London Borough of Haringey

Development Management DPD

Pre-Submission Consultation

Written Statement

Prepared on behalf of Workspace Management Ltd

March 2016

London Borough of Haringey

Development Management DPD

Written Statement

Prepared on behalf of Workspace Management Ltd

Project Ref:	21650/A5/EH	21650/A5/EH
Status:	Draft	Final
Issue/Rev:	01	02
Date:	25 February 2016	3 March 2016
Prepared by:	Alex Jones	Ed Hanson
Checked by:	Ed Hanson	Ed Hanson
Authorised by:	Ed Hanson	Iain Painting

Barton Willmore LLP
7 Soho Square
London
W1D 3QB

Tel: 020 7446 6888   Ref: 21650/A5/EH
Fax: 020 7446 6889
Email: Edward.hanson@bartonwillmore.co.uk   Date: 3 March 2016

CONTENTS

1.0   INTRODUCTION

1.1   These representations are submitted on behalf of Workspace. Workspace owns over 100 properties in London providing 5.4 million square feet of space that is home to some 4,000 businesses employing over 30,000 people. Workspace provides business premises tailored to the needs of new and growing companies across London.

1.2   Workspace are the freehold owners of the Chocolate Factory (Site Allocation 19) and surrounding buildings on the east and west sides of Western Road. They also control other properties in the Borough including Site Allocation 8.

1.3   These representations are lodged in respect of the Development Management DPD Workspace has previously submitted representations in respect of the emerging Development Management DPD, most recently in March 2015.

Approach and Structure

1.4   The approach of the Development Management DPD is to conform to national policies, the London Plan and the Local Strategic Policies document. The DPD should not, however, introduce higher standards or simply duplicate the content of London wide SPD's.

1.5   One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is that planning should be genuinely plan-led through 'succinct' local plans (paragraph 17; page 5). The London Plan 2015 forms part of the Development Plan for all London boroughs thus it is not necessary to repeat the provisions of the London Plan in local planning policy. The inclusion of the London Plan policies within the final DPD would be unnecessarily repetitive and would not be considered 'succinct' as envisaged by the NPPF.

2.0   DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

2.1   The following section considers the Development Management policies in chronological order.

POLICY DM3 – PUBLIC REALM

2.2   This policy seeks to deliver high quality public realm that is appropriately managed and maintained. Whilst this aspiration is supported, the policy as drafted requires the provision of public art and public access to open spaces within a development and their long-term retention, management and maintenance. This would be a notable cost that could impact on development viability.

2.3   NPPF paragraph 173 states that developments 'should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be delivered viably is threatened'.

2.4   In light of paragraph 173, we consider that the policy should be reworded to acknowledge that the provision, management and maintenance of public art and public access to spaces will be considered in the context of development viability and balanced against other priorities such as key infrastructure.

POLICY DM6 – BUILDINGS HEIGHTS

2.5   Policy DM6 seeks to deliver the Council's objectives for 'tall' and 'taller' buildings. Workspace welcomes the identification of Wood Green as an appropriate location for tall buildings and the helpful definition of 'tall' and 'taller' buildings (paragraph 2.39). Furthermore, Workspace supports the detail of the draft policy in respect of tall buildings being 'a wayfinder or marker' (C.a.i) and considers that it would be appropriate to also add public spaces/ urban squares in to the wording.

2.6   There are, however two elements of the draft policy to which Workspace objects:

2.7   Part B of the draft policy states that taller buildings (and as required by Part C, tall buildings) 'must be justified in community benefit as well as urban design terms'. If a tall or taller building is acceptable in urban design terms there should be no need to mitigate its impact by demonstrating community benefits or through other means. In heritage terms, the NPPF requires public benefits to be demonstrated if harm is being caused to the significance of a heritage asset (see paragraphs 133 and 134). However, draft Policy DM6 is not specifically concerned with the impact of tall and taller buildings on heritage assets. As drafted, Policy DM6 appears to presuppose that harm will result from the provision of tall or taller buildings. This approach does not result in a positively prepared, forward thinking policy that encourages development and the optimisation of sites to deliver the growth envisaged by the development plan as a whole. In our view, requiring community benefits is inappropriate and unreasonable in the context of tall and taller buildings and should be deleted from the policy.

2.8   Part E requires the submission of a digital 3D model for all proposals for taller or tall buildings. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that local authorities 'should only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material to the application in question'. Whilst we appreciate that sufficient information would need to be submitted in respect of tall and taller buildings to allow a full and thorough assessment of impact, we consider that it is unreasonable to policy to prescribe the exact nature of such information. 3D images of tall and taller buildings taken from agreed viewpoints is often sufficient to determine the acceptability of building. Requiring a digital 3D model would add to the financial burden of an application in direct conflict with national planning policy.

POLICY DM11 – HOUSING MIX

2.9   Policy DM11 aspires for a mix of housing in new developments having regard to a range of factors which are supported. Part C of the draft policy seeks to prevent an overconcentration of smaller units (i.e. one and two-bed units) unless part of larger developments or in areas where there is a predominance of larger units. In line with the NPPF, local authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on 'current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups' (paragraph 50). Whilst demographic trends may indicate need for units with three bedrooms or more, demand for these is likely to exist in certain areas within the borough and may not correspond to market trends. As worded, we consider the policy to be overly restrictive and not sufficiently flexible to respond to changing

market demand. It should be reworded to clarify that, in line with the NPPF, market demand will also be taken in to consideration when determining appropriate housing mix.

POLICY DM13 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING

2.10   Policy DM13 considers Affordable Housing provision. It is of note that Haringey is socially and economically polarised with high levels of deprivation in certain parts and extreme affluence in others. As expected, the majority of social rented accommodation is heavily concentrated in the poorer areas to the east of the borough. On this basis it is crucial that proposed policy wording makes it clear of the basis on which affordable housing provision will be negotiated. Whilst the policy should refer to viability appraisals and include details of other factors that may influence provision, we note that the pre submission version now specifies the approach of viability assessments (existing/ alternative use value). Furthermore, the level and type of affordable housing should be considered in the context of the availability of grant and the level of developer contributions for on and off-site infrastructure works.

2.11   LBH must take account of the ever changing backdrop to affordable housing. Indeed at the time of writing the Housing and Infrastructure Bill is due to be heard for a second time and could become law later this summer. The requirement for starter homes and other forms of tenure must further be explored before LBH crystallise policy DM13.

POLICY DM22 – DECENTRALISED ENERGY

2.12   It is accepted that developments should seek to connect to existing decentralised energy networks but only where feasible and financially viable to do so (C.d). The inclusion of this provision is welcome and allows for flexibility in the event that there are physical or other reasons why connection is not possible. In our view, it is not appropriate for the policy to require developments within 500 metres of a planned network to secure connection. Delays with the delivery of a planned network could significantly impact on the delivery of development reliant on connection to the network which would be unreasonable and could undermine the growth strategy of the development plan as a whole.

POLICY DM38 – EMPLOYMENT-LED REGENERATION

2.13   Workspace supports the general approach to this draft policy, but has concerns with the provision of capped commercial rents both in policy SA19 (separate representation) and DM38. There is no supporting evidence looking at viability and we consider that its inclusion goes beyond the spectrum of planning and would be particularly hard to enforce. It is noted that draft Policy DM38(c) (iv) gives consideration to viability when determining affordable rents. Workspace requests that at a minimum viability matters should be expressly noted in the site allocation. If LBH seek to minimise rental income, this will be to the detriment of the type employment space that Workspace deliver and would create unnecessary uncertainty.

POLICY DM48 – USE OF PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

2.14   Whilst supporting paragraph 7.7 acknowledges that development viability may result in reduced financial contributions to allow a scheme to be delivered, this is not expressly provided for the draft policy. The viability of a development is key to its delivery. If the weight of financial burden is such that a developer will not secure competitive returns on a development that development will not come forward. NPPF paragraph 173 specifically states that developments 'should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be delivered viably is threatened'. The policy should be reworded to make specific reference to development viability. Moreover, development viability may not allow for financial contributions to all items listed in the draft policy (including affordable housing, infrastructure and employment contributions). It should therefore be clarified that the Council will identify the priorities in respect of each site and should seek contributions accordingly.

2.15   The Council has an adopted CIL Charging Schedule. It will be essential to ensure that policy DM48 works effectively with the local CIL and that 'double charging' does not occur and an unreasonable financial burden is not placed on developments.

POLICY DM55 – REGENERATION/ MASTERPLANNING

2.16   Workspace acknowledges the benefit of masterplanning in some instances and agrees with the draft wording of Policy DM55 which requires masterplans 'if appropriate'. Masterplans are a useful tool in demonstrating how a development on an area of land can be delivered without fettering or prejudicing future delivery of development on adjoining land. Such masterplans should not be approved as part of a development but used as background information in the Council's decision-making process.

POLICY DM56 – SUPPORTING SITE ASSEMBLY

2.17   Workspace support the provision of this policy and the council's aspiration to achieve comprehensive redevelopment through compulsory purchase powers where necessary.

bartonwillmore.co.uk

TOWN PLANNING
MASTERPLANNING & URBAN DESIGN
ARCHITECTURE
LANDSCAPE PLANNING & DESIGN
PROJECT MANAGEMENT
& COST CONSULTANCY
ENVIRONMENTAL
& SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT
GRAPHIC DESIGN
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT
RESEARCH