

**Committee Updates: Planning Committee –**

**Date: 4<sup>th</sup> June 2013**

**UPDATES:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Agenda page</b>	<b>Update – page</b>
B2 and B3	58 Highbury Grove	27	

**Item Nos: B2 and B3**

**Case Officer: Clare Preece**

**Application Nos: P121884**

**Application Type: Full**

**Site Address: 58 Highbury Grove, Islington N5 2AG**

**Description of Development:** Conversion of the existing 263sqm floorspace in B1(a) (office) use class within the front coach house to form two no. two bed flats and the demolition of the existing buildings at the rear of the site and the construction of six no. three bedroom / three storey townhouses and a three storey building comprising 683sqm floorspace in B1 use class, off-street (wheelchair user) car parking, two loading bays, hardstanding and landscaping.

The addendum covers the following:

- A. A further letter of objection was received on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013, representing 14 residents of Melody Lane. The objection does not raise any new points that have not been raised by the existing objections. The issues can be summarised as follows (with the condition of consent and/or paragraph that provides responses to each issue indicated within brackets):
- traffic and safety (9.76, 9.77, 9.78)
  - traffic generation (9.68 – also see response below to the traffic impact assessment submitted on behalf of the residents )
  - parking (conditions 11 and 13 – also see response below to the traffic impact assessment)
  - overdevelopment (9.17, 9.27, 9.75)
  - design of the proposed family houses (9.13, 9.19, 9.53)
  - out of character (9.17)
  - Alternative scheme – No alternative scheme has been submitted by the applicant. The residents however consider that the provision of two short terraces facing east-west would be better suited to the local context, particularly in consideration of the arrangement of the contemporary residential development to the south. However, it is considered that the arrangement of two short terraces with their side elevations facing south would leave the lane undefined and would give the development no street frontage; such an arrangement would be considered unacceptable. (9.13 and 9.16)
- B. To ensure the access and parking arrangements are satisfactory, the heads of terms of the S106 is proposed to be amended.

The existing heads of terms reads:

10(b) Not to occupy the development until a parking management scheme intended to keep Melody Lane free of parked vehicles has been submitted to and approved by the Council. The scheme shall include provisions requiring signage that publicise its requirements and an enforcement strategy for dealing with any breaches of the scheme.

12 Signage that publicises the requirement of no parking along Melody Lane shall be out in place prior to the first occupation of the development and the details of the location, design and content of the signage and a management strategy for dealing with any breaches shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval within six months of the commencement of the superstructure works. The approved management strategy shall be enforced and complied with at all times.

**The proposed amendment will read:**

10(b) The owners of the development shall not park and shall ensure that their visitors do not park in that part of Melody Lane which is within title number LN35352 and there shall be an access and parking strategy within the S106 agreement to ensure that this requirement is enforced by the owners of the development site and of that part of Melody Lane within title number LN35352.

12 to be deleted.

C. **Condition 11** is proposed to be amended. The existing condition reads

CONDITION: There shall be no parking in or any other obstruction of that part of Melody Lane that falls within the application site. Signage that publicises this requirement shall be put in place prior to the first occupation of the development and the details of the location, design and content of the signage and a management strategy for dealing with any breaches shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval within six months of the commencement of the superstructure works. The approved management strategy shall be enforced and complied with at all times.

REASON: To ensure the development remains car free (apart from the approved disabled parking space and the use of the two loading bays associated with the B1 Use Class building), in the interests of

achieving sustainable development in accordance with policy CS10 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011; in the interests of providing a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclist and to ensure there is adequate manoeuvring space for servicing vehicles, particularly refuse servicing, in accordance with approved drawings ref: 1124-0200-AP-012 PL01 and 1124-0200-AP-013 PL01 and policies T18, T19, T45, T46, T47, T48, T49, T52 and T55 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002.

**The proposed amended condition 11 would read:**

Condition 11:

There shall be no parking in that part of Melody Lane which is within the application site. There shall be a parking strategy to deal with the enforcement of this requirement which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to implementation of the permission and the approved parking strategy shall be complied with and enforced at all times.

REASON: To ensure the development remains car free (apart from the approved disabled parking space and the use of the two loading bays associated with the B1 Use Class building), in the interests of achieving sustainable development in accordance with policy CS10 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011; in the interests of providing a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclist and to ensure there is adequate manoeuvring space for servicing vehicles, particularly refuse servicing, in accordance with approved drawings ref: 1124-0200-AP-012 PL01 and 1124-0200-AP-013 PL01 and policies T18, T19, T45, T46, T47, T48, T49, T52 and T55 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002.

- D. A Traffic Impact Assessment was also received on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013, on behalf of the Melody Lane residents. The main points raised can be summarised as follows with a response to each from Council's Spatial Planning and Transport officer:

- A reduction in the safety of the already very narrow existing access

**RESPONSE:** Section 2.3 of the Transport Review acknowledges that the narrowing of the Melody Lane will be reduced in length, thus reducing the length of the conflict zone. However, it does raise concerns that the proposed new front boundary wall will

reduce the openness and visibility of this front area. Further details of the front boundary wall have been requested within condition 4 which will be resolved prior to implementation.

- An increase in the number of vehicular movements and thus conflicting movements

**RESPONSE: Residential**

- It is noted that the TRAVL assessment for the residential development uses sites that are both significantly larger in size (number of units) and numbers of car parking spaces (with the exception of Coverley Close). It also assumes that the modal split (percentages of people travelling by car, walking, cycling etc) is unchanged regardless of whether a site is car-free or not. We do not consider that this approach to estimating the number trips for the proposed residential development is robust enough.
- Furthermore, the Transport Review does not consider the number of vehicle trips made by residents of the Aircool site (which in our view provides a much more useful example of the expected number of trips). The tables in Section 3.2 of the report (as set out below) show that the proposed development will result in more private car journeys than the Aircool site – this is despite the fact that the Aircool site is larger in size (14 units), provides on-site car parking (at least six spaces) and has additional areas of unauthorised car-parking. Considering the size of the Aircool site and provision of on-site car parking, it is considered that the number of private car journeys for the proposed car-free residential development will be minimal in comparison.

	58 Highbury Grove (eight proposed residential units, six of which are accessed from Melody Lane)	Aircool site (14 units)
AM peak (8am-9am)	4	1
PM peak (5pm-6pm)	6	3
Typical hour (3pm-4pm)	2	4

Figure 1: number of private car journeys

- As Melody Lane is a private road, it is important that physical measures are introduced to prevent unauthorised car parking for both new and existing occupiers/visitors. We recommend that this

is dealt with through the requirements for the public realm details, safety audit and parking/access management plan prior to implementation. This has been addressed within Condition 4.

- It is also noted that the proposal will remove approximately seven on-site car parking spaces which are used for the existing storage units, thereby reducing opportunities for vehicles to park.

## Office

- The TRAVL assessment considers only one site - it is generally useful to consider a few similar sites where possible to provide a robust assessment of trips.
- The table under Section 3.2 shows that during particular peak times, there are no expected van trips for the proposed development. It is noted that the TRAVL details for the example site does not include details of vans.
- Without having looked at similar sites on TRAVL, it is estimated that the office may generate approximately two deliveries a day. Although this could be slightly more depending on the nature of the business, it would be adequately accommodated within the on-site servicing bay.
- It is noted that the existing uses on the site is similar in size to the proposed office development (office: 262 square metres and storage sheds: 388 square metres). Therefore Council do not expect that the proposed office will result in an increase in vehicle trips to the current situation.

- A loss of existing car parking spaces

**RESPONSE:** is understood that there is a problem with unauthorised car parking on Melody Lane, which we would like to see resolved by introducing physical measures to restrict car parking.

We support the removal of car parking, which is in line with Islington's Core Strategy Policy CS10, Part H and Policy DM 49 of the emerging Development Management Policies.

- An increase in car parking requirements and an inability to control them

**RESPONSE:** The proposal is car-free and therefore residents will not be permitted to park on the site or Melody Lane. See previous points

- A reduction in the ability to service the existing properties.

**RESPONSE:** Council's refuse department have confirmed that the vehicle Council currently use in Melody Lane is smaller (length/width) than that mentioned in the latest plan. They therefore do not have a problem with collections in Melody Lane going forward. Please see attached for vehicle sizes.

A dedicated servicing bay and turning head has been provided for the development, which is at the far end of Melody Lane (away from the entrance of the Aircool site).

The parking/access management plan should address how unauthorised car parking will be prevented to ensure adequate access to the existing properties.