



Brighter strategies
for greener projects



Client: London Borough of Haringey
Project: Down Lane Park
Report: Urban Greening Factor Assessment

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Issue/Revision:	Draft	Final
Date:	September 2023	October 2023
Comments:		
Prepared by:	Daniel Perlaki	Daniel Perlaki
Authorised by:	Georgia Alfreds	Georgia Alfreds
File Reference:	552104dpSep23DV01_UGF	552104dpOct23FV02_UGF

CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	SITE DESCRIPTION	3
3.0	METHODOLOGY	4
3.1	LIMITATIONS	5
3.2	COMPETENCIES	5
4.0	RESULTS	6
5.0	CONCLUSION	7
APPENDIX A SITE PLAN AND PROPOSALS		
APPENDIX B RELEVANT POLICY		
REFERENCES		

Tables

Table 3.1	UGF Factors (adapted from Table 8.2 of the London Plan)	4
Table 4.1	UGF Breakdown	6

Figures

Figure 1.1	Masterplan with planning boundary	2
------------	-----------------------------------	---

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Greengage Environmental Ltd was commissioned to undertake an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) Assessment by Haringey Borough Council of a site known as Down Lane Park in the London Borough of Islington.

This report has been produced to support a planning submission for the masterplan for the park's renewal has evolved through a process of co-design which started in spring 2022 with a client team from Haringey Council combining both Parks and Regeneration. Plans to improve Down Lane Park have been created in partnership with the Community Design Group (CDG) who's agreed focus is to shape proposals, inform engagement and build support for designs by channelling feedback from residents and groups using the park.

Proposals include significant new tree planting to reinforce the existing canopy cover, combining with a new range of planting styles which offer climate change resilience, support sustainable urban drainage interventions and respond to available maintenance budgets. A strong new offer for play will be distributed across the park with two landmark provisions supported by 'play on the way' and playful landscape interventions. A new community hub building will sit at the heart of the new masterplan with new active sports, play and leisure uses clustered around it. The facility will include a café, celebration spaces, LBH Park's office space, publicly accessible toilets and a community garden directly adjacent. Inclusive design and accessibility are prioritised with enhanced entrances, footpath connections, lighting and natural surveillance to improve safety and offer a greater level of comfort for all users.

Further to confirmations received from the LBH Nature Conservation Officer, the UGF/BNG assessments have been undertaken on a park-wide basis. However, the adjacent masterplan confirms that planning permission is sought for the redline covering part of the south of the park and community hub building only.

Figure 1.1 Masterplan with planning boundary



The proposed development will achieve a UGF score of 0.5068. Whilst neither the residential or commercial development targets set out in the London Plan apply to the scheme, the proposals represent an improvement to existing conditions and improve the ecological value of the site in addition to ecosystem service provision.

Detail relating to the proposed ecological compensation and enhancement actions in relation to habitat creation and management could be provided within an Ecological Management Plan for the site which could be secured through planning condition. Should these recommendations be adhered to, the proposals stand to be compliant with legislation and current planning policy.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Greengage was commissioned to undertake an Urban Greening Factor Assessment by the London Borough of Haringey of a site known as Down Lane Park in the London Borough of Haringey.

This document is a report of this assessment and is submitted in support of a planning submission for the site which involves a holistic review of the park infrastructure using a wide lens. The function and amenity offered by the park will be improved both in terms of contemporary play approaches and sports/leisure along with the enhanced management and maintenance. The new masterplan will seek to integrate the northern Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) park space with the southern which is currently of a distinct character – making the two spaces read quite separately. A new approach to sustainable drainage will be integrated with strategies for play, wayfinding, planting and general design approaches to achieve biodiversity gain. The range of opportunities for the new park masterplan are diverse and community engagement will sit at the heart of the process with an existing Community Design Group leading the design evolution. A community ‘hub’ facility will be located within the masterplan with options for this being developed with the CDG and LBH stakeholders. The resulting proposal will ensure a vibrant, safe and high-quality amenity for Tottenham Hale which better supports the needs of this changing community. The park will realise vital opportunities to challenge issues such as climate change, tree canopy resilience, child mobility, healthy routes to school and greenspace to support strong physical and mental health.

The assessment seeks to quantify the quality and quantity of urban greening, soft landscaping and habitat creation on site for biodiversity and water regulation. Targets are set within the London Plan for all new residential and commercial developments. A target score of 0.3 for commercial and 0.4 for residential developments has been set. This report seeks to assess compliance against these targets.

1.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The survey area extends to approximately 6.94 hectares and is centred on National Grid Reference TQ 34341 89920, OS Co-ordinates 534341, 189920.

The site itself comprised modified grassland, other neutral grassland, line of trees, urban trees, developed land sealed surface, buildings and horticulture and introduced shrub, together forming a public park.

The site is located within the densely developed area of South Tottenham with Tottenham Hale station ~120m south. The wider area is dominated by residential development to the north and west, with Lea Valley and Walthamstow Reservoirs to the east.

Greenspace in the wider area includes East Hale Allotments ~320m east, Pymmes Brook ~425m east, Hartington Park ~440m north west and River Lea and Walthamstow reservoirs ~500m east.t.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Areas of each post-development habitat classification were measured using the proposal drawings by Levitt Bernstein and each parcel is matched to the closest typology within the London Plan. Each area is multiplied by the factor for that specific typology, and all factor scores are totalled and divided by the total site area to get the UGF score.

Proposed site layout drawings and landscaping plans were assessed. Specifically, the following drawings were used:

- 3862-LB-XX-XX-D-L-200001-P1_DRAFT;
- 3862-LB-XX-XX-D-L-200002-P1_DRAFT;
- 3862-LB-XX-XX-D-L-210001-P1_DRAFT; and
- 3862-LB-XX-XX-D-L-210002-P1_DRAFT.

When measuring the area to be used for trees on site, the canopy spread was measured in QGIS using the most up to date available aerial photography.

Table 3.1 UGF Factors (adapted from Table 8.2 of the London Plan)

Surface Cover Type	Factor
Semi-natural vegetation (e.g. trees, woodland, species-rich grassland) maintained or established on site	1
Wetland or open water (semi-natural; not chlorinated) maintained or established on site	1
Intensive green roof or vegetation over structure. Substrate minimum settled depth of 150mm	0.8
Standard trees planted in connected tree pits with a minimum soil volume equivalent to at least two thirds of the projected canopy area of the mature tree	0.8
Extensive green roof with substrate of minimum settled depth of 80mm (or 60mm beneath vegetation blanket) – meets the requirements of GRO Code 2014	0.7
Flower-rich perennial planting	0.7
Rain gardens and other vegetated sustainable drainage elements	0.7
Hedges (line of mature shrubs one or two shrubs wide)	0.6
Standard trees planted in pits with soil volumes less than two thirds of the projected canopy area of the mature tree	0.6
Green wall – modular system or climbers rooted in soil	0.6
Groundcover planting	0.5
Amenity grassland (species-poor, regularly mown lawn)	0.4
Extensive green roof of sedum mat or other lightweight systems that do	0.3

Surface Cover Type	Factor
not meet GRO Code 2014	
Water features (chlorinated) or unplanted detention basins	0.2
Permeable paving	0.1
Sealed surfaces (e.g. concrete, asphalt, waterproofing, stone)	0

3.1 LIMITATIONS

The UGF methodology is solely concerned with post-development habitats. Therefore, it does not take into account pre-development habitats and does not compare pre- and post-development scores. As such, it is not within the UGF methodology to quantifiably assess whether the proposals will improve conditions at site.

3.2 COMPETENCIES

Georgia Alfreds, who reviewed this report, has a degree in Geography (BSc Hons), an MSc in Environmental Biology: Conservation and Resource Management and is an Associate member of CIEEM with seven years' experience in ecological survey and assessment.

Daniel Perlaki, who undertook this assessment, has an undergraduate degree in Ecology (BSc Hons), a Master's degree in Conservation Science and Policy and is a Graduate member of CIEEM. Dan has over six years' experience in ecology survey and consultancy.

This report was written by Daniel Perlaki and reviewed and verified by Georgia Alfreds who confirms in writing (see the QA sheet at the front of this report) that the report is in line with the following:

- Represents sound industry practice;
- Reports and recommends correctly, truthfully and objectively;
- Is appropriate given the local site conditions and scope of works proposed; and
- Avoids invalid, biased and exaggerated statements.

4.0 RESULTS

The UGF score for the development is 0.508. The breakdown is provided in Table 4.1

Table 4.1 UGF Breakdown

Plot	Habitat Type	Factor	Area	Area x Factor	Description
1	Hardstanding	0	0.1899	0	Hardstanding, buildings and sealed surfaces such as tennis courts
2	Amenity grassland	0.4	5.8674	2.34696	PL01 and PL02 planting types - both the retained amenity grassland and the enhanced areas with longer sward
3	Semi-natural vegetation	1	0.0267	0.0267	Scrub planting which is the same planting type as Plot 7 - hedgerows, however is not planted in a linear row on along the site boundary
4	Flower-rich perennial planting	0.7	0.6489	0.45423	PL07-PL11 planting types
5	Rain gardens/ other SUDs	0.7	0.2001	0.14007	PL05-PL06 planting types
6	Tree pits (high volume soil)	0.8	1.8349	1.46792	This constitutes the existing canopy which is to be retained and proposed tree planting
7	Hedgerows	0.6	0.0863	0.05178	Assumed hedgerows will be 1m wide
Totals			8.8542*	4.48766	
UGF				0.5068	

*Total includes tree canopy in addition to habitat beneath tree canopy

Whilst neither the residential or commercial aspirational targets set out in the London Plan apply to the proposed revision of the park a score of 0.5068 exceeds both targets and is considered to be an improvement on existing baseline conditions.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Greengage was appointed by the London Borough of Haringey to undertake a UGF Assessment of the proposed re-design of Down Lane Park in Haringey.

The UGF aspirational targets set within the London Plan pertain to residential or commercial developments and are therefore not relevant to the proposed alteration to the layout of an existing park. However, the proposals result in an overall UGF score of 0.5068, which far exceeds either target whilst also maintaining the play space requirements and other uses of the space. Proposals also increase the proportion of permeable surfaces across the site and include high value SUDs features such as rain gardens to improve surface water retention and biodiversity value.

It is Greengages opinion that the proposals represent an improvement to existing conditions, and whilst the target scores do not apply to this project, the proposals improve the ecological value of the site in addition to ecosystem service provision.

APPENDIX A SITE PLAN AND PROPOSALS