providing less than 50% affordable housing must submit a viability report. Any viability report will be independently assessed at the Applicants expense.

Mayoral CIL

The Mayoral CIL has taken effect on developments that are granted planning permission on and after 1 April 2012. The London Borough of Haringey is designated as the second band of the proposed charging zone, which requires a £35 per sq m charge on net additional increase in floorspace of all developments (with some exceptions) equal to or over 100 sq m, or involve creating one dwelling even where this is below 100 sq m (although any net charge of less than £50 will not be collected). Further information on the Mayoral CIL can be found on the Greater London Authority's (GLA) website.

London Borough of Haringey CIL

The Council is currently developing its own CIL charging schedule and is expecting to adopt it in October 2014. This will be an additional charge to the Mayoral CIL and it will replace S106 contributions that are not site specific.

Consultation

Prior to the submission of any planning application the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would suggest that the applicant undertake initial public consultation with adjoining/neighbouring residents/occupiers and with Ward Councillor's in accordance and encouraged by the NPPF.

It is likely the adoption of a new planning protocol will be in place throughout the journey of this and future pre-applications on this site. As such, this will now include the requirement for Applicants to present their schemes to Members of the Planning Sub - Committee at pre-application stage. Applicants will also be required to undertake a Development Forum as part of the pre-application process in order to engage the local community in order to obtain their opinions on any proposed development before any planning application is submitted for formal consideration and determination.

Once a planning application is submitted, the LPA will undertake the normal consultation procedures in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2012 which will include providing a minimum of 21 days for neighbours and other statutory and non-statutory consultees to provide responses and comments to any submitted planning application.

The scheme will need to be presented to Members of the Councils Planning Committee for determination. The LPA will endeavour to ensure that a formal decision is issued within the statutory 8 - 13 week period however this is contingent on Planning Committee dates.

In order to assist in the application process the applicant is strongly encouraged and would be expected to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the Council in order to assist the smooth process of any planning application from pre-application to determination stages. Please contact Steve Andrews on the details provided to discuss this requirement.

Information required for Planning Application Submission

The following information will likely be required for registration of any future planning application in respect of this site.

- Planning application form and fee;
- A site location plan (scale 1:1250), identifying the application site edged in red and other adjoining land(s) in the ownership of the applicant edged in blue;
- Planning Statement;
- Design & Access Statement;
- Full details/specifications and samples of Materials;
- Accessibility Management Plan;

- Fully annotated and scaled (1:50 or 1:100 or 1:200) drawings (with dimensions and a scale bar on each plan), floor plans, sections & elevations of the existing & proposed;
- Transport Assessment;
- Travel Plan;
- Flood Risk/ Drainage Assessment;
- EIA Screening Opinion;
- Tree Survey/Arboricultural Survey;
- Sunlight/Daylight Assessment;
- Site Waste Management Plan;
- Sustainability Statement (including Energy Statement);
- A completed Sustainability Checklist;
- Determining whether a development may be CIL liable form:
- CIL – Assumption of Liability Form.

However, this list is by no means exhaustive and the LPA retain the right to add to this list should it be required for the any planning application to be properly assessed.

List of Relevant Contacts

Emma Williamson – Head of Development Management - 020 8489 5507
 John McRory – Team Leader – 020 8489 2596
 Stephen Andrews – Planner – 020 8489 2296
 Rhoda Hayashi - Transport Planner - 020 8489 5575
 Richard Truscott – Design Officer – 020 8489 5241
 Nairita Chakraborty – Conservation Officer – 020 8489 2841
 Alex Fraser - Arboricultural Officer - 020 8489 5567
 Sandra Lawrence - Housing Enabling Officer- 020 8489 4721
 Suzanne Johnson - Area Regeneration Manager- 020 8489 3203
 Alison Bell – Environmental Health Officer – 020 8489 5246
 Michael McNicholas - Head of Waste Management – 020 8489 5561
 Andrew Snape - Crime Prevention Design Adviser - 020 8345 2167

Conclusion

In light of the above assessment on the scheme presented at the pre-application meeting, although the broad principle of what is being discussed at pre-application stage is considered acceptable, as the scheme 'stands', the planning service would not be able to support it should the scheme be formally submitted for consideration and determination. It is advised that the above advice be incorporated in any revised scheme in order for the planning service to move closer to supporting such a proposal.

With this in mind, you are strongly encouraged to seek a further pre-application meeting once these revisions have been undertaken.

Without Prejudice

Whilst this advice is offered in good faith and to best of ability it neither conveys planning permission nor binds the Local Planning Authority to the grant of permission, which will be subject to public consultation.