

Our Ref : AC/C3659
Date : 26th March 2015

Haringey Council
Planning Policy
Level 6
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
N22 8HQ

Preston Office:
7 East Cliff
Preston
Lancashire
PR1 3JE
T: 01772 258356
E: preston@cassidyashton.co.uk

Chester Office:
Cassidy House
Station Road
Chester
CH1 3DW
T: 01244 402900
E: chester@cassidyashton.co.uk

Dear Sir / Madam

HARINGEY'S LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTION SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD CONSULTATION DOCUMENT: FEBRUARY 2015 SITE ALLOCATION REFERENCE: SA27 CLARENDON ROAD SOUTH

We act on behalf of the Matliwala Darul Ulloom Charitable Trust, who are the owners of part of the land identified in Site Allocation SA27 of the Site Allocations DPD Consultation Document.

Our clients' interests are shown on the attached plan, together with the adjacent land to the rear which would rely on our clients' land for any meaningful access. The land which is the subject of this representation forms a part of the wider SA27 Site Allocation.

The identification of SA27 for mixed use [re]development is supported by our client, but there are elements of the proposed allocation that are overly prescriptive, in terms of the Site Requirements and Development Guidelines, which may result in development not coming forward in a timely or appropriate manner.

The site lies within a wider general area where high quality residential development is being promoted or already has planning permission [Clarendon Square]. The development of SA27 for primarily residential development will complement and support this general regeneration, however care needs to be taken to ensure that the policy itself undermines these laudable attempts to regenerate the general area.

In terms of the proposed use, there is no specific mention of residential use but given the support for development of up to 8 storeys, and the suggestion that the ground floor should be employment generating, it is implied that residential development will be acceptable for the majority of the development.

In order to emphasise this point and directly promote such development, specific reference should be made that development will be residential led and therefore supported on this allocation.

In this respect, restricting the use of the ground floor to employment generating uses under Use Class B1a or B1c [offices or light industry], is overly restrictive.

www.cassidyashton.co.uk

Architects
Masterplanning Consultants
Specialist Conservation Architects
Project Managers
Interior Designers
Landscape Architects

Building Surveyors
Party Wall Surveyors
DDA Consultants
Heritage & Conservation Surveyors

Town Planning Consultants
Development Consultants
Neighbourhood Planning Consultants
Environmental Impact Assessors
Retail Impact Consultants

Directors
AEP Baines BA (Hons) BArch RIBA
P Gornall BSc MRICS
P Harris Dip Arch RIBA MA
DT Owen BSc (Hons) MRICS MaPS
AP Cassidy BA (Hons) Cert. Ecol MSc MIEMA
MRTPI C.Env
DGM Moore Dip Arch RIBA
I Scales Dip Arch Dip Env Planning RIBA ARIAS
C Taylor BSc (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

Associates
TL McBurney BSc (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA
N Aaron ACIAT
PJ Llewellyn
G Evans MSc BSc (Hons) MRTPI
D Brown BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA
N Dermott
J Short
I Woods

Consultant
MJ Hartley Dip Arch RIBA SCA

Practice Manager
D Parkinson

Honorary Consultants
DH Bennett ARIBA
PM Whiteside Dip Arch ARIBA
JD Cockrell Dip Arch RIBA

Architecture + Building Surveying + Town Planning

Given its location, the site is not ideal for such uses which in the case of B1(a) may be more appropriately directed at Wood Green town centre. In respect to B1(c), although it is acknowledged that such uses can by definition take place in residential areas, the need for servicing and car parking will be such as to result in an inefficient use of the land which will restrict the extent to which residential development can come forward on the site.

The allocation should therefore recognise that other uses can also be employment generating and therefore should allow for a more flexible range of uses, including A1-A5, B1(b) and D1 [Given the need to relocate the West Indian Culture Centre at the southern end of the allocation].

The requirement for 33% employment floorspace is also unrealistic. Even at the suggested scale of 8 storeys and two storeys this, in simple terms would require 2-3 storeys of employment uses on one side of Clarendon Road and 1-2 storeys of employment uses on the other side of Clarendon Road. This is simply unrealistic and overly prescriptive.

Rather than setting a target of 33%, it would therefore be more appropriate to set this out as support being given for up to 33% of floorspace being for B1(a) and (b) or other employment generating uses.

Turning to the scale of development that is considered acceptable, it is noted that as proposed, the allocation would allow 8 storey development to the west of Clarendon Road and 4 storey development to the east of Clarendon Road.

Such a restriction is arbitrary and not based upon a proper analysis of townscape, topography or the realistic capacity of the site to accommodate new development in an acceptable form. Furthermore, given the grant of outline planning permission for the Clarendon Square development immediately to the north includes approval for 16-20m of development [5-7 storeys], in a location much closer to the properties on Hornsey Park Road [especially numbers 83-105], there is clearly no justification in restricting development to the east of Clarendon Road to 4 storeys, as this would also look out of scale against the Clarendon Square development. To the west of Clarendon Road the approved height is even greater.

The policy for the allocation should therefore be worded to take into account the existing approval at Clarendon Square and if a maximum height is required, should set this as 8-9 storeys for the site as a whole, subject to site specific assessment.

There are concerns in respect to the timescale for development. Although it is acknowledged that the reference to 2020 onwards is indicative, it is noted that the realignment of Clarendon Road has been debated for a number of years [cf. Haringey Heartlands Development Framework (Supplementary Planning Guidance Planning Report 5 November 2003) and the development of part of the area should not be delayed whilst this process is concluded. Indeed, the northern end of the site relates more closely to the approved Clarendon Square development than to the proposed realignment works and should therefore be encouraged to come forward separately, in advance of the remainder of the site if this is delayed, provided it does not prejudice the overall redevelopment of the SA27 Allocation.

If the policy supporting the allocation is worded to requires comprehensive development, there is a grave risk that the site will not come forward at all and an opportunity will be missed. This would not only be contrary to the positive approach to sustainable development ordained by the NPPF but could seriously blight the allocated area for a number of years.

Reference should be made to the design opportunity given the development that has been approved on Clarendon Square to the north. This provides the opportunity for positive linkages and complimentary design which will not only serve to integrate the allocated area with the Clarendon Square development to the north but also facilitate improved pedestrian linkages to Wood Green town centre.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our client's support the principle of Site Allocation SA27 being identified for redevelopment subject to the following caveats:

- The allocation should emphasise that development will be residential led;
- Appropriate ground uses should be more flexible and support should be for up to 33% employment uses [including other appropriate uses in addition to B1];
- Development should be encouraged up to 8-9 storeys to reflect the approved development to the north;
- There should be support to allow the northern area of the allocation to come forward in advance of the rest; and
- Reference should be made to the opportunity to provide linkages and complimentary design with Clarendon Square to the north.

We trust that I have provided sufficient information in order to consider this matter but if you would like any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the writer.

Yours sincerely

ALBAN P. CASSIDY

For and on behalf of

CASSIDY AND ASHTON GROUP LTD

ARCHITECTS BUILDING SURVEYORS TOWN PLANNERS

email: albancassidy@cassidyashton.co.uk

www.cassidyashton.co.uk

Architecture + Building Surveying + Town Planning

**HARINGEY'S LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTION
SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD CONSULTATION DOCUMENT: FEBRUARY 2015
SITE ALLOCATION REFERENCE: SA27 CLARENDON ROAD SOUTH**

LAND OWNED BY THE MATLIWALA DARUL ULLOOM CHARITABLE TRUST



Land owned by Matliwala Darul Ulloom Charitable Trust



Adjacent land which may require shared access

www.cassidyashton.co.uk

Architecture + Building Surveying + Town Planning

Cassidy and Ashton is a trading style of Cassidy and Ashton Group Limited
Registered in England and Wales No. 2510645 - 7 East Cliff, Preston, PR1 3JE

RIBA

RICS

RTPI

ISO 9001
REGISTERED FIRM

ISO 14001
REGISTERED FIRM

Honorary Consultants
DH Bennett ARIBA
PM Whiteside Dip Arch ARIBA
JD Cockrell Dip Arch RIBA