



Pre-Application Planning Advice Note

Ref: PRE/2022/0020

Site Address: Tennis Club, Southern Road, N2 9LH

Proposal: Our proposal concerns the redevelopment of the Fortis Green Tennis Club and its grounds. The proposal consists of:

- o The refurbishment of the two northern tennis courts.
- o The reprovision of a new clay tennis court.
- o A new building with three apartments & the reprovision of a new tennis club house at ground floor.
- o 5 new terraced houses to the south of the site.
- o New vehicular connection from Cherry Tree Road into the site.
- o 5 car parking space

Submitted Documents:

Meeting Date: 28/02/2022

Attendees: Samuel Uff (Planning Officer); Elisabetta Tonazzi (Conservation Officer)

Summary of Council's response

Overall RAG Rating	Reason for rating
	• The retention and improved tennis club use will be required to justify the loss of the court and open space associated with the tennis club. This is the starting point and shall be fully detailed and cleared through Sport England if this is to be accepted in principle. • The mixed use will create issues for public and private spaces and residential will only be acceptable if it will not

Development Management, 6th Floor, River Park House, 225 High Road, N22 8HQ

www.haringey.gov.uk

preapp@haringey.gov.uk

	jeopardise the community use. Loss will require details of how remaining facility will be improved and schedule of works. • Access will require LB Barnet authorisation. • Development of the site will lead to a change in character from the openness of the tennis club and landscaped area. Design will need to be fully justified and the impact on heritage assets justified. • Scale and massing of clubhouse and mews terrace will need to be addressed and reduced. Re-landscaping required and how this will mitigate the level of development. Trees to be retained where possible. • Scale, massing and siting of the mews likely detrimental to immediate neighbours and requires reconsideration. • Likely amenity concerns. • Landscaping as means of designating public and private areas and routes into site. Privacy of new dwellings required without impacting outlook. Noise and disturbance from mixed uses problematic. • Transport issues of access, parking, refuse and manoeuvring require consultation with LBB & LBH officers. Transport assessment required. • Consider potential for affordable homes, energy and sustainability, tree retention, drainage and inclusive access for the uses.
--	--

Next Steps/recommendations

The proposal would be suitable for a Planning Performance Agreement, further details can found on the Council's website. Following the agreement of a PPA, the scheme would be put before a Development Management Forum, the Quality Review Panel, and would be presented to a Planning Committee Pre-Application meeting.

Review of Submitted Proposal

The assessment of the proposal submitted uses a RAG rating system (see below). Comments are provided on the reasons for the rating given.

Red = This element of the scheme is not currently considered to be acceptable.

Amber = This element of the proposal has not been adequately addressed within the submission.

Green = This element of the proposals is considered to be acceptable by officers.

Development Management, 6th Floor, River Park House, 225 High Road, N22 8HQ

www.haringey.gov.uk

preapp@haringey.gov.uk

NOTE: The rating assigned will be a result of the officer/panels consideration of the proposal against the development plan (see below) and all other material planning considerations insofar as they are known at this stage (i.e before statutory consultation and public/community engagement has taken place).

Policy Aspect				Comments
Principle of Development		✓		Existing use: The NPPF (2021) makes specific reference to open spaces in paragraph 99: “Existing open space, sports and recreation buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: a) An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or b) The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or c) The development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss”. London Plan Policy S5 reiterates the requirement to retain sports facilities, unless an assessment can show the facilities are surplus to requirements. Equally if a case can be made that the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity or public benefits would outweigh the loss. Such criteria is expanded in Local Plan policy SP15 which also seeks to retain sports and leisure facilities. Policy DM49 Part b(c) states that where a development proposal may result in the loss of a community facility, evidence will be required to show that the existing facility is not viable in its current use and there is no demand for any other suitable community use on the site. The proposed development would result in the loss of a tennis court and associated open space for the tennis club use. This loss will need to be justified if partial change of use of the site is to be accepted. In the first instance it is expected that the case be made for why the courts cannot be funded in any other way and how the club functions to show that this issue will not recur in

				future. Details of the use and function of the site (membership, existing / proposed uses etc.) will be required. If the loss is accepted then the proposed residential will need to justify the design and all other planning considerations. Consultation with Sport England is recommended prior to submission and if not required then that should be referenced in the planning statement. Residential use: DPD Policy DM7 covers development on infill, backland and garden land sites. Part A of the policy outlines that there is a presumption against the loss of such land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of a number of whole land plots. The 'comprehensive' wording does not necessarily refer to scale (which should always be reflected in site specific response) but to a suitable contextual response to the setting. Part B of the policy elaborates on requirements a site specific approach of appropriate and sensitive setting, retention of sufficient amenity space and either a provision of street frontage or for the proposed building to be ancillary to associated buildings. DPD Policy DM2 states that proposals should ensure that new developments can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all. Policy D3 of the new London Plan continues this approach, stating that development proposals are required to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design, ensuring they can be entered, used and exited safely, easily and with dignity by all. The proposed development will include the relocated tennis court and club house / residential above, as well as a new mews development. The development would involve the loss of the openness of the existing site and a continuation of public highway of Cherry Tree Road into the site. This will create a new access to the tennis club and significant change to the character of this green and undeveloped end of street setting. The clubhouse would be significantly greater than the existing and would be an independent building. The mews would be a terrace in its own right and set back significantly from the associated terrace.
--	--	--	--	--

				No street frontage is proposed nor is it considered appropriate in this setting. The development as a whole would be considered as a comprehensive redevelopment. However, this would create a mixed use within the site, which would need to be carefully considered. The mixed use should primarily ensure the sustainable and ongoing use of the site for the primary sporting purposes. Any residential use would be on the basis of retaining this use and be designed to ensure that there was not reverse sensitivity of future residents complaining about this use. Access: An access would be created from Cherry tree Gardens, effectively extending this road into the site. The existing access is pedestrian / cycle only so the opening up of this access would need careful consideration, as detailed below. The access would require S.278 works to be undertaken by LB Barnet and may require planning permission for the engineering works to extend the highway. Details of consultation with Barnet and clarification that they support the extended public highway into the site will be required with any application. All advice below is on the basis that such development from LBB is acceptable. The acceptability of those works is not considered in this preapp response. Summary: The acceptability of the scheme will require robust justification of the loss of the sports facility. The conflict of the mixed uses will also require suitable mitigation to ensure the future of the retained sports facility. Details of improvements to those facilities will also be required. It is considered that the scale of all development will need to be addressed and that whilst a comprehensive redevelopment can be successful it will need to be appropriate to this setting and open character of the area. In the meeting it was stated that the level of development is required to support the use, which will need to be justified.
--	--	--	--	---

Design Approach	✓			Part B of policy DM7 requires development proposals for infill, backland and garden land to relate appropriately to the surrounding area and ensure good access where possible. Development of such sites should provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area. Adequate amenity space should be retained and provided for existing and new occupants. London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality design and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D3 'Delivering good design' states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials. The alterations to the street frontage to create vehicular access and scale of the proposed buildings will significantly alter the open and green character of the area and create a new character to the cul-de-sac. In the meeting it was stated that there had been various options considered prior to this iteration. Such alternatives and reason for rejection should be covered in the DAS. This should also detail the requirement for such intrusive development as a means to secure the long term future of the site.
-----------------	---	--	--	--

				The siting of the clubhouse and loss of the tree is considered undesirable. This was rationalised in the meeting and such a rationale and mitigation shall be justified in the submission. The scale is considered excessive, with a width and height significantly more imposing than the terrace and the existing clubhouse. This would have an appearance of a block of flats rather than a modest clubhouse building. If residential above can be justified then the scale and siting should be subordinate to the terrace and respect this relationship. A single storey clubhouse building is recommended. Despite the setback of the proposed mews terrace beyond No. 42, the continuous frontage with high gables would appear imposing and out of character with the two storey heights of adjacent buildings. From a design perspective, it is considered that the terrace could step forward and have a more satisfactory relationship with the terrace whilst remaining subordinate to this. However, a suitable separation between proposed residential use and tennis club should be retained to avoid conflict of uses and habitable rooms in this frontage would potentially be an issue. The depth of projection to the rear is excessive and creates a larger footprint of development in smaller plots than those of the adjacent plots. Significant reductions in height, site coverage and massing will therefore likely required if this is to avoid dominating the site and appearing excessive in this context. The access should attempt to retain a green setting through suitable landscaping and retention of trees where possible. Clearly demarcated sports and residential uses and respective accesses, which avoid the use of physical screening / high fences, will be required. Indicative details of landscaping should be submitted at application stage. Suggested reductions in the size of the dwellings and creation of non-family sized units could justify a reduction in parking and improved landscaping of the frontage. There should be consideration of integrated refuse and cycle storage.
--	--	--	--	---

Heritage and Conservation		✓		The site is adjacent to the Fortis Green Conservation Area. Any development should be designed to preserve and enhance the setting of the character and appearance of the conservation area. The setting of the listed buildings at 29-31 Southern Road and impact on the significance of the heritage setting will be required to be explained in a Heritage Statement. The scale of the proposed clubhouse would be a main concern, as would loss of trees and alterations to nay fencing / boundary treatments.
Housing Quality		✓		London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments. All residential units would need to meet minimum floorspace and floor to ceiling standards. There should be consideration of the level of privacy, outlook and daylight / sunlight availability for future resident, especially with regard to the proximity to the communal garden. The mixed use nature of the site would need to be carefully considered and use of landscaping and siting of windows should ensure suitable living conditions. The proximity of tennis courts to habitable bedrooms in the proposed terrace would need to be reviewed. Clear definition between the uses and accesses also required. No scale bar is provided on these plans but the residential dog leg of the mews appears to be in close proximity to court. The main mews building appears to be a similar distance from the court as the rear elevation of Shakespeare Gardens but these are hheavily screened and separated by private rear gardens. No such screening is proposed and would be unlikely to be acceptable so this relationship appears tight and remains a concern. Noise and disturbance will be a significant issue on this site due to the mixed use. Proposing

				balconies overlooking the tennis court will have noise concerns and potential disturbance from loose balls.
Impact on Neighbouring Amenity		✓		Any design proposal should consider the impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties, particularly those on either side of the terrace and the dwellings on Cherry Tree Road and Shakespeare Garden. Cherry Tree Road will be particularly impacted by the new access to the tennis club and increased comings and goings. The relationship of the stepped rear building line, parallel to that of the terrace of Cherry Tree Road, would result in a significant massing adjacent to the side boundary of no.42. It was noted in the meeting that the height is somewhat mitigated due to proposed land levels but staggering this forward / reducing the depth should be considered. This neighbour has side windows but these do not appear to be primary windows to habitable rooms so impact would be less significant than that of the excessive projection to the rear. This would also allow for more generous rear garden space, particularly important for the family sized units. On the other side of the proposed terrace, no.18 Shakespeare Gardens would also have a close proximity, which will need to be mitigated. Likewise any revised footprint that projects forward of the existing proposal would need to consider these relationships. The scale of the clubhouse should be significantly reduced for design reasons but will also need to consider the amenity impact on the immediate neighbour at no.31 and any overlooking of the rear of properties facing onto the site.
Inclusive Design		✓		London Plan Policy D5 and DPD Policy DM2 consider accessibility for all in both public and residential areas. The DAS shall clarify compliance with building regulations. Consideration of provision of a lift in the flatted development may also be required in this regard.

Affordable Housing		✓		Local Plan Policy SP2 requires developments of more than 10 units to contribute to the Borough's target of 40% of affordable housing contributions to the Borough's affordable housing stock, subject to viability any proposed scheme providing less than 40% affordable housing must submit a viability report. The proposed development would provide 8 large units and is likely to lose significant floorspace in amendments required. The development could feasibly provide a number of smaller units and provide affordable housing, with inherent benefits of this. If the mix remains as largely family sized units rather than meeting the threshold for affordable then that would need to be justified.
Sustainability		✓		The NPPF, London Plan and local policy require developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design, including the conservation of energy and water; ensuring designs make the most of natural systems; and the conserving and enhancing the natural environment. London Plan Policy SI2 require all new developments to be zero carbon, achieving a minimum 35 per cent carbon reduction on site beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP4 requires a 100% improvement on Building Regulations 2013 Part L, on site. The application should consider how this can be lean, be green and be seen through the use of sustainable development, renewable technologies and reducing the need for energy consumption. Passive design of buildings should be the initial consideration. In addition, there should be consideration of the materials, any possible provision of green roofs or solar panels and reducing reliance on energy consumption for lighting, ventilation etc. An energy statement should be provided with the application.

Highways and Transportation	✓			The site has a PTAL of 3, considered 'moderate' access to public transport services. 4 different bus services are accessible within 6 to 8 minutes walk of the site, and East Finchley Underground Station is an 8 minute walk away. The site is located just within the eastern edge of the Fortis Green CPZ, which operates from 11.00 to 13.00 Monday to Friday. Shakespeare Gardens and Southern Road are within this up to the Borough Boundary which passes to the immediate west of the site. Summerlee Gardens and Cherry Tree Road are LB Barnet Roads, there appears to be formal CPZ parking arrangements in place administered by Barnet. For any future application a Transport Statement or similar will be required, to detail and consider the proposals from the transportation perspective and comment on how the development will work in transportation terms on a day to day basis. In addition to the above it is also proposed to create a new highway access off the eastern end of Cherry Tree Road, and to provide 5 parking spaces within the site. There will be an overall reduction from 4 courts to 3 with this proposal. Access arrangements As commented above, it is proposed to create a new highway access to the western side of the site to enable vehicle access to the off street parking. There is also reference in the submission to refuse collection trucks being able to turn within the site. This new highway access will be off a LB Barnet road, not a Haringey Road, so the applicant would need to submit details and get highway approvals from LB Barnet. They will need to see details of vehicle manoeuvres into and out of the site, and will need to enter into and conclude a S278 Agreement under the Highways Act. It is expected Barnet will require sight of swept path plots to demonstrate manoeuvres can be carried out in a safe and acceptable manner and it is queried whether such manoeuvring will be possible within the forecourt, especially with parking landscaping requirements. The applicant will need to meet all physical and administrative costs.
-----------------------------	---	--	--	---

				Clubhouse / operation A new clubhouse is included within this application, it will be necessary for the applicant to detail the intended use and trip attraction resultant. In particular whether any tournament or events take place and how the current site operates. Parking provision For the 8 new residential units, 5 off street parking spaces are proposed. The 2011 census recorded average car ownership per household at 0.9 vehicles. This is likely to have reduced since then. There are 5 family sized units included in this proposal, and the provision of 5 spaces for 8 units would probably be appropriate to ensure no external parking demands are generated. In any instance the application should outline the rationale for the provision proposed. Given the PTAL value of 3 the site wouldn't meet the criteria within policy DM32 to be able to be designated with permit free status. Cycle parking Cycle parking to meet the numerical requirements of the London Plan will be required, along with details of the proposed arrangements including the system to be used, and fully dimensioned drawings showing spacing, headroom and manoeuvring space according to meet the installation requirements of the parking system chosen. The cycle parking arrangements will need to meet the London Cycle Design Standards as produced by TfL. Consideration of short and long stay parking and private and public spaces will be required. Deliveries and servicing/ Refuse and recycling collections There is reference to waste and recycling collection vehicles using the off highway area that accommodates the parking to make turning manoeuvres, swept paths will be required to demonstrate that this can be achieved safely. It will need to be clarified which Borough will make refuse and recycling collections and the proposed arrangements for storage and collections will need to be approved by them.
--	--	--	--	---

				Construction phase Given the site's location adjacent to other residential properties, and services/accessed from Cherry Tree Road, it will be appropriate for a detailed draft of a Construction Logistics Plan or similar, this will need to detail how the development will be built out, and how potential impacts on the safe and smooth operation of the public highway and adjacent neighbours will be minimised, mitigated and managed. Details required will include swept paths for visiting construction vehicles, the programme and phasing of the works, how materials and plant are brought into and out of the site and stored, and how the construction will be managed with respect to arriving and departing vehicles and access in general. Summary Overall there are concerns regarding the new access and vehicle manoeuvring within the site and access road. The level of parking would likely be sufficient but could be reduced further if family units reduced. PTAL 3 is generally not sufficient to restrict car parking but could be investigated further if a case was made for this. LB Barnet should be contacted in the first instance with respect to the highway changes proposed and future waste and recycling collection arrangements.
Waste and Recycling		✓		The main concern with this application is that there is no Haringey frontage for refuse vehicles to collect from and it is not envisioned that Barnet refuse collection can be used. Consultation with LBH refuse services is recommended and that this is clarified in a robust refuse management plan. The proposal is required to provide adequate refuse and recycling storage for the proposed dwellings. Further advice can be obtained from the Council's Sustainable Construction and Design SPD Appendices (March 2013). The drag distance of the proposed terrace appears to be over 20m so would need an independent refuse store, potentially creating more visual clutter. This design and siting will need to be considered.

Trees		✓		Details of the trees to be removed and any proposed replacements should be presented at application stage. Likewise, basic details of hard and soft landscaping will be required, especially given the shared area for existing residents.
Mayor CIL / Haringey CIL and Planning Obligations		✓		The Mayoral CIL is currently charged at £60.55 per sq m charge on net additional increase in floor space of all developments (with some exceptions) equal to or over 100 sqm, or involving the creation of one dwelling even where this is below 100 sq m (although any net charge of less than £50 will not be collected). Further information on the Mayoral CIL can be found on the Greater London Authority's (GLA) website. As per the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations introduced in April 2010 the Council moved to the new tariff style system on 1st November 2014. The site falls within the Western part of the borough and as such any new residential floor space created would currently be subject to £369.23 per sqm with indexation included. For more information on this please go to the following link: http://www.haringey.gov.uk/cil Note: The CIL rates published by the Mayor and Haringey in their respective Charging Schedules have been inflated in accordance with the CIL regulations The Council's adopted the Planning Obligations SPD (2014) sets out the Council's approach policies and procedures in respect of the use of planning obligation. The proposal may require the following matters to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement: • Operational use of the tennis club • Works to improve tennis facilities • Sustainable Transport / Car parking restrictions / Car clubs • S278 Highway Works • Affordable Housing (if 10 units) • Employment and training provision (if Major)

Building Control

It is recommended that you obtain technical advice regarding building control matters during the early stages of project design, and Haringey Building Control has extensive experience in working with clients on a wide range of projects. Should you wish to discuss your project and how Haringey Building Control may best advise you regarding compliance with relevant building control regulations, please contact Bob McIver on 020 8489 5500 or by email on Bob.McIver@haringey.gov.uk

Information required for Planning Application Submissions

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

1. Standard application form (three copies plus original unless submitted electronically)
2. 'Determining whether an application is CIL liable' form and plan or drawing showing any chargeable development and gross internal area in square metres on each plan
3. Location plan on an up to date map at an identified standard metric scale (typically 1:1250 or 1:2500 to fit onto A4 or A3 paper) with the red line including all land necessary to carry out the proposed development and blue line for any other land owned by the applicant
4. Site plan – direction of North, proposed development in relation to the site boundaries with written dimensions (and public rights of way, trees, hard surfacing and boundary treatment where relevant) typically 1:500 or 1:200
5. Ownership certificate and notices, and Agricultural land declaration
6. Fee
7. Fully annotated and scaled (1:50 or 1:100) drawings showing, floor plans, elevations of the existing and proposed buildings as well as drawings showing site sections and a 'streetscene elevation' showing the relationship with the neighbouring buildings. **Please note that Haringey requires all applications to have a scale bar and all proposed plans/elevations require one significant dimension. This is to ensure that the Planning Officer can accurately measure dimensions using measuring software.**
8. Design & Access Statement (including a statement confirming compliance with Lifetime Homes standards and London Plan SPG housing space standards)
9. Planning Statement
10. Heritage Statement
11. Transport Statement
12. Draft Travel Plan

Development Management, 6th Floor, River Park House, 225 High Road, N22 8HQ

www.haringey.gov.uk

preapp@haringey.gov.uk

- 13. Energy Assessment and Sustainability Strategy
- 14. Tree Report
- 15. Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

For further information please see the Council's Validation Checklist.

List of Relevant Contacts

Samuel Uff – Planning Officer – 2177
Maurice Richards – Transport Planner – 0208 489 5575
Michael McNicholas – Head of Waste Management – 0208 489 5561
Bob McIver – Head of Building Control – 0208 489 5500
Lee Warwick – Met. Police Crime Prevention Officer – 0208 217 3813

INFORMATIVE

Without Prejudice

Please be advised that this response is given at officer level and does not form a formal response or decision of the council with regard to future planning application(s) or other formal approaches. The views expressed above are given in good faith, to the best of ability, and without prejudice to the formal consideration of any future planning application, which will be subject to formal consultation and ultimately decided on by the council.