



-  RESIDENTIAL WITH CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS
-  COMMERCIAL USE
-  RESIDENTIAL WITH ESTABLISHED USE

Arena Design Centre survey table						
Unit Address	Current usage	Do premises have Lawful Use certificate/what for?	Planning Reference	Size of Unit (m2)	VOA description	VOA floorspace
ARENA DESIGN CENTRE						
A1 - ff	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for five self contained flats	2001/1069	102 sqm		
A2 - gf	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for five self contained flats	2001/1069	102 sqm		
A3 - g	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for five self contained flats	2001/1069	102 sqm		
A4 - g	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for five self contained flats	2001/1069	102 sqm		
A5 - g	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for five self contained flats	2001/1069	102 sqm		
B1	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single dwelling house (C3)	2012/0640	approx.110 sqm		
B2	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single dwelling house (C3)	2012/0638	approx.130 sqm		
B3	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single dwelling house (C3)	2012/0618	110 sqm		
C	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single residential dwelling unit	2012/1246	approx.363 sqm		
D	COMMERCIAL	No	No	670 sqm		
E left	LIVE/WORK	No	No	408 sqm	Workshop and premises	
E right	COMMERCIAL	No	No	390 sqm		
E2 split into 2 units- left/right	LIVE/WORK	No	No	836 sqm		
F ground floor/mezzanine	LIVE/WORK	Yes for single residential unit	2012/1030	approx.730 sqm		
G first floor /mezzanine	HMO	Yes for HMO	2012/0619	464 sqm		
H	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single residential unit	2012/1040	approx.230 sqm		
I /mezzanine	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for single self contained residential unit	2013/0416	approx.462.5 sqm		
J	RESIDENTIAL	No	No	464 sqm	Workshop and premises	
K1	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K2	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K3/ mezzanine	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K4/ mezzanine	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K5	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K6	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
K7	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for seven self contained residential units	2012/1147	185 sqm		
L6/ mezzanines	LIVE/WORK	No	No	464 sqm	Workshop and premises	
M	RESIDENTIAL	Yes for HMO	2012/0616	185 sqm		

Unit Key	
	RESIDENTIAL WITH CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS
	COMMERCIAL
	RESIDENTIAL WITH ESTABLISHED USE

Arena Design Centre

Residential with lawful certificate	4589.5sqm
Commercial	1060sqm
Residential with established use	2172sqm

APPENDIX F

Our ref: BAH/199arena
Date: 20th April 2015

CgMs Consulting
7th Floor
140 London Wall
London
EC2Y 5DN

Dear Sirs

Units D & E, Arena Estate, 199 Eade Road, London, N4

Further to our discussions and inspection of the above units, we set out below our thoughts with regards the potential lettability and demand for this type of space in the current market.

The units are situated in Arena Design Centre which is on Ashfield Road, which is to the north of Seven Sisters Road and east of its junction with Green Lanes. Arena Design Centre comprises mainly residential occupied warehouses and the surrounding area is mainly residential houses and flats.

Manor House Underground Station is approximately ½ a mile to the south west of the property and Seven Sisters Underground Station is within walking distance. Numerous bus routes run along Seven Sisters Road and Green Lanes.

The two units are located in the north west corner of the Estate and are currently light industrial units which have been occupied by a Stonecutter. The units are very basic, not in the best condition and due to the limitations with the building and access issues is not satisfactory to meet the modern day standards of a light industrial or warehouse occupier. It would require substantial investment to make them more attractive to potential occupiers.

We believe that the nature and type of the building would have limited appeal to modern day occupiers. The space is dilapidated and suffers from access issues with poor access from narrow roads, through a residential area to the east of the site. The approach to the unit is narrow and often obstructed by pedestrians or residents cars making it extremely difficult for an industrial or warehouse operator to gain beneficial use from the units and to adequately move possessions or

have deliveries effectively into the buildings. Also parking is a major consideration for these types of users and there is not adequate parking provided with the units.

From our experience the majority of light industrial and warehouse occupiers are being drawn to modern buildings with regular floorplates, minimal columns and in prominent locations close to underground stations. They require prominence to advertise their business and good access and egress.

When considering the marketability of the existing buildings we have to take into consideration demand for the product. Bearing in mind the comments above the current configuration, layout and access we believe this would deter commercial tenants from occupying the space as they would have difficulty in utilising the existing space efficiently and as the space is dilapidated the cost of investment is too vast. Also the two units are part of the Arena estate where the other occupiers on the site are for residential/warehouse living use which will deter potential occupiers that want to be sited on estates that are solely or mainly commercial similar users. This therefore makes the space, in our opinion, unmarketable.

From our experience potential commercial occupiers are being more particular about the quality of the space they are taking and have a distinct preference for modern space with high specification and quality internal fit out. This is especially important for companies and organisations where their profile and presentation is as important as the work that they do for and with their clients. Companies want up to date facilities which can only be achieved for Units D and E with a complete overhaul of the existing internal and external structure of the building.

If a refurbishment of the existing building is proposed then it is necessary to consider the definitive costs of the refurbishment in relation to the proposed income receivable from a potential B1/B8 occupier to ensure it is financially viable.

We have a definite concern that the B1/B8 rental achievable may not make a refurbishment financially viable. We believe that in order to attract interest from a light industrial or warehouse operator in this particular location the rental would need to be in the region of £6-£7 per sq ft. It therefore also has to be considered that even if the money is spent refurbishing the building, which could cost in excess of £100 per sq ft can be justifiable to achieve only a rental of at best £7

per sq ft and that is before any incentives such as rent free periods. Also there is no guarantee that a B1/B8 occupier could be found immediately and you would

need to allow for up to 18-24 months possibly to secure a tenant which is a considerable void after a colossal capital spend and in the meantime interest will mount up on any bank loan taken out to cover the cost of the refurbishment works.

Whilst we therefore believe that the building is unlettable in its current state for a potential B1/B8 occupier, it may be difficult to obtain finance for a full refurbishment as listed above due to the length of time it would take to recoup the costs via the rental, especially with the risk of not being able to secure a tenant for up to 2 years which is a considerable void.

Obviously some of the more desirable space in prominent recognised commercial locations and with good access are more likely to be let above secondhand and dilapidated buildings with very difficult access issues and on mainly residential estates. As a result a lot of the second hand spaces and buildings which are disjointed and difficult to utilise by a wide variety of potential office occupiers remain empty and at risk of dilapidating or being squatted, such as the subject premises.

To summarise, the subject buildings are at a disadvantage to other available buildings in the area due to the layout of the building, the dilapidated condition, very restrictive access way and residential dominance of the Arena Estate. As we have previously stated this is important for the majority of potential commercial occupiers as a prominent profile and strong identity is a means of advertising their business operation.

We have significant concerns about Units D and E and the viability of being able to let the space either as a whole or in part to a potential occupier due to the obvious limitations with the building that we have cited above.

The current buildings are not well designed and we believe it would be unlikely to be possible to find a new occupier to take occupation of one or both of the units at a feasible rental.

We have concerns that even if the buildings could be refurbished to create high quality commercial space it will not be simple to secure a commercial occupier due to the off pitch location problematic access and mainly residential nature of the Arena Estate. Also it has to be considered whether the costs of the refurbishment, which would be substantial and would involve complete remodelling of the existing or demolishing a large part of the site and rebuilding, could be justified in view of our comments above.

Therefore we would reiterate that bearing in mind the comments above the current configuration, layout and lack of modern facilities coupled with the current

market conditions would deter any commercial tenant from occupying the space and makes the space, in our opinion, almost unmarketable.

We hope the above adequately summarises our thoughts on the two commercial units and their lettability and please do not hesitate to contact us if you require further clarification on any of the points raised.

Yours faithfully,

**CHRISTOPHER CURRELL
GROUP CHAIRMAN
CURRELL**

APPENDIX G

Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 2 September 2014

Site visit made on 2 September 2014

by John Murray LLB, Dip.Plan.Env, DMS, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 September 2014

Appeal A: APP/Y5420/C/14/2212163 Unit 4, 199 Eade Road, London, N4 1DN

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Kempton Investments Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The Council's reference is PRJ/2013/00260.
- The notice was issued on 12 December 2013.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is "without planning permission for[sic] the unauthorised change of use to residential units."
- The requirement of the notice is to cease the use of the land for residential use.
- The period for compliance with the requirement is 6 months after the notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (e) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed subject to the enforcement notice being corrected in the terms set out below in the Decision.

Appeal B: APP/Y5420/C/14/2212166 Unit C, 199 Eade Road, London, N4 1DN

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Kempton Investments Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The Council's reference is PRJ/2013/00896.
- The notice was issued on 18 December 2013.
- The alleged breach of planning control, the requirement of the notice and the period for compliance with that requirement are all as per the notice under Appeal A above.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed subject to the enforcement notice being corrected in the terms set out below in the Decision.

Main Issues

1. The main issues in these appeals are:

- Re ground (e) (Appeal A only), whether copies of the notice were correctly served in accordance with section 174 of the 1990 Act and, if not, whether any defect in service resulted in substantial prejudice, having regard to section 176(5);

- Re ground (b), whether the appellant has proved on the balance of probability that the matters alleged in the notices, or either of them, have not occurred;
- Re ground (a)/the deemed applications for planning permission:
 - (i) the effect of the development on the supply of employment land within the Borough and the extent of any benefits delivered; and
 - (ii) (Appeal A only) whether the occupiers of Unit 4 enjoy satisfactory living conditions, in terms of access to sunlight and daylight, ventilation and external amenity space¹;
- Re ground (g), whether 6 months is a reasonable time for compliance, having regard to the need to find alternative accommodation.

Reasons

Ground (e) (Appeal A only)

2. The appellant maintains that the notice was not correctly served. However, at the hearing, it acknowledged that it had suffered no substantial prejudice as a result. Clearly, it has been able to submit a considered appeal and, having regard to section 176(5) of the 1990 Act, I am satisfied that ground (e) should not succeed, whether or not there was any defect in service.

Ground (b)

3. Both notices merely allege an “unauthorised change of use to residential units.” The Council acknowledges that, in each case, the residential use is a sui generis one. The number of residents, and the fact that they do not form single households, mean that the uses cannot fall within Class C3 and the number of residents also precludes Class C4².
4. However, beyond this, the appellant contends that there is a considerable employment element in the use of both Units 4 and C. Ms Nakamya, the Council’s Planning Enforcement Officer, said that when she inspected both units on 14 May 2013, she saw no evidence of work being undertaken on any significant scale and concluded that both units were in solely residential use. Furthermore, Building Regulations (BR) applications submitted in October 2013 and April 2014, relating to Units 4 and C respectively, each referred simply to residential conversions. Although Ms Nakamye did not specifically ask the Building Control Officers what they saw, she shares an office with them and they gave no indication that their inspections had revealed anything other than residential use.
5. Dealing first with the BR applications, I heard from Mr Gardiner, one of the residents of Unit 4. Assisted by a consultant, Mr Rimmer, he submitted the BR application for Unit 4. He explained that he had not known how to characterise the use of the building, but had been advised by the Building Control Officer to describe it as residential, because that would attract the highest level of safety requirements. That explanation is entirely plausible and, without hearing from the Building Control Officer in person, I am unable to conclude that he saw no evidence of employment activity, merely because he did not flag this up with Ms Nakamye. I did not hear similar evidence

¹ During the hearing, the Council confirmed that it no longer has concerns regarding the amount of internal space

² See Classes C3 and C4 in the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987.

concerning the BR application for Unit C, but it seems likely that the same approach was taken. In any event, that application was not made until April 2014, several months after the enforcement notice was issued, and there is other evidence of what was going on at the time of issue.

6. I have no reason to doubt that Ms Nakanye saw no evidence of significant employment activity when she inspected both buildings in May 2013. However, this was some 7 months before the notices were issued. The crucial thing is what was going on in December 2013 and the period immediately leading up to that. The Council was unable to offer any direct evidence to assist in that regard. However, I have a number of written statements from occupiers of both units³ indicating that, at the relevant time, the communal spaces within the units were in shared use for a range of work, mainly in creative industries, such as: music (performance and composition); painting; sculpture and installations; photography; video/film production; web graphics and illustration; textiles/fashion/garment making; drama; dance and circus skills; magic and illusion. I heard oral evidence from a number of residents who reinforced this. In addition, I am told that they also use their reasonably sized individual bedrooms for some work activities. Indeed, whilst this is rarely a selling point, the lack of natural light in the bedrooms of Unit 4 makes them particularly suitable for use as photographic dark rooms.
7. It has to be said that, whilst the units appeal primarily to people who need flexible work space, not all of the residents now, or at the time the notices were issued, work or worked in the units. Some have full time jobs elsewhere, or are students. The indications are that these people simply enjoy the creative, communal environment, as well as the relatively low rents. Some work in fields such as events management and one is an electrician, but they benefit and indeed feed off the activities of the other residents. Others are endeavouring to get creative businesses off the ground, whilst working in other fields, or are just trying to make the transition from full time study. Indeed I heard of at least one occupant of Unit C becoming a full time performer since moving into the unit.
8. It must also be said that the employment activity is subject to constant change. This was stressed by Mr Gardiner, who said that many of the activities and projects are of a temporary nature and the amount of space taken up will vary from time to time. The communal space may be full of music/studio equipment for rehearsals or recording one day, which is packed away the next. Someone may be working on a sculpture, which could then appear to be serving as decoration of the living space. This state of flux, in which activities crystallise and dissolve, only to be replaced by others, is inevitable, given that the communal space is subject to competing demands.
9. My inspection of the inside of the units took place well after 5:00 pm. Whilst I saw, musical instruments and equipment; art works in progress; sewing machines; part completed garments and jewellery, it was difficult to gain an impression of the scale of work activities undertaken. Any site inspection provides only a snap shot in time and it is entirely understandable that Ms Nakanye's visit in May 2013 led her to believe the use was purely residential. Of course things may have moved on between May and December 2013 anyway, and Ms Nakanye acknowledged that there was no

³ See appendices 12 and 13 of Mr Roe's statement and Hearing Documents 1 – 3.

- evidence to contradict what residents told me about the extent of employment activities in the units around December.
10. On the evidence, I am satisfied that the use of both units goes beyond a pure residential use and involves a significant element of work, albeit that it is difficult to define with precision. Indeed, Mr Currell, a Chartered Surveyor with some 28 years of experience, said he had seen nothing like it before. He described the concept of occupation as “artistic, culturally entrepreneurial and intensively collaborative” and said it offers the ability for those starting businesses to “network and share ideas through the communal space.” All of that is apt but this style of living and working does not fit easily into any conventionally recognised land use category. On the evidence, the allegation of a change of use “to residential use” does not adequately describe the new use. The appellants initially commended the description “communal warehouse living.” However, whilst this captures the shared living aspect and the fact that the buildings were warehouses, it does not reflect the work element.
 11. In a previous appeal, concerning a site at *Fountayne Road*⁴, the notice alleged a “change of use to residential use (C3) and live/work units (sui generis).” In relation to the live/work elements, the inspector eloquently described a pattern of use similar to that under consideration in these appeals. Although she granted permission for use of the premises as “live-work units”, she noted that they did not conform to the normal model of such units envisaged, for example, in paragraph 5.39 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP), adopted July 2006, which supports saved Policy EMP7. Under that provision, a “live-work unit” is described as “a self contained unit with separate living and working floorspace.” The Inspector said she was dealing with “workspaces in which the operators of the business also live; and living spaces in which most of the residents also work.” That is what I find here.
 12. In another appeal concerning *60 – 68 Markfield Rd*⁵, the notice alleged a change to “live/work units.” Though the appeal was dismissed, the Inspector acknowledged that the building did not comprise physically and functionally separate live-work units. He therefore found that the allegation was technically inaccurate and corrected it to refer to “a mixed use comprising the following elements: business and residential uses”. In another Haringey appeal concerning a site at *Mill Mead Road*⁶, the Inspector described a similar use as “a variant on the live/work concept”, but did not alter the allegation of a change of use “to live/work units”, before dismissing the appeal.
 13. Whilst Units 4 and C clearly provide living accommodation, what has occurred here is not simply a change of use to residential. To that extent, the alleged change has not occurred, as a mater of fact. However, the appellant does not contend, and neither do I consider, that this would necessitate the notice being quashed under ground (b). The allegations should properly reflect the sui generis uses taking place when the notices were issued. Having regard to the evidence and submissions put to me and the comments made in other appeals, I consider that an accurate allegation would be “without planning permission, the material change of use of the premises to use as communal live/work accommodation.” This recognises the mix of uses and the fact that the

⁴ Appeal Ref APP/Y5420/C/08/2063420 – see Mr Roe’s appendix 17.

⁵ Appeal Ref APP/Y5420/C/13/2201618 – see appendix 4 to the Council’s statement re Unit 4.

⁶ Appeal Ref APP/Y5420/C/14/2212172 – This decision was issued the day before the hearing and I advised the parties that I had been made aware of it.

buildings do not comprise self contained units, with functionally and physically separate living and working elements. No doubt a better label could be devised, but neither party objected⁷ to my proposed description of the uses. I will correct the allegations accordingly and, to that extent, the appeals succeed on ground (b).

Ground (a)/the deemed applications

14. Policy 4.4 of The London Plan (July 2011) promotes a rigorous approach to industrial land management to ensure a sufficient stock. Subject to that, it prescribes a "plan, monitor and manage" approach to the release of surplus industrial land, so that it can contribute to strategic and local objectives, especially the provision of more housing. Consistent with this, Policy SP8 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2016 (HLP), adopted March 2013, sets out a hierarchy of industrial sites. The appeal sites lie within, but at the south-eastern end, of a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS). This is the middle category in the HLP hierarchy, one below the Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL), which have additional protection under Policy 2.17 of The London Plan. Policy SP8 generally seeks to support local employment and regeneration aims, minimise travel to work and to support small and medium sized businesses that need employment land. However, it also specifically safeguards any LSIS for a range of industrial uses (B1(b), (c), B2 and B8), where they continue to meet the demand and the needs of modern industry and business.
15. The sui generis uses of Units 4 and C are not within Class B1(b), (c), B2 or B8 and, to that extent, they conflict with HLP Policy SP8, unless it can be said that the LSIS no longer meets the demands and the needs of modern industry and business. I shall return to that point but, in any event, I have found that the uses include a significant employment element, supporting small local businesses and, given the live/work character, minimising travel to work. To this extent these developments can be said to meet the wider aims of HLP Policy SP8 and these characteristics, together with the social benefits outlined by Mr Currell, are consistent with the hallmarks of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
16. The sites are also within an Industrial Location Defined Employment Area (DEA) under the UDP. Saved UDP Policy EMP4 lays down criteria for judging whether planning permission should be granted to redevelop or change use of land and buildings in employment generating use. Notwithstanding the element of employment use, having regard to the Inspector's findings in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal, I consider that giving over a significant proportion of the space to residential use brings UDP Policy EMP4 into play.
17. For these developments to comply with Policy EMP4, it has to be shown: (a) that the appeal sites are no longer suitable for business or industry use on environmental, amenity and transport grounds; and (b) that there is well documented evidence of an unsuccessful marketing/advertisement campaign over a period of normally 3 years; or (c), as an alternative to (a) and (b), that these developments would retain or increase the number of jobs permanently

⁷ Notwithstanding that it could provide no direct evidence of the uses taking place as at December 2013, the Council did not accept the appellant's and residents' evidence regarding the scale of employment use, but said it does not object to the term "communal live/work accommodation", in the event that I am convinced by that evidence.

- provided on site and result in wider regeneration benefits. Criteria (a) and (b) are clearly consistent with the statement in the Framework that planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use when there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.
18. The appellant cannot meet the combined requirements of criteria (a) and (b) of EMP4 because Unit C has not been marketed and unit 4 was only marketed for 18 months, as a warehouse, prior to the start of the current use. Furthermore, the evidence of that marketing/advertisement campaign is insubstantial, consisting merely of an undated copy of the agent's brief particulars. However, for the appellant, 2 chartered surveyors expressed the opinion that the buildings are poorly suited to modern industrial use. This is because of the amount of surrounding incompatible, but lawful, residential development, as well as the steep access and restricted turning area. Notwithstanding the absence of any adequate marketing campaigns, on the basis of their experience, they say that these factors would make it extremely hard to let either of these units for modern industrial or warehouse purposes. Further support for that view is found in a letter from FedEx UK Ltd⁸, who occupied Unit 4 for B8 purposes between June 2007 and October 2010.
19. The appellant's unchallenged evidence⁹ is that the first floor of Unit C was last used for industrial purposes about 10 years ago, when 2 people were employed. Thereafter, it was used as a church meeting hall for several years without planning permission. The appeal premises at Unit 4 comprise about one third of the footprint of a larger building. The floor above the appeal premises at Unit 4 is occupied by Cole & Son, a wallpaper manufacturer, for warehousing and a few offices, the manufacturing work having ceased at this site. The remaining upper floors of the overall building are occupied by Alvin, a food distributor. However, both of these businesses have separate exclusive vehicular access off Eade Road¹⁰. Accordingly, the immediate vicinity of Units 4 and C is currently dominated by the unlawful communal live/work use of those units and, more importantly, the lawful residential use of Stone House, just to the north, to which there is free access from the appeal premises.
20. The Council did not put forward any expert evidence to counter the appellant's experts' views regarding the unsuitability of the Units for industrial or warehouse use, but stressed that the LSIS status of the site is set out in the recently adopted HLP. That designation was based on an Employment Land Study, first published in 2004 and updated in 2008 and 2012¹¹, which sought to predict need between 2006 and 2026. Whilst that study is currently under further review, the Inspector's report on the HLP¹² concluded that the evidence base was reasonable and proportionate and it supported robustly the thrust of the HLP. He found it appropriate to respond to the changing dynamics of London and the local economy through a "controlled release of employment land." A plan-led, strategic approach is clearly advocated in the Framework and this is reinforced by Policy 4.4 of the London Plan and in the supporting text for HLP Policy SP8.

⁸ Mr Roe's appendix 8.

⁹ Mr Roe's statement, paragraph 2.11.

¹⁰ Statement of Common Ground (Hearing Document 8), paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5.

¹¹ See paragraph 47 of the HLP Inspector's report (Hearing Document 4).

¹² Hearing document 4.

21. I have considerable sympathy for the Council's view that employment land should not be released on an ad-hoc, piecemeal basis. Nevertheless, it is trite law and policy that each case must be treated on its individual merits. Whilst the appellant cannot satisfy criterion (b) of UDP Policy EMP4 in any event, the expert evidence of 2 chartered surveyors, unchallenged by contrary expert evidence, does suggest that the appeal sites are no longer suitable for business or industry use, in accordance with criterion (a) and must be an important material consideration. In terms of the more general requirements of HLP Policy SP8, that evidence also tends to show that this part of the LSIS does not continue to meet the demand and needs of modern industry and business.
22. In an appeal concerning *Gaunson House, Markfield Road*¹³, the Inspector concluded that arguments under Policy EMP4 criterion (a), concerning the unsuitability of the building, were overstated. Whilst he found the premises to be "less than ideal", he considered that they were not obviously unfit for industrial purposes and did not suffer significant constraints in terms of location or accessibility. The evidence before me is somewhat different and comes from witnesses with specific, relevant expertise. In the *Mill Mead Road* appeal, the Inspector found that there was no substantial evidence that the building was either unsound or incapable of use on environmental grounds. Furthermore, it was within an area of employment uses, comprising industry, warehousing and similar uses with access and parking arrangements similar to others nearby. During my hearing, the Council did not dispute the appellant's evidence that the *Mill Mead Road* premises were on a thriving industrial site with good access. Whilst that might well be said of much of the LSIS, it cannot be said of these appeal sites, located towards its south-eastern extremity.
23. The Council did not accept that all of the residential uses indicated as lawful on the plan at Mr Roe's appendix 14 are indeed lawful, but the schedule included in that appendix indicates that a large proportion of them actually have planning permission for residential use, including Stone House, immediately to the north of Unit 4, and much of Cara House, to the east. In any event, when pressed by me, the Council was unable to respond to the appellant's contention that the extent of lawful residential uses in the vicinity of the appeal sites makes them unsuitable for industrial uses.
24. In addition, the Council published its Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) in January 2014¹⁴. In that document, the LSIS, which includes the appeal sites, forms the greater part of Site S3: Vale Road/Tewkesbury Road, and the proposed allocation recognises the scope for redevelopment, namely 97,000 m² residential (approximately 1,000 units) and 134,000 m² commercial. The document describes the site as "a wide area in mixed use, with some industrial units being converted over time into informal, unapproved live-work, as well as purely residential accommodation and continuing employment use." Consultation on the proposed submission draft is due to start this autumn, with the Examination in Public expected in 2015. The proposed S3 allocation could be subject to change and therefore carries limited weight, but it is a material consideration and one which did not arise in any of the other appeals drawn to my attention. The Council's apparent view of the nature of the area and its suitability for further residential development lends

¹³ Hearing document 5.

¹⁴ See the Statement of Common Ground, appendix 9.

some support to the appellant's evidence regarding the appeal site's suitability for industrial uses.

25. In any event, the appellant contends that criterion (c) of UDP policy EMP4 is satisfied. Mr Roe said that the last industrial use employed 5 people on the whole of the ground floor of Unit 4, whereas 8 people now work in the floor space retained for communal employment use. As far as Unit C is concerned, the last industrial use of the ground floor ended in 2009, when 3 people were employed, whereas 5 now work there, in what remains of the space available for employment use.
26. I note the concern of the Inspector in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal that, notwithstanding the significant increase in the number of people employed at those appeal premises, it was difficult to establish what percentage of the increased floor space within the building was actually available for employment use, since it was not defined, or capable of being defined. Accordingly, and having regard to the plans provided, he concluded that there may well have been a decrease in employment space. However, he also noted the evidence of a neighbouring occupier that, had he been able to acquire the premises, he would have employed a similar number of people, without increasing the floor space. There is no such evidence before me. The Inspector in the *Gaunson House* appeal¹⁵ was also concerned that the residential element of the use resulted in a loss of space that could potentially generate more employment. I respect that conclusion, but I must consider what is likely to happen, on the balance of probabilities.
27. I do not know the precise layout of the premises in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal but, in the appeals before me, the appellant submitted plans¹⁶ identifying the areas available for communal working. Save that it was confirmed, during the site visit, that Room 1 in Unit C is not available for employment use, those plans conformed to what I saw on site. This is an unusual situation in that those areas will also be used for communal residential purposes, but conditions can be imposed to ensure that these areas are kept available for employment use during normal working hours.
28. The numbers of people working in both units is likely to fluctuate, but that would be true if the premises were in B1(b), (c), B2 or B8 use. The best evidence I have is that the numbers of people working in both units exceed the numbers working there previously, despite the significant reductions in floor space available for employment use. I acknowledge that economic conditions may have been worse at that time, but the evidence before me¹⁷ is that there is significant demand for communal live/work accommodation of this kind and that such demand is likely to continue. I contrast this with the evidence I have heard about the likely difficulty in securing occupiers of these units for industrial or warehouse purposes, even in the current climate. That evidence is more compelling than anything apparently presented in the *Mill Mead Road* or *Gaunson House* appeals. On the balance of probabilities, I am satisfied that, subject to appropriate conditions, these uses would at least retain and possibly increase the numbers of jobs permanently provided on the sites.

¹⁵ Hearing document 5.

¹⁶ Drawing Nos P_20_002/A (Hearing Doc 6) and P_20_003/A re Unit 4 and Drawing No P_20_001 Rev B (Hearing document 9) re Unit C.

¹⁷ See section 11 of Mr Currell's statement and paragraph 5.3 of Mr Matthews' statement.

29. In the *Mill Mead Road* appeal, the Inspector did accept that the live/work use of those premises had provided facilities for small enterprises, which might be regarded as a wider regeneration benefit. I accept the evidence before me, including that from the residents themselves, that the current use of Units 4 and C has provided valuable, flexible and affordable facilities for new businesses and fosters a creative, entrepreneurial and inspirational environment. That environment is consistent with the character of Overbury Road, immediately to the northeast, which appears to be dominated by residential and live/work units and where a sign has been erected saying "Artists Village." Furthermore, the combined live/work use will boost the local economy, as residents spend money in the locality. These are regeneration benefits in terms of EMP4(c) which, as I have said, also contribute to meeting the wider aims of HLP Policy SP8.
30. Saved UDP Policy EMP7 states that live/work units, as defined above, will only be permitted if specified criteria are met. As already stated, the uses in this case do not come within the definition of live/work units for the purposes of UDP Policy EMP7. In the *60 – 68 Markfield Rd*¹⁸ appeal, the Inspector noted that the single building, without physically and functionally separate live/work units, was not technically a live/work unit, but he nevertheless applied and found conflict with EMP7. In the *Fountayne Road*¹⁹ appeal, as the use did not fit the live/work definition in EMP7, the Inspector found that, though material, that policy could not be determinative in that case. Indeed the Council accepted that "the units as currently used did not fit comfortably within the parameters of that policy." In the *Mill Mead Road* appeal, the conclusion was that the difference between the use taking place and the live/work definition affected the application of criteria (b) and (c) of that policy, concerning residential room sizes, amenity standards and workspace areas.
31. In my view, standards relating to residential room sizes and workspace areas cannot be applied to communal use accommodation. I will return to general amenity issues later but, whilst sharing the view that EMP7 cannot be determinative in these appeals, I also agree with the Inspector's conclusion in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal that the departure from the definition of live/work units does not detract from the applicability of EMP7's objectives relating to location.
32. Criterion (a) of Policy EMP7, states that the live/work units must be outside a DEA. These sites are not, so these developments cannot strictly comply. However, paragraph 5.41 of the supporting text to the policy explains that, due to the nature of some of the activities that occur within DEAs, live work units are not appropriate, as the residential element may endanger the continued employment use within the area²⁰. In this case, I have already found that the appeal sites are no longer suitable for pure business or industrial use, partly because of the amount of lawful residential use already established in the vicinity. Accordingly, although these developments breach the letter of criterion (a), they do not compromise its objective.
33. Criterion (d) of EMP7 is that, where appropriate, the proposal complies with UDP Policy EMP5. In turn, that provides that: (a) any trips generated by the

¹⁸ Appeal Ref APP/Y5420/C/13/2201618 – see appendix 4 to the Council's statement re Unit 4.

¹⁹ Mr Roe's appendix 17.

²⁰ I note that, in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal, there was an objection from a neighbouring occupier on that basis. No such objection has been received in these appeals.

proposal are catered for by the most sustainable and appropriate means; and (b) if it is on the edge of, or adjacent to a DEA, it does not inhibit the continued operation of any existing employment generated uses or compromise the employment status of the area. With regard to (a), the live/work nature of the developments greatly limits the number of trips generated. In any event, Unit 4 has a high Public Transport Accessibility Level and Unit C has a moderate level, though it is very close to Unit 4. Criterion (a) is therefore met. Criterion (b) is not, in terms relevant, as the sites are actually within a DEA, but for the reasons already given, I am content that these developments do not breach it.

34. To conclude on the development plan in relation to the first main issue under ground (a), whilst London Plan Policy 4.4 and HLP Policy SP8 require a strategic approach, the appeal developments comply with Policy SP8, because they: support local employment and regeneration aims; minimise travel to work; and support small businesses that need employment land in a specific part of the LSIS, which does not otherwise continue to meet the demand and the needs of modern industry and business. They also comply with saved UDP Policy EMP4 because, subject to conditions, they would at least retain the numbers of jobs permanently provided on site. In addition, there is evidence that the appeal sites are no longer suitable for pure business or industry uses. Although, UDP Policy EMP7 cannot be determinative, the developments do not compromise its relevant objectives concerning location.
35. Given the constraints inherent in the specific appeal sites, these developments also contribute to sustainable economic growth, in line with the Framework. The Framework also encourages the facilitation of flexible working practices, such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit, and the avoidance of the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use, where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. I have also given some weight to the direction of travel in the emerging Site Allocations DPD concerning this area.
36. For all the reasons given, **I conclude on the first main issue under ground (a)**, that these developments will not harm the supply of employment land within the Borough, whilst delivering some regeneration benefits.
37. Turning to living conditions in Unit 4, HLP Policy SP2 requires high quality residential development and UDP Policy HSG2 governs changes of use to residential, the relevant criterion in this context being (d), namely that the building can provide satisfactory living conditions. Neither policy was referred to in the *60 – 68 Markfield Road*²¹ or *Millmead Road* appeals, even though living conditions were in issue, and HSG2 was only mentioned in passing in the *Gaunson House*²² appeal. In my view, Like Policy EMP7, Policies HSG2 and SP2 cannot be determinative in these appeals, as they involve a change of use to communal live/work accommodation, rather than pure residential developments. Nevertheless, the Framework requires a good standard of amenity and achieving sustainable development involves improving the conditions in which people live. Living conditions must be satisfactory but, in these appeals, they need to be assessed in the context of communal living and working. Such communal use inevitably impacts on living and indeed working

²¹ Appendix 4 of the Council's statement re Unit 4.

²² Hearing Document 5.

conditions; people do not normally live in spaces where others work and vice versa.

38. In assessing residential amenity under UDP Policy EMP7 criterion (b), the Inspector in the *Mill Mead Road* appeal found the daylight to the living/kitchen spaces inadequate to work by or to satisfy general living standards and other open areas had no direct daylight. Furthermore, the daylight in the majority of the residential units inspected was significantly inadequate. He said: *"...the quality of light is poor and there is a complete lack of outlook from what is otherwise a very physically and visually confined space. Accordingly, I conclude that the occupants of the appeal development would be subject to inadequate daylight provision for normal day to day living."*
39. In the case before me, the bedrooms of Unit 4 do not have direct access to natural light, but rely on borrowed light from the communal areas, via small windows. At some 14 – 19 m², the individual bedrooms are a good size, but they are dark and this would normally result in unduly oppressive living conditions. However, this deficiency is outweighed in my view by the access to the generously proportioned communal areas at ground and mezzanine level, which are well lit by the large, high level windows on the front elevation. I am persuaded that, overall, the access to sunlight and daylight is satisfactory, taking account of the communal spaces, and the characteristics of the accommodation differ from those in the property at *Mill Mead Road*. Whilst the views of current occupiers would not normally be conclusive, they are a material consideration and, in this case, they support my conclusion that conditions are acceptable.
40. Turning to ventilation, I was advised that a ventilation system had been installed since the notice was served. Indeed, I was shown vents in one of the bedrooms, along with the heat exchanger unit upstairs. It was not easy to tell whether this system is adequate, but this can be addressed by a condition requiring details to be submitted for approval, together with implementation of any approved system.
41. The appellant contends that there is no policy requirement for outdoor amenity space for this kind of development. Paragraph 8.8 of the Haringey Local Development Framework Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted October 2008, says all new residential development, including conversions where appropriate, should provide external amenity space appropriate to the needs of the likely occupants. Although this is not purely a residential scheme, paragraph 1.4 of the SPD states that it also applies to mixed use proposals involving housing. I accept that the adequacy or otherwise of external amenity space is material in this case and no such space is currently provided for Unit 4. However, I was shown an area to the north of the unit, where a strip of amenity space could be provided on land within the appellant's control, in a similar fashion to that successfully achieved for Stone House. That provision could be required by condition. The space would be limited and north facing but, given that the Tewkesbury Road open space is nearby, Finsbury Park is within some 800m and the development is unlikely to be occupied by families with children, I consider it sufficient.
42. For all the reasons given, **I conclude on the second main issue under ground (a)** that, subject to conditions, the occupiers of Unit 4 will enjoy satisfactory living conditions, in terms of access to sunlight and daylight,

ventilation and external amenity space. Whilst HLP Policy SP2 and UDP Policies HSG2 and EMP7(b) are not determinative, in so far as they are relevant, the development satisfies their objectives and also complies with the SPD.

Overall conclusion

43. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issues and all other matters raised, I am satisfied that the appeals should succeed on ground (a) and planning permission should be granted on the deemed applications, as defined by the amended allegations, but subject to conditions, to which I turn next. That being the case, ground (g) does not fall to be considered.

Conditions

44. The retention of employment space is crucial to the acceptability of these developments. As with more conventional live/work units, it would not be reasonable to require vacation of the premises in the event that a resident ceases to work there, but it is reasonable to require that the employment floor space remains available for such use. I will therefore impose the appellant's suggested condition restricting the use of specified areas to specific purposes. I will however omit the words "or any other use as agreed in writing by the local planning authority". Any variation should be the subject of a formal application. In the interests of precision and enforceability, rather than merely specifying a percentage of the overall floor space, I will refer to the plans submitted by the appellant during the hearing²³, whilst taking note of the error in the plan relating to Unit C already referred to. Given that the workspace also serves as communal living space, the restriction shall apply during normal working hours only.
45. The appellant also proposed a requirement on the freeholders of the property to submit details to the Council annually, to include: plans showing the layout at the time; details of all business activities operating; and the names and details of all tenants. A similar condition was imposed in the *Fountayne Road*²⁴ appeal, but during my hearing, there was a debate as to the usefulness of these requirements, as it was not clear what the Council would do with the information. However, on reflection, some sort of annual return would serve a useful purpose. Conditions of the type referred to above can present local planning authorities with practical enforcement difficulties. If the owners are required to confirm that the employment floor space remains available for use as such and to provide details of the business operating from it, they would not subsequently be able to claim that the relevant conditions had become immune from enforcement action, without that claim necessarily involving positive deception on their part. Such deception would be likely to prevent the breach becoming lawful. This requirement is therefore necessary to ensure other conditions are enforceable but, rather than referring to the freehold owner, I will refer to the owner, as defined in the 1990 Act, as the lessee under a long lease may be in more direct control.
46. In the interests of residential amenity and safety and to promote sustainable transport, I will impose the appellant's suggested conditions requiring the provision of: an access for pedestrians and cycles, segregated from vehicles;

²³ Hearing documents 6, 7 and 9.

²⁴ Mr Roe's appendix 17.

cycle stands²⁵; amenity space for Unit 4; a screened external bin store and a segregated pedestrian route between the two units. The creation of a level threshold for Unit C was also proposed, but this has already been provided. For the reasons given, I will also require the submission of details of a scheme of ventilation for the bedrooms in Unit 4.

47. The appellant submitted a plan illustrating how some of these things could be achieved²⁶ and all of them can be achieved on land within the appellant's control. However, that plan shows insufficient details in relation to the proposed amenity area. Furthermore, whilst there is space for an alternative bin store, that plan shows the store where there is now a small outside seating area. Accordingly, I will require the submission of a new plan for approval. Given that the use is already operating, this condition will need to provide for the use to cease if a scheme is not approved or implemented. The period for cessation of the use in that event can reasonably be set at 28 days, given that further enforcement action would be necessary.

Decisions

Appeal A: APP/Y5420/C/14/2212163

48. The enforcement notice is corrected in section 3 by the deletion of the words "without planning permission for the unauthorised change of use to residential units" and the substitution of the words "without planning permission, the material change of use of the premises to use as communal live/work accommodation." Subject to that correction, the appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed. Planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the premises known as Unit 4, 199 Eade Road, London, N4 1DN to use as communal live/work accommodation subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Between the hours of 0900 to 1830 Mondays to Fridays (excluding public holidays) and 0900 to 1200 on Saturdays, the business floor space shown hatched black on drawing Nos P_20_002/A and P_20_003/A, submitted during the hearing on 2 September 2014 shall not be used for any purpose other than: (i) a use falling within Class B1 (Business) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, namely:
 - (a) as an office other than use within Class A2 (financial and professional services);
 - (b) for research and development of products and processes; or
 - (c) for any industrial processOR (ii) use as a workshop or studio for the design, storage, production and/or rehearsal of visual and/or performance arts.
- 2) On or before 1 January 2015, and at no less than annual intervals thereafter, the owner of the premises, as defined in section 336(1) of the

²⁵ I will not specify the numbers, as it is not clear from the suggested condition what number relates to each unit.

²⁶ Mr Roe's appendix 36

Town and Country Planning Act 1990, shall provide to the local planning authority in writing:

- (a) confirmation that the business floor space identified in condition 1 hereof remains available for business use as specified in that condition; and
 - (b) details of the nature of the business activities being carried on by residents of the premises at that time.
- 3) The use hereby permitted shall cease within 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
- i) within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for:
 - (a) ventilation of the bedrooms within Unit 4;
 - (b) the segregation of pedestrians and cycles from vehicles on the eastern part of the access ramp from Eade Road;
 - (c) the provision of cycle stands;
 - (d) the creation of external amenity space to the north of Unit 4, including hard and soft landscaping;
 - (e) the provision of a screened external bin store; and
 - (f) the provision of a segregated pedestrian route between Unit 4 and Unit C to the west,such scheme (save in so far as it requires ventilation) to be illustrated on detailed plans and hereafter referred to as the site improvement scheme shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the said scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation;
 - ii) within 11 months of the date of this decision the site improvement scheme shall have been approved by the local planning authority or, if the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme, or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State;
 - iii) if an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted site improvement scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State; and
 - iv) the approved site improvement scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Appeal B: APP/Y5420/C/14/2212166

49. The enforcement notice is corrected in section 3 by the deletion of the words "without planning permission for the unauthorised change of use to residential units" and the substitution of the words "without planning permission, the material change of use of the premises to use as communal live/work accommodation." Subject to that correction, the appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed. Planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the premises known as Unit C, 199 Eade Road, London, N4 1DN to use as communal live/work accommodation subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Between the hours of 0900 to 1830 Mondays to Fridays (excluding public holidays) and 0900 to 1200 on Saturdays, the business floor space shown hatched black (but excluding the area identified as "Room 1") on drawing No P_20_001 Rev B, submitted during the hearing on 2 September 2014 shall not be used for any purpose other than: (i) a use falling within Class B1 (Business) of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, namely:
 - (a) as an office other than use within Class A2 (financial and professional services);
 - (b) for research and development of products and processes; or
 - (c) for any industrial processOR (ii) use as a workshop or studio for the design, storage, production and/or rehearsal of visual and/or performance arts.
- 2) On or before 1 January 2015, and at no less than annual intervals thereafter, the owner of the premises, as defined in section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, shall provide to the local planning authority in writing:
 - (a) confirmation that the business floor space identified in condition 1 hereof remains available for business use as specified in that condition; and
 - (b) details of the nature of the business activities being carried on by residents of the premises at that time.
- 3) The use hereby permitted shall cease within 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
 - i) within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme, including detailed plans, for:
 - (a) the segregation of pedestrians and cycles from vehicles on the eastern part of the access ramp from Eade Road;
 - (b) the provision of cycle stands;
 - (c) the provision of a screened external bin store; and
 - (d) the provision of a segregated pedestrian route between Unit C and Unit 4 to the east,hereafter referred to as the site improvement scheme shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the said scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation;
 - ii) within 11 months of the date of this decision the site improvement scheme shall have been approved by the local planning authority or, if the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme, or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State;

- iii) if an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted site improvement scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State; and
- iv) the approved site improvement scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

J A Murray

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Morag Ellis QC	Instructed by CgMs Consulting
Matthew Roe BA(Hons) MTP MRTPI	CgMs Consulting
John Ferguson Bsc (Hons), PG Dip TP, MRTPI	CgMs Consulting
Neal Matthews BSc MRICS	Strettons Chartered Surveyors
Christopher Currell MRICS	Currell Chartered Surveyors

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Edward Grant of counsel	Instructed by the Solicitor to the London Borough of Haringey
Sumaya Nakamya	Planning Enforcement Officer for the London Borough of Haringey

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Lillie Jamieson	Resident of Unit C
Debbie Turner	Resident of Unit C
Peter Coleman	Resident of Unit 4
Jack Lynch	Resident of Unit 4
Waseem Akbar	Resident of Unit 4
Ellis Gardiner	Resident of Unit 4
Matt Rimmer	C108 Consultants
Adrian Gambier	Leaseholder of Unit C

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Statement Of Peter Coleman
- 2 Statement of Waseem Akbar
- 3 Statement of Debbie Turner
- 4 Extract from Inspector's report on the examination into the Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies Development Plan Document
- 5 Appeal decision Ref APP/Y5420/C/13/2207689 re Gaunson House, Markfield Road, London, N15 4QQ
- 6 Drawing No P_20_002/A showing the extent of the work space on the ground floor of Unit 4
- 7 Drawing No P_20_003/A showing the extent of the work space on the first floor of Unit 4
- 8 Signed Statement of Common Ground
- 9 Drawing No P_20_001 Rev B showing the extent of the work space in Unit C


APPENDIX H

Table 10.1: Potentially suitable uses at each of the preferred sites, established through application of a systematic methodology

Site	Site potentially suitable for..:				
	Housing	Employment	Town Centre	Community	Open Space
LBH Civic Centre (SA10)	Y	Y	Y	?	N
Green Ridings House (SA11)	Y	Y	Y	?	N
Wood Green Bus Garage (SA12)	Y	N	Y	?	N
Station Road Offices (SA13)	Y	Y	Y	?	N
Mecca Bingo (SA14)	Y	N	Y	?	N
Morrison's Wood Green (SA15)	Y	N	Y	?	N
Wood Green Library (SA16)	Y	N	Y	?	Y
The Mall (SA17)	Y	N	Y	?	Y
Bury Road Car Park (SA18)	Y	N	Y	?	Y
16-54 Wood Green High Road (SA19)	Y	N	Y	?	N
L/b Westbury & Whymark Avenue (SA20)	Y	N	Y	?	N
Turnpike Lane Triangle (SA21)	Y	N	Y	?	N
North of Hornsey Rail Depot (SA22)	Y	N	N	?	N
Wood Green Cultural Centre (North) (SA23)	Y	Y	N	?	N
Wood Green Cultural Centre (South) (SA24)	?	Y	Y	?	N
Wood Green Cultural Centre (East) (SA25)	?	Y	Y	?	N
Clarendon Gateway (SA26)	?	Y	Y	?	Y
Clarendon Road South (SA27)	Y	Y	N	?	N
NW of Clarendon Square (SA28)	?	Y	N	?	Y
Land Adjacent to Coronation Sidings (SA29)	Y	N	N	?	N
Wightman Road (SA231)	Y	N	N	?	N
Arena Retail Park (SA33)	Y	N	Y	?	Y
Arena Design Centre (SA34)	Y	N	N	?	Y
Crusader Industrial Estate (SA35)	Y	N	N	?	Y

APPENDIX I

HARRINGEY



WAREHOUSE DISTRICT

PROVEWELL ESTATES



 **PROVEWELL ESTATES HAVE BEEN A COMMERCIAL INVESTOR IN HARINGEY FOR ALMOST 30 YEARS AND THEIR CURRENT PLANS ARE BASED UPON LONG TERM INVESTMENT RETURNS.**

 **THE INVESTOR'S DESIRE IS TO DEVELOP AN AFFORDABLE, INNOVATIVE, HOUSING PRODUCT WITH STRONG CONNECTIVITY TO THE SURROUNDING AREAS / EXISTING COMMUNITIES**

 **OUR TWO SITES ACCOMMODATE A WELL-ESTABLISHED, VIBRANT AND SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY. WHILST MANY OF THE BUILDINGS REQUIRE FURTHER INVESTMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT, WE ARE LOOKING TO WORK WITH THE EXISTING RESIDENTS / WORKERS TO CAPTURE THE UNIQUE AND CREATIVE SPIRIT OF THE LIVE / WORK COMMUNITY, SO THAT THE PHASED REDEVELOPMENT CONTINUES TO DELIVER, AN INTEGRATED RANGE OF PRIVATE AND LOW COST HOUSING ALONG SIDE START UP / SME EMPLOYMENT FLOORSACE.**


 **OUR PROFESSIONAL TEAM HAVE BEEN SELECTED FOR THEIR EXPERIENCE IN SUCCESSFULLY DELIVERING CUTTING EDGE AND INNOVATIVE URBAN REGENERATION**

 **PROVEWELL IS COMMITTED TO SUPPORTING RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL INNOVATION, WHILST CREATING A VIABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR OUR LONG TERM INVESTMENT IN HARINGEY**










- LIMITED QUANTUM OF GENUINE, TRADITIONAL B CLASS SPACE;
- WELL DOCUMENTED SHORT COMINGS OF SPACE IN TERMS OF LOCATION, ACCESS, CAR PARKING, AGE AND PHYSICAL CONDITION;
- OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT CONTRIBUTION IN TERMS OF:
 - PHYSICAL SPACE
 - QUANTUM OF SPACE
 - EMPLOYMENT DENSITY
 - MEETING IDENTIFIED NEED FOR SMES WITH UNIT SIZES STARTING AT 1000 SQFT

DECENT AFFORDABLE HOMES FOR ALL




**THINGS TO
LEARN FROM
X3**

FACTORY COMPLEX



YARDS






STUDIO CULTURE



ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

X3


DAYLIGHT



SERVICES



SECURITY OF TENURE



PRECEDENTS