

Date of meeting: 05/06/23

Thank you for attending the recent pre-application planning advice meeting with Haringey Council to discuss your proposal. We hope you found the meeting useful. The points discussed at the meeting are outlined below, along with feedback from the Planning Service about aspects that were good, could be improved, or are unlikely to obtain planning permission as currently proposed. We hope this summary will provide you with useful guidance about the steps you will need to take before submitting an application for planning permission.

If you have any questions about the feedback we have provided, please contact the named officer who will be able to clarify the advice. If you require further advice, our website can provide you with some information about the things we take into consideration when determining a planning application, or you can book a second pre-application advice meeting.

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

Proposal: Redevelopment of the site to provide eight new homes, one new clay tennis court, a new clubhouse, refurbishment of two of the clay tennis courts, and the creation of housea vehicular access off Cherry Tree Road, all with associated landscaping, car parking, cycle storage, and refuse storage.

Attendees:

- Josh Parker - Planning Officer
- Matthew Gunning – Team Leader
- Richard Truscott –Design Officer
- Max Plotnek– MJP Planning
- James S. Winston - Capstone Group Ltd
- Andy Puncher - Phplus Architects
- Phil Spencer - P S P Partnership Ltd

1. SITE DESCRIPTION & PROPOSAL

- 1.1. The site relates to a tennis court of 4 tennis courts and grassland, located North of Cherry Tree Wood, on the very western boundary of Haringey and next to the border with Barnet. The site is currently accessible through a private pedestrian link accessed from Southern Road.
- 1.2. The surrounding patten of development comprise a mix of terraces and semi-detached, two-storey houses served by on-street car parking. East Finchley Underground Station is located approximately 400 metres to the east of the site, providing regular Northern Line services into London.

2. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- National Planning Policy Framework (2023);
- London Plan (2021);
- Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017); and
- Development Management DPD (2017).

3. COMMENTS ON PRE-APPLICATION SCHEME

3.1. In response to the plans/information submitted and having regard to the discussions at the pre-application meeting, the following advice and assessment is provided by officers.

3.2. The main planning considerations for such a proposal would be:

- Principle of development;
- Housing mix
- Design, Appearance & Heritage;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Trees, Landscaping & Biodiversity;
- Basement Development;
- Drainage & Flood Risk;
- Standard of Accommodation;
- Energy & Climate Change;
- Transport.

Principle of development

Supply of housing / small sites

3.3. Providing additional residential units is consistent in respect of Government, London and local plan policies in respect of increasing housing supply and higher levels of density in relation to accessible locations, with both the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and London Plan putting particular emphasis on 'small site' development.

3.4. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (July 2023) recognises the importance of small and medium sized sites can make in meeting the housing requirement of an area, with these often built-out relatively quickly.

3.5. The considerable emphasis on the development of small sites for housing, coming forward, is also strongly supported by London Plan 2021. In specific the London Plan Policy H2 'Small sites' places great weight on the contribution that small sites with within 800m of a Tube or rail station are to make to delivering housing in London, with targets set for each borough.

Loss of a tennis court / open space

- 3.6. Policy S5 of the London Plan 2021 states that existing sports and recreation land (including playing fields) and facilities for sports and recreation should be retained unless:
- a) an assessment has been undertaken that clearly shows the facilities to be surplus to requirements at the local or sub-regional level, with a borough's assessment of need for sports and recreation facilities informing this assessment; or
 - b) the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
 - c) the proposal is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.
- 3.7. This is supported by paragraph 103 of the NPPF which indicates that should sports facilities be surplus to requirements, where an assessment of sports facilities has been undertaken to prove this, they will be appropriate for redevelopment to other uses.
- 3.8. The scheme makes for the re-provision of 3 tennis courts, however the proposal would lead to the physical/ spatial loss of land protected as open space and a single court.
- 3.9. From discussions it is noted that demand and interest in using this tennis court facility here has diminished over time, as the facilities/ qualities of the courts are no longer to an acceptable standard especially through the winter months. The information provided and discussed outline that there would be no nett loss of LTA approved courts with them revamped with all-weather surface courts. Suitable information would need to be provided in terms of policy justification to demonstrate the loss of one court and open space.
- 3.10. While the scheme here seeks to release some of the site for development, for the purposes of such a planning submission, it should be demonstrated that there is not an alternative club/ group, that may be able to keep the site in its current configuration as 4 courts with open space, and to overcome the current issues facing this facility, namely the substandard quality of the courts. As such the site should be marketed for such a use to demonstrate that there is no demand for it continued use as 4 courts.
- 3.11. The applicant states that the United Reform Church (URC) is the freeholder of the site. The LPA would expect to see a collaborative approach between the current/last tennis club operator and the URC, in ensuring tennis courts can still be provided on this site and open to the public and in providing the necessary evidence base to demonstrate why this site needs to be partly redeveloped.

- 3.12. Other aspects of the proposal also need to be assessed and an on-balance judgement will be made taking into account all relevant issues.

Housing Mix

- 3.13. In terms of housing mix, London Plan Policy H10 and DM DPD Policy DM11 explains that schemes should generally consist of a range of unit sizes. In determining the appropriate housing mix regard should be had to: local evidence of need, the housing demand identified in 2017 London SHMA, the requirement to deliver mixed/inclusive neighbourhoods, the nature/location of the site, the aim to optimise housing potential and the need for additional family housing.
- 3.14. A higher proportion of one and two bed units is generally more appropriate on sites which are close to a town centre or locations that have higher public transport access, in line with London Plan Policy H10. DM DPD Policy DM11 notes that the Council will not generally support proposals which result in an overconcentration of 1 or 2 bed units.
- 3.15. The proposal has a range of bedrooms and size units, as reflected below, including family sized unit.
- 1 bedroom x 2;
 - 2 bedroom x 3;
 - 4 bedroom x 2.

Design, Appearance & Heritage

Design approach

- 3.16. The proposed design has been through numerous iterations, including the final set which the LPA have not been provided with a great level of detail, in contrast with the initial proposals. This design assessment will consider the most recent drawings submitted by Downen Farmer Architects.
- 3.17. The proposed design of the scheme would be contemporary in nature. This is considered acceptable given the specific circumstances of this site, being somewhat secluded in nature from public vantage points, as such meaning there is more freedom in design approach as opposed to following a specific context.
- 3.18. The scheme would feature a terrace of properties in the southern part of the site. The proposed terrace would be lower in height to the adjacent terrace on Cherry Tree Road. The front elevation would be articulated using cut-outs at first floor level. Basement floors would sit below the footprint of the houses with the use of front and rear lightwells/amenity areas. These

lightwells have been altered from the previous iterations to show a lesser lightwell and additional green space.

- 3.19. Moreover, a level of attention would need to be shown on the rear gardens which flow onto a band of mature trees running on the southern flank shared with Cherry Tree Wood. A level of spaciousness and greenery is an important feature in the local context and all versions of the rear lightwells so far are relatively closed off and do not provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area.
- 3.20. In regards to the terrace, the building would be of a two-storey height setback from the initial Cherry Tree Road terrace. The roofs would be flat in nature and would be two-storey for the entirety of the building excluding a small section which juts out from the eastern flank. The front elevation is slightly staggered, falling away west to east with the cut-out sections which feature balconies/ terraces. Officers would prefer to see a less symmetrical elevation for the front elevation, staggering the footprint would work in this instance.
- 3.21. The material for the terrace appears to be, a mixture of wood/dark coloured metals and glazing. There is no information on what the cladding would comprise, however Officers have a level of concern as to whether the materials would withstand well to weathering. The colour palette options selected for the southern terrace has a softening effect when observing the landscape and woodlands in the backdrop and could work if the materials are of high quality and respond positively.
- 3.22. The clubhouse and accommodation above, is a three-storey building that has different sections splitting up the floors and sections. The bottom floor would have the new club and changing rooms which face east on to new court. It should be mentioned that the clubhouse and new court would be set into the undulating land, meaning the northern side of the ground floor would be stepped into the existing topography. The front of the building has been setback to follow the building lines of the northern terrace, and this is a preferred approach.
- 3.23. Although the building appears to be bulky, the contemporary design and secluded setting at the end of a discontinued road, with tennis club use at ground floor makes the building appearance seem less uncharacteristic. It should be noted Officers are still unclear as to how the clubhouse massing will respond to the neighbouring terrace especially with the new drawings, this would need to be demonstrated through well detailed computer-generated imagery (CGIs) etc.
- 3.24. The overall Landscaping and additional greening of the site appears to enhance the site. Moreover, the introduction of green roofs would be welcomed and necessary as it is an appropriate solution to break up and soften buildings. This also helps with the local biodiversity and as such be maximised across the site.

- 3.25. The Design and Access statements and drawings will need to demonstrate the scheme is based on the use of high-quality materials and be illustrative of details proposed.

Impact on amenity

- 3.26. At present, the site is open in appearance and the built form of the site is very small, and as such the site affords some visual amenity value to adjoining residential properties.
- 3.27. The development as seen from adjoining site and properties would result in some changes in the existing situation in respect of outlook and vistas. The scheme is however designed to avoid being dominant and harmful to residential amenity.
- 3.28. The profile of the proposed terrace of building seems slightly less sympathetic to the western terrace compared to previous schemes however, this is not apparent as we do not have the technical drawings of the most recent scheme, only CGI renders. The previous scheme for the proposed terrace had proportions and window sightings that were respectful of the eastern address and similar proportions would appear to align better with the amenity considerations regarding sense of enclosure, daylight and outlook. This is also the case with the clubhouse as the exact proportions is unclear.

Number 31 Cherry Tree Road

- 3.29. The introduction of the new clubhouse and flats would introduce a large building next to the end of terrace dwelling of No. 31, which has a small ground floor, first floor window and a roof light all facing east to the site. The clubhouse has been sited and separated from No. 31 by means of staggering the storeys in terms of height and siting the bulk of the building against and above the tennis court. The rear of the first storey of the clubhouse building has been angled as such opening up oblique views for No. 31.
- 3.30. While there are concerns in regard to the overall bulk and the effects on western property, Officers accept that the design have been mindful of the adjacent property, with the imagery provided indicating improvements in terms of the arrangement/ relationship with No 31.

Number 42 Cherry Tree Road.

- 3.31. This property has a number of openings facing the existing tennis courts with two large ones on the ground floor, one on the first and a roof light. The application has changed with regards to privacy/ amenity to No 42 and these openings/windows. Drawings now show the proposed southern terrace staggered with the western side pulled forward to avoid inappropriate

outlook and overlooking. All windows would be facing forward and rearward with only solid walls to be perpendicular to No 42.

- 3.32. From the most recent submissions Officers did not have obvious objections in terms of effects of amenity and privacy to this site. With the current scheme which is based on visuals as opposed to specific drawings, the amenity impacts cannot be fully understood, but appear to be sensitive.

Number 18 Shakespeare Gardens

- 3.33. The proposed southern terrace is setback from the dwellings on Shakespeare Gardens. There is a level of existing vegetation that would be retained on the eastern boundary that would help soften the effects of the terrace, and like the western end of the terrace, windows would avoid overlooking the rear gardens and windows of No. 18 Shakespeare Gardens. Building on this eastern side appears partially single storey.

Conclusion

- 3.34. The proposal generally respects neighbouring properties regarding amenity consideration in terms of siting, layout and design, with such an application in turn needing to be supported by a daylight/ sunlight assessment.

Trees, Landscaping & Biodiversity

- 3.35. The Arboricultural Report prepared by TIM MOYA ASSOCIATES dated March 2023, has been reviewed by an Arboricultural Officer. The report outlines that the anticipated loss of the category of 20no. trees, 4no. shrub groups, and 3no. shrubs, which includes 3no. Category B trees.
- 3.36. The loss of these trees would need to be effectively mitigated for, with appropriate tree replacement planting, along with the introduction of a planting programme. There is 18 trees proposed to replace this loss of existing trees and requires the pruning of 8no. trees and 1no. hedgerow, which includes 5no. Category B trees.
- 3.37. Trees and their root protection zones affected by the new development in particular from the subterranean works need to be protected. An arboricultural report with methods of construction and mitigation measures would be expected to accompany any forthcoming application.
- 3.38. A preliminary Ecological Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. This has a number of recommendations including for further surveys to assess the impact of the proposed works and mitigation measures.

- 3.39. The applicant would be required to meet the London Plan requirements on urban greening and an appropriate plan/ detail that shows how the development meets these requirements would need to be submitted with any full planning application. The applicant should also consider whether any biodiversity measures such as bird boxes, insect hotels and native plant species can be integrated into the development proposal. As mentioned in the design section the landscaping plan would be welcomed to compensate for the replace greenery lot.

Basement Development

- 3.40. As part of the proposed replacement dwelling, it is proposed to construct a large basement. This would extend from the front of the new building, past the rear building line of the replacement dwelling and into the rear garden. The existing swimming pool would be replaced to allow construction of the basement.
- 3.41. The Council has a specific policy on Basement Development, DPD policy DM18, which requires proposals to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect the structural stability of neighbouring buildings; do not increase flood risk to nearby properties; avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area and to not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment. Policy DM24 ('Managing and reducing flood risk') also outlines the requirement of new development to manage and reduce surface water runoff.
- 3.42. A detailed Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) should be prepared in support of such an application, prepared in line with Camden's guidance noted in CPG4 introduced in early 2011 (Camden geological, hydrogeological and hydrological study).

Drainage & Flood Risk

- 3.43. The Council's Drainage Officer would be consulted on this application given it would fall within the category of a 'major application'. The requirement of a Flood Risk Assessment or sustainable drainage plans. Greenfield surface water run-off rates should be met. Detailed calculations are required that explain the proposed runoff rates and explain how rainwater attenuation and retention have been maximised.
- 3.44. Please see below a link to the copy of our SuDS Guidance and requirement for Technical Assessment for preparing the submission:

[Microsoft Word - Haringey SuDS Guide - Requirements for LLFA TA Issued Living Draft 11.03.2016 FINAL.docx](#)

- 3.45. You must submit a copy of the Council's drainage pro-forma with any planning application and this document is available on request.

Standard of Accommodation

- 3.46. The proposed scheme would clearly meet the space standards and private outdoor space requirements of London Plan Policy D6. Furthermore, all the habitable rooms within the replacement dwelling would be served by at least one window or opening. This would ensure that good levels of light would reach these spaces and acceptable outlook would be achieved for future occupiers. Any future proposal should again accord with the requirements of London Plan Policy D6, so to provide satisfactory living conditions. In addition, a future scheme should demonstrate that the proposed replacement dwelling would comply with Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings', in line with London Plan Policy D7.

Transport

- 3.47. 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.
- 3.48. 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.
- 3.49. 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.
- 3.50. It is proposed to create a new highway access to the western side of the site via Cherry Tree Road to enable vehicle access. This new highway access will be off a LB Barnet road, not a LB Haringey Road, which appears to have the go ahead in principle. 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.

- 3.51. 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 with the additional 8 residential flats in mind, 3 being 4 bedrooms.
- 3.52. 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. As such, the tennis club should see some parking provision especially for limited access. In any instance the application should outline the rationale for the provision proposed.
- 3.53. 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. Cycle parking has been demonstrated in the clubhouse and outside by the carpark. The cycle parking arrangements will need to meet the London Cycle Design Standards as produced by TfL.
- 3.54. 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.
- 3.55. 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.
- 3.56. Overall, there are concerns regarding the vehicle manoeuvring within the site and parking. The level of parking would likely be sufficient but could be reduced further if family units reduced. Additionally there should be provisions for parking for club use, although the existing situation has no onsite parking, adding parking limited access that would not impede the manoeuvring lines would be welcomed. PTAL 3 is generally not sufficient to restrict car parking but could be investigated further if a case was made for this.

Sustainability and Carbon Reduction

- 3.57. As discussed at the pre-application meeting the commitment to a zero-carbon development is noted, however as there is a general presumption in favour of retaining existing buildings to reduce the embodied energy required to demolish, excavate and rebuild a building, it should be explained in the application as to why the existing building cannot be refurbished, remodelled, extended, and enhanced to improve its energy efficiency and reduce operational energy demand.
- 3.58. The application will need to be supported by an Energy Report. The development must fully consider a series of potential passive design approaches to reduce overall energy demand by balancing the need for 'active' heating and cooling measures such as central heating and air conditioning. Overheating must also be considered at an early stage to enable an appropriate design response and this can be achieved thorough utilising the Good Homes Alliance 'Early Stage Overheating Risk Tool' in Appendix 1 of the Energy Assessment Guidance (2020).
- 3.59. Any future planning application must be supported by an Energy Report to demonstrate compliance with the above policies. The report should clearly outline:
- the baseline regulated and unregulated emissions
 - the assumptions included in that baseline model
 - the Target Emission Rate (TER), Dwelling Emissions Rate (DER) for the residential home
 - the reduction in carbon emissions following the energy hierarchy (Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green).
 - SAP output for a sample of the proposed residential dwellings for each stage of the energy hierarchy.

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.60. In November 2023 (as a result of the Environment Act 2021), Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will become a mandatory part of the planning process. This will take effect from November 2023 for major planning applications and April 2024 for minor planning applications. Minor developments for the purposes of mandatory BNG are those:
- For residential: where the number of dwellings to be provided is between one and nine inclusive on a site having an area of less than one hectare, or where the number of dwellings to be provided is not known, a site area of less than 0.5 hectares; and
 - For non-residential: where the floor space to be created is less than 1,000 square metres OR where the site area is less than one hectare.

3.61. All minor planning applications will be required to consider BNG requirements from the very on-set, prior to site design. A 'biodiversity gain plan' will need to be submitted with such applications documenting and describing how the development will achieve a 10% BNG, informed by a biodiversity metric assessment. It is understood that a standardised template for 'biodiversity gain plans' will be published in due course. If 10% BNG cannot be achieved within the red line boundary of the planning application site, offsite habitat creation would need to be relied upon and secured accordingly. You are advised to consult Government and Natural England guidance on BNG including information on the small sites metric which is expected to be the statutory metric for the purposes of minor developments for meeting the requirements of this legislation.

4. INFORMATION TO ACCOMPANY AN APPLICATION

Should you wish to submit an application following this advice, the easiest way to apply is electronically by registering on the Planning Portal at:

<https://www.planningportal.co.uk/applications>

Any application will need to be accompanied by the following information before it will be registered and considered. If you submit your application on paper rather than electronically we will need two sets of all information.

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

1. A standard full application form – all sections must be completed signed and dated.
2. Planning application fee - £462.
3. Location Plan – Must be based on an up-to-date map, and should be at a scale of 1:1250. The site boundary should be identified in red, with a blue line drawn around any adjacent land owned by the applicant.
4. Existing Block Plan – Should show footprints of all existing buildings on site and should be at a scale of either 1:200 or 1:500.
5. Proposed Block Plan – Should show the footprint of the buildings as proposed and should be at a scale of either 1:200 or 1:500.
6. Existing Floor Plans & Elevations – Full floor plans and elevations of existing buildings at a scale of either 1:50 or 1:100. Street scene elevations should be provided showing the relationship with neighbouring buildings.
7. Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations – Full floor plans and elevations of proposed buildings at a scale of either 1:50 or 1:100. Street scene elevations should be provided showing the relationship with neighbouring buildings. Site sections should also be supplied.
8. Design & Access Statement (D&A)
9. Planning Statement

10. Heritage Statement
11. Landscaping Plan / Urban Greening Factor
12. Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement
13. Energy Report, Overheating Strategy and Sustainability Strategy
14. Basement Impact Assessment
15. Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy / Council's drainage pro-forma
16. Statement of Community Involvement
17. Fire Statement

If any of these requirements are missing, we cannot consider your application until it is provided. If you are in any doubt, please take time to view the requirements at our website at:

<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-applications/pre-application-guidance/do-i-need-planning-permission/planning-application-requirements>

5. PLANNING APPLICATION PROCESS

Once you have submitted your planning application, it goes through several steps:

1. Validation/Checking
Applications are checked to make sure all required documents and fees are there and checked for any potential issues which need addressing to ensure compliance with policy. If considered 'valid' and likely to be acceptable they are registered. Applications are only checked when an officer is available so there can be several weeks before an application is validated and checked.
2. Registration
The application is entered into the register of applications and customers are informed formally that their application is registered, their application reference number, their case officer and the deadline they can expect to hear back by.
3. Consultation (a minimum of 24 days following registration)
Details of the application will be provided to neighbours in line with our consultation policy and they will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed development. Consultees are given a minimum of 24 days to comment on an application.
4. Decision
The planning service can deal with smaller applications under delegated powers (within 13 weeks) and will issue a decision notice stating whether the application has been approved or refused, and if there are any conditions that must be met.

6. CARRYING OUT BUILDING WORKS

Once you have planning permission, it is recommended that you obtain technical advice regarding building control matters. Building Control services ensure that the works carried out by your appointed builders are done safely. Building Control services can be found through your local council or an approved inspector service.

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 Building Control on 020 8489 5504 or by email on building.control@haringey.gov.uk

PLEASE NOTE

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.