Woodberry Down Estate
in the London Borough of Hackney
planning application no. 2008/1050

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral (new powers)

The proposal
Outline planning permission to provide 4,664 residential units, 30,000 sq.m. education, health and community facilities, 3,144 sq.m. business use, 5,194 sq.m. retail units, provision of open space and landscaping, remodelling of Seven Sisters Road and site access points; and car parking.

The applicant
The applicant is Hackney Homes Ltd, and the architects are Matrix Partnerships and Shepheard Epstein Hunter.

Strategic issues
The proposal to redevelop Woodberry Down to provide replacement social rented homes together with additional affordable and market housing, community and social facilities, transport improvements and open space is supported in principle. The approach taken to design, play and recreation space is supported and responds positively to London Plan policies. Further discussions are required regarding the energy strategy to ensure that the proposal adopts the previously agreed approach, which accords with London Plan Policy and the applicant should submit further details regarding access.

Recommendation
That Hackney Council be advised that the application broadly complies with the London Plan, but that further information is required to address current deficiencies, as detailed in paragraph 82 of this report.

Context
1. On 5 June 2008 the Mayor of London received documents from Hackney Council notifying him of a planning application, received on 21 April 2008, of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.
2 The application is referable under the following Categories of the Schedule of the Order 2008:

- **1A (a)** “Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”.

- **1B (c)** “Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings...outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres”.

- **1C (c)** “Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building...more than 30 metres high and outside the City of London”.

- **3A (a)** “Development which is likely to result in the loss of more than 200 houses, flats, or houses and flats (irrespective of whether the development would entail also the provision of new houses or flats).”

- **3F** “Development for a use, other than residential use, which includes the provision of more than 200 car parking spaces in connection with that use”.

3 Once Hackney Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

5 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

**Site description**

6 The Woodberry Down Estate application site areas covers 43.6 hectares (24.1 hectares when open space, West Reservoir, and education facilities are excluded), and currently comprises 2,013 homes with an estimated population of 5,399. The site is bounded to the south, west and north by the New River, and to the west by Green Lanes. The site is split by Seven Sisters Road (A503), which is a six-lane dual carriageway that runs through the site. The East and West Stoke Newington Reservoirs are located immediately south of the site, with Finsbury Park to the west. Manor House Underground Station is located at the junction of Green Lanes and Seven Sisters Road, at the western end of the site.

7 The current estate was constructed in stages from 1940 to 1970, and is dominated by five to eight storey blocks. The site also includes a small local shopping parade comprising fifteen retail units, a health centre, two primary schools, St Olave’s Church and Church Hall, and a community centre. The Church of St Olave, Woodberry Down Primary School and the John Scott Health Centre are all listed buildings. The majority of the site is owned by Hackney Council.

**Details of the proposal**

8 Hackney Homes, as Arms Length Management Organisation to Hackney Council, is seeking outline planning permission for the redevelopment of Woodberry Down Estate. The architects are Matrix Partnership and Shepheard Epstein Hunter.
There are currently 2,013 units on site, 1,458 are socially rented, 522 are leaseholders, and 33 are private properties. A housing condition study undertaken in 2002 reported that many of the residential buildings at Woodberry Down were in a poor state of repair, falling short of the government’s Decent Homes Standards, and were therefore recommended for demolition. The development proposes the phased demolition of these buildings over a twenty year time period, and the construction of 1,458 replacement social rented units, with new provision of 478 intermediate units and 2,728 private units.

The proposal also includes a range of non residential uses, comprising:

- replacement space for existing retail units, and provision for retail expansion,
- business and training centre,
- primary school and nursery,
- six-form entry City Academy,
- children’s centre and youth centre,
- community centre and the redevelopment of St Olave’s Church to provide for community facilities and three satellite community facilities,
- elderly peoples day centre,
- police shop and community safety unit, and
- health care facilities.

The proposal also includes open space provision and landscaping improvements to the New River and reservoir frontages, a remodelling of Seven Sisters Road, new access points into the site, and car parking provision.

### Application process

This proposal is for outline planning permission. The application comprises a masterplan, which establishes a series of development parameters, including total quantum of development, areas of open space, maximum and minimum building heights, means of access, provision of car parking and affordable housing provision. Future reserved matters applications must be in accordance with the parameters established at the outline planning stage. The site will be redeveloped in five phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Estimated re-housing and demolition</th>
<th>Estimated construction</th>
<th>Unit total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2004 - 2008</td>
<td>2008 – 2013</td>
<td>1,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2008 - 2013</td>
<td>2009 – 2016</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011 - 2017</td>
<td>2016 – 2020</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016 - 2019</td>
<td>2019 – 2023</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2018 - 2022</td>
<td>2022 – 2027</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Phasing

Under the terms of the Mayor of London Order (2008), the Mayor does not have a statutory right to consider applications at the reserved matters stage. Therefore, unless revised or new applications are submitted on this site, or future applications do not comply with the legal agreement or EIA parameters, the Mayor’s only statutory involvement in these proposals is at this outline stage.
Together with the masterplanning process for the entire Woodberry Down Estate, Hackney Council have undertaken a competitive tender exercise to identify a development partner to deliver the first four development sites within the estate. In 2006 Berkeley Homes and Circle Anglia were appointed. An application for full planning permission for the first of the four kick start sites has been submitted and approved by Hackney Council. This was initially considered by the former Mayor on 18 November 2007 (PDU/1826/01) and following Hackney Council’s resolution to grant permission was considered by the Deputy Mayor on 14 May 2008 (PDU/1826/02). The Deputy Mayor concluded that the application raised no outstanding strategic issues and was consequently the application was left to Hackney to determine. The first development site application was in accordance with the previously approved masterplan parameters.

Case history

On 18 July 2007 the previous Mayor considered a report regarding a proposed masterplan to redevelop the estate (PDU/0704a/01). The application was largely the same as the one considered here and was supported in principle. Following the decision by English Heritage to list the existing Woodberry Down Primary School and the John Scott Health Centre, and the need to ensure viability of the proposal, a series of changes were required which resulted in the need to submit a revised application. The majority of the changes relate to the layout and location of buildings and uses within the masterplan to take account of the newly listed buildings. The revisions have resulted in a minor change to the overall floorspace, the details of which are provided in Table 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Previous proposal</th>
<th>Current proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4,644 units</td>
<td>4,664 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5,000 sq.m.</td>
<td>5,194 sq.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, health and community</td>
<td>30,000 sq.m.</td>
<td>30,000 sq.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business use</td>
<td>3,150 sq.m.</td>
<td>3,144 sq.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Accommodation schedule – previous and proposed

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Housing
- Affordable housing
- Density
- Urban design
- Heritage
- Access
- Children’s play space
- Mix of uses
- Climate change and mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Policies and guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>London Plan; PPG15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS1; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Wheelchair Accessible Housing BPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s play space</td>
<td>London Plan; Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of uses</td>
<td>London Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and mitigation</td>
<td>London Plan; PPS, PPS Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS1; PPS3; PPG13; PPS22; the Mayor’s Energy Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 1995 Hackney Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004). The 2008 Hackney Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Woodberry Down Area Action Plan (adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance in 2004) are also relevant material considerations:

### Housing

18 London Plan Policy 3A.15 seeks to prevent the loss of affordable housing. Paragraph 3.75 provides specific guidance on estate renewals and states that “Where redevelopment of affordable housing is proposed, it should not be permitted unless it is replaced by better quality accommodation, providing at least an equivalent floorspace”. The Supplementary Planning Guidance on Housing provides further policy context in respect of estate renewal, and emphasises that in redeveloping affordable housing there should be no net loss.

19 At the time of original masterplan preparation there were 1,458 social rented units on site (104 of these units have already been demolished). The masterplan seeks to reprovide 1,458 social rented units. The masterplan therefore fully reprovides the existing quantum of social rented units which is in accordance with London Plan Policy. The mix of the existing units, and the proposed units is provided below. There are 49 units which are listed as ‘uncertain’ as the applicant has not indicated the bedroom size of these units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>Current social rented provision</th>
<th>Proposed social rented provision</th>
<th>Housing SPG social rented mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bed</td>
<td>312 (21%)</td>
<td>394 (27%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bed</td>
<td>658 (45%)</td>
<td>597 (41%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>358 (25.5%)</td>
<td>146 (10%)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed plus</td>
<td>81 (5.5%)</td>
<td>321 (22%)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>49 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,458</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3 social rented accommodation schedule

20 The replacement social rented provision seeks to match, and improve on, the current provision. If half of the ‘uncertain units’ are treated as large units, there are currently 464 3-bed plus social rented units on site. The application will provide 467 3-bed plus social rented units, with a significant shift from 3-bed towards 4-bed and 5-bed units. The Housing SPG provides a guidance housing mix for new
developments based on the GLA housing requirements study. The mix of the social rented units does not accord with the SPG, however given that this is an estate renewal scheme, which primarily seeks to reprovide for existing tenants, and that the replacement provision does deliver a significant increase in larger units, the proposed mix is acceptable.

21 In order to fund the reprovision of the existing social rented units on site, it is accepted that it is necessary to include a significant proportion of private market housing. The scheme includes 2,728 private market units. The proposal also includes 478 intermediate units. Overall the masterplan delivers 41% affordable units and 59% private units, at 75:25 social rent to intermediate split. Given the need to replace existing homes and the need to fund the reprovision, this is considered as an appropriate balance for this regeneration project. There is an overall increase of 496 affordable homes.

22 The mix of the intermediate and private is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed intermediate provision</th>
<th>Housing SPG intermediate provision</th>
<th>Proposed private provision</th>
<th>Housing SPG private provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>134 (5%)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>134 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-bed</td>
<td>123 (25.5%)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>One-bed</td>
<td>814 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-bed</td>
<td>184 (38.5%)</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Two-bed</td>
<td>826 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-bed</td>
<td>106 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three-bed</td>
<td>944 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-bed</td>
<td>62 (013%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Four-bed</td>
<td>10 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4 Intermediate and private housing mix

23 It is acknowledged that the provision of private and intermediate units is necessary to fund the reprovision of social rented units, therefore the proposed mix is affected by viability. The additional units accord with the Housing SPG’s desire to increase the supply of larger units within the private and intermediate provision, with 35% of units at 3-bed plus.

Density

24 London Plan policies 4B.1 and 3A.3 outline the need for development proposals to achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles of the compact city, and with public transport accessibility. Table 3A.2 of the London Plan provides guidelines on density in support of policies 4B.1 and 3A.2. The previous masterplan proposal, which in terms of unit output is largely similar to this scheme, had an average density of 617 habitable rooms per hectare. The applicant states in the submission documents with the revised masterplan that the density is 540 habitable rooms per hectare. Clarification is therefore sought as to how the recent density level has been calculated.

25 The site has a varied public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of three to six, although the majority of the site is highly accessible at levels six and five. Table 3A.2 of the London Plan provides a guidance range of 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare for urban sites with a PTAL rating of between four and six. The proposed density of the masterplan area is therefore within the guidance range. Given the site’s location, the high quality design of the masterplan, and the significant level of play and recreation space proposed (discussed in paragraphs 38 - 42), the proposed density is therefore acceptable.
Summary

26 The application reprovides for the existing tenants in the estate, ensuring no net loss in affordable housing, therefore complying with London Plan policy. The social rented mix reflects the need to provide replacement accommodation, whilst seeking to significantly increase the provision of larger units. This is in line with London Plan policy. The tenure split of the proposals reflects the need to provide units, which is accepted. The density of the proposals accords with the density matrix within the London Plan and reflects the site’s location and is supported with high quality design and substantial play and recreation provision (discussed in paragraphs 27-33 and 36-40). The housing element of the proposal is therefore in accordance with London Plan policy.

Urban design

27 Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan and is specifically promoted by the policies contained within Chapter 4B which address both general design principles and specific design issues. Policy 4B.1 sets out overarching design principles for London and states that the Mayor will seek to ensure that new developments maximise site potential, enhance the public realm, provide a mix of uses, are accessible, legible, sustainable, safe, inspiring, exciting and respect London’s natural and built heritage. Other policies include general design principles, which should be reflected in developments, relate to the promotion of world-class design, maximising the potential of sites, ensuring appropriate development densities, improving the public realm and creating accessible environments.

28 The architects have worked closely with Council officers and the GLA to produce a masterplan and a design code to illustrate and fix a number of key parameters and principles at this outline stage. Securing these principles is fundamental to delivering high quality design throughout the lifetime of the development and convincingly ensuring design excellence throughout the 20-year development lifespan. Establishing design codes at the outline planning stage which will then guide the development of the detailed scheme is an accepted approach.

29 The design code and masterplan documents illustrate that a sound and well considered design rationale has been used by the architectural team and both documents provide significant comfort that the redevelopment of Woodberry Down will be of a high quality. The design rationale relies heavily on the principles of maximising the use of, and views to, the reservoirs, increasing the quantity and improving the quality of usable open space, increasing permeability into and through the site, and delivering high quality homes for both the existing and future residents. These principles are supported and are reflected well throughout both documents.

30 Both the masterplan and design code provide comprehensive guidance on the detailed design of both public and semi-public spaces, as well as play provision. Materials, building heights, block layout and distances, building frontages, street design, permeability and sustainability are all developed in detail. The masterplan centres on a series of development blocks with internal courtyards. Ground floor units have street access rather than from internal lobbies, which ensures activity at street level. There is also a clear distinction made between the public and private realm with the majority of units having access to secure internal courtyards for play and amenity and also public areas of open space.

31 In establishing the technical feasibility of delivering the overall housing requirements a building height strategy has been developed. This is intended to be used as a guide for the future development of the site. The strategy takes into account the need to accommodate a significant increase in housing density, whilst avoiding monolithic slab blocks. The guidance ranges in height from three to twenty five storeys and the design code provides further design guidance for the location and design of tall buildings. The approach taken is supported and is in line with London Plan policy.
32 Within the design code the applicant has established a clear process for implementing the objectives and principles of the masterplan and other submission documents throughout the detailed design phases. This process details how the code will be used at each phase to drive the design development, and also how the code will be reviewed and monitored. This strategy is welcomed and should be reflected in the legal agreement to ensure that the principles are delivered.

33 The thorough approach taken in both documents demonstrates a clear commitment to delivering a high quality community which is strongly supported and the proposals accord with London Plan design policies.

Heritage

34 Policies 4B.12 and 4B.13 of the London Plan seek to protect and enhance historic assets and support schemes that make use of these assets. The previous masterplan included retention and enhancement of the Grade II listed St Olave’s church. The proposed Masterplan stipulates the retention of the listed church, together with a two to six-storey redevelopment of the existing Church Hall with the taller element located away from the listed church. The redeveloped church hall would act as an enabling development, to facilitate the refurbishment of the main Church building. New buildings to the east of the Church have been positioned to provide maximum space around the church and its yard, to ensure its setting is enhanced as a result of the redevelopment. Furthermore, the building heights have been deliberately kept to a reduced scale near the church.

35 The recent listing of the John Scott Health Centre and the Woodberry Down Community School has promoted a review of the Masterplan and its subsequent amendment, in order to retain these buildings and preserve their setting. The listed school will be retained in a more open setting, which represents an enhancement for this low-rise school building. The John Scott health centre at the south western corner of the site will also be preserved and well integrated with the new buildings in this quarter. Whilst this application is in outline form, the Masterplan makes clear the intention that the detailed contemporary design of the surrounding redevelopment will be of the highest quality. Subsequent reserved matters applications and Listed Building Consents will need to ensure that the buildings are protected and the setting is preserved. There are no tall buildings in the vicinity of the listed buildings and the scale of the buildings proposed would not harm the setting. Therefore the proposals comply with policies 4B.12 and 4B.13.

Inclusive design

36 London Plan Policy 4B.5 requires development to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion. This should be demonstrated in an access statement. The applicant has submitted a design and access statement which details how the development will be designed to be accessible to all. The statement also indicates that the proposal will accord with the London Plan Policy 3A.5 requirement that all new housing should be built to ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards and that 10% should be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.

37 However, it is disappointing that the design code and masterplan do not adopt inclusive design principles nor illustrate with indicative flat layouts how the flats will be designed to meet Lifetime Homes and wheelchair accessible requirements. The applicant is encouraged to develop an inclusive design chapter within the masterplan and design code, which should include principles on how buildings and streets will be accessed, and traversed by all, particularly how the needs of partially sighted, and wheelchair users, will be met in the street design. The documents should also include indicative flat layouts illustrating compliance with the sixteen Lifetime Homes standards and how 10% will be accessible to wheelchair users, or easily adaptable, which are London Plan requirements. This information is required to fully comply with the London Plan.
Children’s play space

Policy 3D.13 of the London Plan sets out that “the Mayor will and the boroughs should ensure developments that include housing make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs.” The applicant has provided an assessment, using the methodology within the Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation’, which demonstrates that there will be approximately 2,747 children within the development. The SPG sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable child playspace to be provided per child. As such the development should make provision for 27,470 sq.m. of playspace. The likely age ranges of the children are provided in Table 1.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Anticipated child population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,747</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5 Anticipated child population

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive play strategy detailing principles for the development of play and amenity spaces within both the masterplan and design code document. The masterplan includes the provision of 41,716 sq.m. of recreation space, which is significantly above what would be required as a minimum provision. In addition, a number of off-site facilities are identified within 800 metres of the masterplan site, including Finsbury Park, which provides 465,000 sq.m. of open space and nearby youth facilities, including a local climbing centre. The on-site play and recreation provision is broken down into a range of different types of facilities for varying ages, as demonstrated by Table 1.6. The spaces are located throughout the entire masterplan area to ensure easy access to play and amenity for all residents.

The design code provides guidance as to the type and age range of each facility, their location and catchment, boundary treatments, materials equipment and furniture, planting and illustrative examples of play space. Particular attention has been paid in the design code to the integration of the doorstep play spaces provided within internal courtyards, to address the interaction of play with other competing uses for example private gardens and general residential amenity space.

To ensure delivery of play provision and the design principles that have been established at this stage, the applicant has stated that the play strategy will be conditioned as part of the outline planning permission. The delivery of the play spaces has also been factored into the economic viability assessment and will be included within the legal agreement as a significant contribution to be delivered by future development partners.

The applicant has demonstrated a comprehensive approach to the provision of play space. Overall quantum of play and recreation provision is significantly above the guidance within the SPG, which is strongly supported, and the design code has established clear and detailed principles for the design of the spaces and their interaction with the development. The Council should secure the details in Table 1.6 as part of any planning permission. The play proposals are therefore in accordance with London Plan requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of provision</th>
<th>Size (sq.m.)</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Size (sq.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood play space</td>
<td>3,605</td>
<td>Spring Park</td>
<td>3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local playable space</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>Woodberry Square</td>
<td>2,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rowley Gardens</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorstep playable space</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10 DPS located in public realm</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 DPS located in private realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other principal public playable space</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>Woodberry Gardens</td>
<td>1,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amphitheatre</td>
<td>2,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other playable space</td>
<td>19,619</td>
<td>Riverside Park north and south</td>
<td>19,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth space</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>Multi use games area in Spring Park</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi use games area in Rowley Gardens</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth centre</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing field associated with schools</td>
<td>2,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total on-site play and recreation provision</td>
<td>41,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6 On-site play facilities

**Mix of uses**

43 London Plan Policy 3A.18 states that in major areas of new development and regeneration adequate provision should be made for social infrastructure and community facilities. London Plan Policy 3A.7 states that for large residential developments provision should be made for suitable non-residential uses.

44 The masterplan includes the provision of facilities for children, play, cultural, leisure, educational, health and shopping purposes. Proposals include an expanded primary school, two nurseries, a refurbished health centre, replacement and potential for additional retail units (to take account of the growth in population), community hall, refurbished church hall, youth centre, business space, as well as other mixed-uses. The proposed mix of uses in addition to residential provision is in accordance with London Plan policy and supported.

**Climate change and mitigation**

45 The London Plan climate change policies as set out in chapter 4A collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions, adopting sustainable design and construction measures, prioritising decentralised energy supply, and incorporating renewable energy technologies with a target of 20% carbon reductions from on-site renewable energy. The policies set out ways in which developers must address mitigation of and
adaptation to the effects of climate change. Policies 4A.2 to 4A.8 of the London Plan focus on how to mitigate climate change, and the CO2 reduction targets that are necessary across London to achieve this.

Sustainable design and construction

46 Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan requires all development proposals to include a sustainability statement. Further guidance on this policy is given in the SPG Sustainable Design and Construction. In accordance with London Plan Policy, the application includes a sustainability statement. In acknowledging that the application is in the early stages of design, submitted only in outline, the applicant has provided a series of ‘design statements of commitment’ which are established clearly in the strategy to indicate which measures are being committed to for the detailed design stage. Each commitment also includes a performance indicator. The applicant has assessed the commitments proposed against the essential standards within the SPG which is welcomed.

47 The strategy commits to the majority of the essential standards within the SPG and includes measures such as use of recycled and sustainable materials, sustainable urban drainage system, rainwater collection, green and brown roofs, waste recycling facilities and the management of construction waste.

48 As the project has a twenty year development timescale and in recognition of the fast moving nature of sustainable design and construction technologies, and policy context, the applicant has indicated that prior to each of the five phases the statements of commitments and key performance indicators will be reviewed. This approach is supported.

49 The Council should secure the statements of commitments and key performance indicators through any future planning consent, and also secure the review process prior to each development phase to ensure delivery of the strategy and its objectives. The strategy accords with London Plan sustainable design and construction policies.

Climate change and mitigation

50 As part of discussions regarding the previous masterplan, the applicant has worked closely with GLA officers in developing an energy strategy which accords with London Plan energy policies. The agreed strategy has both a preferred and a back-up strategy.

Preferred strategy

51 The preferred strategy seeks, upon completion of the masterplan, to deliver a site-wide heat network operated by a single energy services company and served by gas-fired combined heat and power plants with biomass boilers. The system will be run with two energy centres. In the interim stages of development, early phases would be served by combined heat and power plants which would subsequently be decommissioned. The first phase of the estate redevelopment which has already been through the planning process is required, by legal agreement, to use reasonable endeavours to assist in the delivery of this system and discussions between GLA officers the masterplan team, and the first phase applicant, are on going to help secure this strategy.

Back-up strategy

52 If a single energy services company is not possible and the preferred strategy is not implemented, then a back-up strategy has been agreed to ensure continual compliance with London Plan policies. This strategy would allow no more than six energy centres, but importantly maintains the site-wide network.

53 In January 2008 the applicant gave written assurances that clauses provided by GLA officers for inclusion in the legal agreement to secure both the preferred and back-up strategy were acceptable.
Following the revised masterplan the applicant has submitted a new energy strategy. However, this document differs in many ways with the agreed strategy, and endorses a twelve energy centre approach. Given that the development has not changed significantly, a change in approach to the energy strategy is not acceptable. Since its submission, the applicant has provided written assurances that an updated strategy would be submitted by August 2008, which will fully reflect the previously agreed strategy.

Subject to the applicant submitting a revised energy strategy, which accurately reflects the previously agreed strategy, the proposals accord with London Plan energy policies. It should be noted however that any change in the previously agreed approach would not be acceptable.

**Metropolitan Open Land and Blue Ribbon Network**

London Plan Policy 3D.10 states that “*The Mayor will and boroughs should maintain the protection of Metropolitan Open Land from inappropriate development*”. Policy 4C.1 states that the Mayor will and boroughs should recognise the strategic importance of the Blue Ribbon Network. Hackney Council UDP (1995) designates the New River and footpath and the East and West Reservoirs as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). The river and watercourses are currently largely fenced, restricting access to the water. The New River runs around nearly two thirds of the site and acts as a barrier preventing movement to and from the wider surroundings. The river and reservoirs form part of the Blue Ribbon Network.

The masterplan proposes a new riverside walkway, with re-landscaping alongside the New River, and a riverside park adjacent to the West Reservoir. Two new pedestrian and cycle links crossing New River will increase permeability in and around Woodberry Down, and the introduction of piers onto the West Reservoir will provide access to the water. As a result of the listed buildings, the bridges have been moved which has improved access and permeability to the site, as the bridges are now more satisfactorily spaced. The first phase application included the provision of the riverside park which was designed to deliver a high-quality park with clear and open views and access to the river. This is a significant improvement against the existing situation where access is heavily restricted.

The boundary of MOL as currently designated will not be altered by the proposal, and the only built form on MOL will be pedestrian bridges or piers. The proposals will bring environmental and recreational benefits to the site and bring the MOL land back into use for leisure and recreational purposes. In this respect the proposals are supported.

**Biodiversity**

The application site includes part of two Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, Stoke Newington Reservoirs and the New River. There is no direct land take from the Metropolitan Sites for built development, but there are a number of potential impacts from disturbance, lighting and landscaping, and also potential impacts on protected and Biodiversity Action Plan priority species within the estate. It is acknowledged that the proposals are in outline, therefore appropriate conditions should be included by the Council to secure the following issues are considered at the appropriate stage:

- Impacts of disturbance on gadwall and other water birds which commute between the site and the Lea Valley Special Protection Area.
- Assessment of impacts (positive and negative) on ecology and access to nature along the New River in respect to detailed access and landscaping.
- More detailed consideration and, if necessary, mitigation of impacts on the common toad, now a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species.
• Conditions to minimise impacts of lighting on bats and waterfowl.
• Opportunities for further mitigation and enhancement of the river and reservoirs should be discussed with interested groups such as London Wildlife Trust, The Reservoirs Nature Society (TeRNS) and Thames Water’s conservation staff.

Noise

60 At this outline stage, the proposal does not raise any strategic noise concerns, but the potential exists to achieve a good acoustic standard, which should be pursued as the detailed design is developed. London Plan Policy 4A.20 states that adverse impacts of noise should be minimised and that new noise sensitive development should be separated from major noise sources wherever practicable. As the environmental statement correctly identifies, a small proportion of residential units facing onto Seven Sisters Road will experience noise levels falling within Noise Exposure Category C of PPG24: Planning and Noise. As Policy 4A.20 states noise sensitive developments, such as housing, should be separated from major noise sources. Separation could in this case be achieved by designing the effected dwellings so that only non-habitable rooms are located on the nosiest facades. This should be encouraged by the Council at the detailed designed stage.

61 Construction noise and vibration has the potential to cause disturbance to those living and working nearby, but is a matter for the Council to control via its powers under the Control of Pollution Act, 1974. The Council can also set appropriate conditions to ensure that noise from any mechanical plant (for example, on the new school building) is suitably controlled. Details of any acoustic glazing and ventilators can also be specified at the appropriate stage, but where this is required, ventilation systems providing a positive flow of air without mechanical assistance (such as passive stacks) would be preferable to either trickle vents or mechanically powered ones.

62 The application raises no strategic noise issues.

Transport for London

63 TfL requests clarification about the inconsistency between the numbers of units proposed and assessed within the transport assessment. There is also concern about the trip generation methodology and distribution. Until this is resolved TfL has concerns that the additional vehicle trips will have a significant impact on the Transport for London Road Network and conflict with London Plan Policy 3C.2. TfL is also concerned about the junction capacity analysis and that more up to date accident data should be used.

64 The proposals include the reduction of Seven Sisters Road from six to four lanes. TfL welcomes the principle of this as it will improve the public realm, reduce the severance between the two parts of the development and increase pedestrian permeability in accordance with the principles of policy 3C.18. TfL welcomes continuing discussion with the developer about this modelling and the impact of the development on the Transport for London Road Network, particularly on bus delays. Alterations to the Transport for London Road Network will be made at the applicant’s expense and secured by a s278 agreement with TfL as highway authority. Consideration should be given to the provision of a segregated cycle track or mandatory cycle lane within the bus lanes.

65 Car parking provision of approximately 50% may be within the London Plan maximum but remains high for an area with a PTAL level of up to 6a. Rather than take a demand based approach to provision TfL requires confirmation that the car parking strategy produced for the previous masterplan will be used. This related provision to accessibility and dwelling type and was welcomed as it related to local circumstances and accorded with policy 3C.23. The principles of this strategy should be enshrined in any outline permission and secured by condition. TfL also expects that to limit on street parking the
existing controlled parking zone will be extended to the whole site and that a car parking management plan shall be secured, including neighbouring areas outside the masterplan area. Occupiers of the residential developments should also be excluded from eligibility for on-street residents parking permits. Car parking should be provided for disabled persons in accordance with annex 4 to the London Plan. TfL also requires clarification about the levels of non-residential parking.

66 Cycle parking for 4,901 spaces is proposed. To be is consistent with the TfL Cycle Parking Standards, as referred to in the London Plan (Annex 4, Para 37) 5,182 spaces should be provided for the residential developments. For the non-residential uses provision should also comply with the TfL standard depending on floorspace and type of use.

67 TfL welcomes the proposals for improved cycle access through the site. Earlier proposals for a cycle lane adjacent to the New River have been deleted so that the emphasis will now be on east-west cycle ways through the site. TfL regrets this decision as it was an important route linking through the site to Green Lanes. The developer should therefore consider providing an alternative route to Seven Sisters Road either by a quiet street or designated route.

68 TfL welcomes the improvements to the pedestrian environment within the site. The proposed pathway along the New River is supported provided it will have step free access to street levels. Whilst the provision of an all arms pedestrian crossing at Amhurst Park/Seven sisters Road is supported, it may encourage pedestrians to cross outside the designated area with waiting on the footway followed by two pedestrian islands. In addition, the yellow box does not comply with current standards. The two extra crossings across Seven Sisters Road and the pedestrian cycle footbridges across New River are supported.

69 Given that the eastern part of the site is more than 450 metres from Manor House station it is likely that such trips will be made by bus. TfL has concerns about peak hour capacity on the 253/254 corridor between Manor House and Stamford Hill. In order to address these concerns and to comply with policy 2C.2 the applicant has agreed to provide £270,000 for an additional peak hour service. In accordance with policy 3C.20 TfL will also expect proposals to improve stand arrangements within the site, for example to route 279, and to enable future routes to serve the development.

70 TfL supports the production of travel plan in order to promote and encourage sustainable travel amongst residents and to accord with policy 3C.2 of the London Plan. Site specific travel plans will be developed as individual sites are brought forward and they will benefit from further development particularly with regard to measures to encourage cycling. Proposals for a car club are also welcomed to reduce the demand of for private car use.

71 Policy 3C.24 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that development includes suitable servicing, off road where practicable. TfL does not support drop-off/pick-up along Seven Sisters Road as it is part of the Transport for London Road Network and a main bus route. In order to ensure that the development has appropriate servicing facilities TfL requests that the development be subject to a delivery and servicing plan, as referred in the London Freight Plan. A delivery and servicing plan could also include optimum delivery times for the larger premises, in order to reduce the freight traffic contribution to congestion and poor local air quality in the area.

72 TfL supports the development of a construction Travel Plan and this could be consolidated in to a construction logistics plan as referred to in the London Freight Plan. Each phase development must include a separate assessment detailing potential use of public highway, for example deliveries and crane operations which cannot be accommodated within the site boundary. TfL will not accept temporary closure to the Transport for London Road Network (both carriageway and footway) or construction traffic accesses directly from the Transport for London Road Network during the construction period.
Provided that the proposals are amended to take into account the comments above and clarification is provided with regard to cycle and vehicle parking then TfL considers that this proposal will comply with transport policies in the London Plan.

**London Development Agency**

When considering the previous masterplan the LDA recommended the following:

- The provision of affordable and subsidised childcare places within the masterplan;
- The provision of affordable incubator units as part of the business and training centre; and
- An Initiative to create employment opportunities for local people and to utilise services and labour from small and medium enterprises and black Asian and minorities ethnics businesses.

**Update**

The LDA continues to support the regeneration of the Woodberry Down Estate. The LDA, nevertheless, encourages the applicant to confirm the inclusion of business incubator units and affordable childcare spaces.

According to Table 1.5, the development will be home to a significant amount of children under 5 years old. Consequently, there would be substantial demand for childcare spaces from within the development not withstanding surrounding demand. The provision of affordable childcare spaces is particularly important given childcare can be 25% more expensive in London than elsewhere in the country. The lack of affordable good quality childcare is a major barrier to taking families out of poverty. The provision of nursery accommodation has been included within the masterplan, however the overarching legal agreement should secure that a proportion of affordable and subsidised childcare places are provided within the relevant development stage.

The Woodberry Works Construction Training Partnership has been established to increase the employability among residents from the estate. The ongoing training initiative is welcomed by the LDA and complies with London Plan 3A.26 and 3B.1.

The Equality Impact Assessment identifies the loss of thirteen businesses and related employment during the redevelopment as having short term negative impacts. Affected workers are mainly from the Turkish community. The LDA recognises that there is ongoing discussion between business owners and the Woodberry Down Regeneration team regarding the relocation strategy, however, the LDA would like to be assured that these businesses are given the opportunity to relocate within the development with realistic options in terms of costs and location in order to minimise the loss of jobs and businesses. This could be achieved through the provision of incubator units in addition to a relocation strategy.

**Local planning authority’s position**

The Council is due to consider this proposal in September 2008.

**Legal considerations**

Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in
order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

81 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

82 London Plan policies on housing, design, access, play space, mix of uses, climate change and mitigation, Metropolitan Open Land, biodiversity, noise and transport are relevant to this application.

In broad terms, the application complies with these policies but in some circumstances further information is required to ensure compliance.

- Housing: The proposal reprovides for the existing tenants in the estate, ensuring no net loss in affordable housing, therefore complying with London Plan policy. The mix and tenure split reflect need to provide replacement accommodation, which is accepted. The density of the proposals accords with the density matrix within the London Plan and reflects the site’s location and is supported with high quality design and substantial play and recreation provision. The housing element of the proposal is therefore in accordance with London Plan policy. The Council should secure the housing accommodation schedule within the legal agreement, particularly the quantity and mix of social rented provision.

- Design: The proposals respond positively to London Plan design principles. The Council should adequately secure the masterplan and design code through the legal agreement.

- Access: In accordance with London Plan policy the applicant has submitted an access strategy. However, this does not adequately demonstrate how the principles of inclusive design will be integrated into the development or how the proposal will meet the London Plan requirement to deliver all new housing to Lifetime Homes standards and 10% wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable. This could usefully be included within the masterplan and design code documents.

- Play space: The proposals respond positively to London Plan policy with regard to play and recreation provision. The applicant has provided detailed principles and design guidance for the development of play areas, which is supported.

- Mix of uses: The masterplan includes a range of community, educational, retail, business and social and healthcare facilities, which is in line with London Plan Policy. The Council should consider including within the overarching legal agreement a requirement to provide a proportion of affordable and subsidised childcare places within the relevant development stage. In addition to the relocation strategy, the Council is encouraged to secure the provision on incubator units for returning businesses.

- Climate change and mitigation: The proposals accord with the London Plan sustainable design and construction policies. The submitted energy strategy does not reflect the previous strategy agreed as part of the discussions regarding the original masterplan application. The applicant has indicated that the masterplan will commit to the delivery of the previously agreed strategy. Subject to this agreement, the proposals positively respond to London Plan energy policies. It should be noted however that any change in approach would not be acceptable.
• Metropolitan Open Land: The boundary of MOL as currently designated will not be altered by the proposal, and the only built form on MOL will be pedestrian bridges or piers. The proposals will bring environmental and recreational benefits to the site and bring the MOL land back into use for leisure and recreational purposes. In this respect the proposals are in accordance with London Plan MOL policies.

• Blue Ribbon Network: The proposal will enhance the Blue Ribbon Network through provision of a riverside walkway and riverside park and the creation of access to the water through the introduction of piers.

• Biodiversity: The application raises no strategic issues with regard to biodiversity. The Council is encouraged to include conditions which secure further investigation of the developments impact on existing species at the appropriate stage.

• Noise: The application raises no strategic issues with regard to noise.

• Transport: The alterations to Seven Sisters Road, improvements to the pedestrian environment (including the riverside walkway), contribution to bus services and production of a travel plan are all welcome contributions to a sustainable transport approach. However, clarification is required on trip generation, parking strategy and servicing arrangements. Consideration should be given to cycle provision on Seven Sisters Road and an alternative cycle route to replace the one that had been proposed adjacent to the New River.
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