

# PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Development Management Service  
Planning and Development Division  
Environment and Regeneration Department  
PO Box 333  
222 Upper Street  
LONDON N1 1YA

<b>PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: B4</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>27 April 2017</b>	

Application number	P2016/4634/FUL
Application type	Full Planning Application
Ward	Bunhill Ward
Listed building	N/A
Conservation area	None. Adjacent to Hat and Feather Conservation Area
Development Plan Context	Bunhill & Clerkenwell Key Area Central Activities Zone Major Cycle Route (adjacent to the site) Adjacent to the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area Within 50m of a Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) – King Square Gardens Mayor's Protected Vista – Alexandra Palace
Licensing Implications	None
Site Address	The Triangle Estate, Goswell Road / Compton Street / Cyrus Street & 131-135 [odd] Goswell Road London EC1
Proposal	Demolition of six dwellings, the central podium, garages and one retail unit and the construction of 54 new dwellings (including 27 homes for social rent), provided as infill developments, an additional seventh floor on existing residential blocks and a new part 7/part 8 storey corner building with associated private amenity space, bicycle storage, a new landscaped courtyard garden and improvements to the public realm. The application also includes the provision of 146.8sqm of retail floorspace to replace the demolished unit.

Case Officer	Stefan Sanctuary
Applicant	Mathew Carvalho - New Build and Regeneration Team, London Borough of Islington.
Agent	Sarah Eley - HTA Design LLP



### 3 PHOTOS OF SITE/STREET

Photograph 1: Aerial View of Site looking north



Photograph 2: Aerial View of Site looking east



**Photograph 3:** View from Goswell Road – Lever Street junction



**Photograph 4:** View from Percival Street looking south



**Photograph 5:** View from Cyrus Street over Compton Park



**Photograph 6:** View from podium deck looking north



**Photograph 7:** View from podium deck looking west



**Photograph 8:** View from podium deck looking east



## 4

### **SUMMARY**

- 4.1 The application proposes the creation of 54 new homes on the Triangle Estate, of which 55% (by habitable rooms) would be for social rent. The proposal also includes a new landscaped courtyard (including community growing garden), a new retail unit, as well as improved access arrangements and cycle parking across the estate.
- 4.2 The development proposes a mix of high quality residential accommodation, including family-sized homes, on underused land, car parking and garage spaces in accordance with the aims and objectives of the London Plan and Islington Core Strategy Policies. Moreover, the development results in a significant increase in affordable homes as well as a replacement retail unit.
- 4.3 The development proposes a number of additions to the existing estate in the form of side and roof extensions, conversions and infill housing. The additions are well-designed and are considered to each respond successfully to their respective context and surroundings. The designs proposed are considered to provide a successful intermediary between the existing estate buildings and the surrounding urban context. The proposal would deliver significant landscape improvements within the courtyard space that would enhance biodiversity and provide significant amenity improvements for residents. While some of the existing trees would be lost (12 trees), the proposal would result in a substantial number of additional trees (19 trees) that is considered to mitigate the loss of existing trees.
- 4.4 Despite the site constraints, the development would result in the delivery of high quality residential accommodation with well-considered internal layouts, good levels of natural light and a significant amount of private and communal amenity space. All of the proposed residential units would comply with the minimum unit sizes required by planning policy.
- 4.5 The proposal's housing density is considered to be within acceptable limits and the proposed dwelling mix is considered satisfactory given current demand for housing. The housing mix provides a good mix of tenures and the affordable housing offer is considered to be the maximum amount achievable without rendering the scheme unviable. Furthermore, the application proposes a sustainable form of development which would suitably minimise carbon emissions. Finally, the proposal's transportation and highways impacts are considered to be acceptable, subject to conditions and the planning obligations.
- 4.6 For the reasons given above and explained in more detail in the subsequent sections of this report, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a Directors' Agreement to secure the necessary mitigation measures.

## 5

### **SITE AND SURROUNDING**

- 5.1 The Triangle Estate is located on the western side of Goswell Road and is bound to the north and south by Percival/Cyrus Street and Compton Street respectively. It consists of three 6-storey residential blocks, a 2-storey element (with retail uses) on the northern corner of the site and a raised central podium deck with car parking beneath it. The deck includes a triangular-shaped fenced off area of green space and abuts Compton Park to the west, which is a designated Open Space. The estate, which was built in the 1970s and is of brick construction, currently provides 130 dwellings, with a mix of 1 and 2 bed units, and three commercial units fronting Goswell Road.

- 5.2 The surrounding buildings are of four, five and six storeys in height and are generally traditional in design. The Hat and Feathers Conservation Area is located immediately to the east and south of the site. Looking at the surrounding area in more detail, on the opposite side of Goswell Road is a terrace of four storey Victorian buildings with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential above. Two of the buildings on this stretch, Nos 166 and 184-186, are locally listed buildings. To the north of the estate is an attractive 6-storey red-brick building known as Davina House, which is predominantly in office use.
- 5.3 On the opposite side of Cyrus Street, which borders the site to the north-west, is Tompion House, a 5/6-storey post-war red-brick apartment building. To the immediate west of the application site is Compton Park, beyond which is the 1930s residential block known as Cyrus House. To the south-west of the estate, on the south side of Compton Street, is St Peters and St Pauls Primary School, a traditional Victorian school building set within a playground. The remaining buildings on the south side of Compton Street are 2- to 5-storey converted warehouse buildings in commercial and residential use.
- 5.4 The estate is within London's Central Activities Zone and part of the estate is within the protected viewing corridor of St Paul's Cathedral from Alexandra Palace. The site is also within 50m of King Square Gardens, which is a designated Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Finally, the site is located within the Clerkenwell and Bunhill Key Policy Area.

## **6 PROPOSAL (IN DETAIL)**

- 6.1 The application proposes the creation of 54 new homes across the Triangle Estate, of which 6 would replace existing dwellings to be demolished. The proposal also includes the demolition of the existing podium and the creation of a new landscaped courtyard as well as improvement to the public realm. The proposal also includes the replacement of a new retail unit on the corner of Goswell Road and Percival Street.
- 6.2 The new dwellings are proposed in the following locations:
- The existing undercroft garages replaced by new dwelling units accessed from the landscaped courtyard;
  - A series of new infill dwellings at first floor level, partly replacing storage space;
  - Three new 6-storey additions on the ends of the three existing Triangle blocks;
  - A single-storey roof extension across all three blocks;
  - A new part 7-, part 8-storey building on the junction of Goswell Road and Percival Street with a retail unit at ground and first floor level and residential accommodation above;
- 6.3 The proposal involves creating a secure boundary to the estate by infilling the gaps between the three blocks with housing. A new single-storey wheelchair unit is proposed in the gap between the Goswell Road and Cyrus Street blocks. The gap currently provides vehicular access to the undercroft parking, however this is to be removed as part of the proposal. The single-storey infill building incorporates separate entrances for the new unit as well as communal entrances for the two existing blocks and the landscaped courtyard. The single-storey addition also includes new plant room and an electricity substation to serve the new units.

- 6.4 The link bridge between the Goswell Road and Cyrus Street blocks would be removed and a new six storey addition is proposed between the existing lift shaft and the Cyrus Street block. This addition would provide 3 new residential dwellings in the form of duplex apartments / maisonettes. Access to these units would be from the retained and remodelled lift and stair core. At first floor level of this block two new 1-bed flats are proposed in spaces that are currently used as storage. The flats would have aspect onto Cyrus Street and would protrude out from the existing façade by some 900mm with an overhang over the existing entrances of the block. On the courtyard side of the Cyrus Street block a further three new dwellings are proposed with access from the landscaped courtyard.



*View from Compton Street*

- 6.5 On Compton Street, a new six storey addition is proposed which would face onto and overhang Compton Park. The addition would provide two new maisonettes with access from the retained and remodelled stair and lift core. On the courtyard side of the Compton Street block a further two new dwellings are proposed at ground floor level with access from the landscaped courtyard and a further two dwellings are proposed at first floor level with access from the existing stair cores. On the junction of Goswell Road and Compton Street, a new six storey addition is proposed which would result in the demolition of 6 existing dwellings and the creation of 12 new dwellings. A new lift within the existing stair core would provide access to these new dwellings. The link bridge between Compton Street and Goswell Road blocks would be removed.
- 6.6 The proposal would add a further three new dwellings to the Goswell Road block. The dwellings would replace existing garage and storage space at ground and first floor level and would be accessed from the landscaped courtyard space. This block would also incorporate new bicycle storage for future residents. At the end of the Goswell Road block on the junction with Percival Street, a new 8-storey block would provide a new retail unit and ten new dwellings.





*View of Corner Building from King Square Gardens*

- 6.7 At roof level of all three blocks, a new extension is proposed that would provide a total of 14 new dwellings, 4 on the Cyrus Street block and 5 on each Goswell Road and Compton Street blocks. New landscaping, public realm improvements, access arrangements, cycle and refuse storage facilities are proposed across the estate.

## 7

### **RELEVANT HISTORY:**

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS:**

- 7.1 The following is the most recent and relevant planning history for the site:
- The erection of boundary railings walls and gates to the general height of 6'6" (2m.) to the street frontages was approved on the 14<sup>th</sup> February 1994.
  - An application for the replacement of existing metal windows with UPVC at 90 The Triangle was approved on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2002.
  - An application for repair / renewal works for replacement windows: Insertion of replacement top-hung fully reversible windows and to incorporate sliding windows to all balconies was approved on the 27<sup>th</sup> April 2007.
  - The replacement of 3 existing windows and one existing garden door with double glazed UPVC units was refused on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2007.
  - An application for the provision of a door to replace existing window at Flat 121 was approved on the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2008.
  - The relocation and minor alterations to boundary railings of Compton Street Park was approved on the 5<sup>th</sup> February 2010.

- The installation of new windows in connection with enclosure of disused space adjacent to flat to extend existing floor space was approved on the 24<sup>th</sup> September 2012.
- Removal of two double glazed windows from the ground floor living room and installing a uPVC patio door was approved on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016.

### **PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE:**

7.2 The proposal has been subject to ongoing pre-application discussions throughout the last 3 years. The points raised at pre-application stage have informed the design of the scheme being considered here. The following are the most important improvements that have arisen as a result of pre-application discussions:

- The corner building has been significantly improved since earlier iterations. The building now picks up on the architectural language of adjacent Davina House and is proposed in high quality materials;
- The roof top additions have been set back from the edge of the roof to lessen their impact and the materials proposed are now considered to be of good quality;
- The landscaped courtyard design has been successfully developed and the tree replacement strategy has been significantly improved; and
- The quality of accommodation proposed in terms of size of units, natural lighting and access to amenity space has been improved.

### **ENFORCEMENT**

7.3 None relevant

## **8 CONSULTATION**

### **Public Consultation**

8.1 Letters were sent to occupants of 1270 adjoining and nearby properties across the Triangle Estate as well as on Sebastian Street, Goswell Road, St John's Street, Lever Street, Seward Street, Cyrus Street, Percival Street, Tompion Street, Dallington Street, Ashby Street, Malta Street, Compton Street and Passage, Cyrus Street, Berry Place, Brewhouse Yard, Brunswick Court and Davina House on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2016. A number of site notices and a press advert were also displayed on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016. The public consultation on the application therefore expired on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2017. However it is the Council's practice to continue to consider representations made up until the date of a decision.

8.2 At the time of the writing of this report a total of 8 responses had been received from the public with regard to the application. The responses consist of 4 objections, 2 letters of general interest and 4 of support. The issues raised can be summarised as follows (with the paragraph that provides responses to each issue indicated within brackets).

8.3 The following are the general comments received:

- Information related to air quality, waste management, noise, vibration, dust and contamination should be provided to residents during the construction process [paragraph 10.90 – 10.91];
- The proposed rooftop PVs should be optimally oriented and angled to face due south [10.125];
- Samples of all proposed façade materials should be made available to residents before they are agreed so that residents have a say in the final appearance of the building [10.44];
- Top floor planter materials are not disclosed on the façade materials drawing [10.40];
- Adequate insulation and noise mitigation measures should be incorporated, particularly where bathrooms are located above bedrooms [10.105];
- The proposed section does not note the height of the existing roof level and the level of new build top floor [10.43];
- Surplus proceeds from the sale of private flats should be reinvested on general estate maintenance for the existing estate blocks [10.13 - 10.21]

Objections:

8.4 The following is a list of the objections received in response to the proposal:

- Some of the flats have been excluded from the daylight assessment [10.74 – 10.79];
- The link bridges should be retained as this would negate the need for a 2<sup>nd</sup> lift [10.30 – 10.31];
- Building projects should be avoided as they add to complexity and cost of maintenance [10.2 – 10.40];
- The façade treatment of the new building on the corner of Goswell Road and Percival Street should be more consistent with the architecture of the existing estate [10.41 – 10.42];
- Some of the existing flats will suffer a loss of daylight / sunlight which has not been properly considered [10.74 – 10.82];
- Trees in the courtyard should be evergreen so that the view and outlook from courtyard dwellings is improved [10.70 - 10.74];
- More soft landscaping should be incorporated into the courtyard design and more trees should be planted on Cyrus Street [10.72]
- The removal of the link bridges reduces the accessibility to residents on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor [10.53 – 10.54].

8.5 The following is a list of the comments in support of the proposal:

- The plans seem to redress the historic neglect of this architecturally interesting estate;

- The proposal addresses the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that have blighted the estate;
- The principle of creating more affordable housing is supported;
- Upgrade and refurbishment of the estate is long overdue and welcome;
- The new homes are thoughtfully designed;
- The landscaping proposal is well-considered and supported.

8.6 And a number of non-planning related comments were made. These can be summarised as follows:

- The presence of asbestos on site should be considered within the air quality assessment;
- The construction should be carried out so as to minimise disruption as much as possible;
- Any damage to residents' property should be appropriately compensated;
- There should be a site-wide plan for increased security during the construction process;
- The rights of displaced leaseholders should be protected;
- The capacity and condition of existing services should be carried out and any necessary upgrade should be undertaken as part of this proposal;
- All man-hole covers should be designed so as to minimise their negative visual impact;
- The 1<sup>st</sup> floor projection on Cyrus Street is not realistic;
- The need for an on-site caretaker is not convincing;
- Leases should be revised to make contributions to lift maintenance fairer for flats with no direct lift access.

### **Applicant's consultation**

8.7 The applicant, Islington Housing Strategy and Regeneration have carried out very extensive consultation with members of the TRA and have carried out a number of drop-in sessions.

8.8 Some of the residents' input at these meetings has informed the final design of the proposal. The final proposal is a balance between residents' aspirations to secure the perimeter and reduce anti-social behaviour on the estate on the one hand and the applicant's objective to deliver affordable housing for Islington residents in an accessible, well designed manner on the other.

### **External Consultees**

8.9 **Crime Prevention Officer** – raised no objection and supports the principle of securing the perimeter.

- 8.10 **UK Power Networks** – raised no objection.
- 8.11 **London Fire & Emergency Planning** - satisfied with the details submitted, subject to sprinkler systems being installed within the building.
- 8.12 **Thames Water** – No objection, subject to conditions and informatives requiring details of sewerage infrastructure, surface water drainage, water infrastructure and impact piling.
- 8.13 **Historic England** – an archaeological desk-based assessment should be undertaken prior to a decision being made on the application. *This has now been undertaken and condition 30 has been recommended.*

### **Internal Consultees**

- 8.14 **Access Officer** - The Access Officer requested full justification for the proposal to secure the perimeter and the removal of public access from the courtyard space. This has now been provided. While the access officer still objects to the principle of securing the perimeter, a full assessment and justification is provided in the body of this report.

The incorporation of a number of inclusive design measures was also requested including the following:

- step-free access to communal landscaped areas,
- the provision of electric scooter storage,
- accessible cycle storage;
- compliance with Category 2 / Lifetime Homes standards;
- fully accessible amenity facilities.

All these measures have been incorporated in the design of the proposal or will be required by condition.

- 8.15 **Planning Policy** – Support the proposal.
- 8.16 **Design and Conservation Officer** – have been involved in the proposal from the outset and support the design being proposed.
- 8.17 **Energy Officer** - The Energy Officer initially requested the following additional information:
- Further clarification regarding BREEAM water efficiency standards.
  - Further discussion of and potential improvements to energy efficiency parameters / specifications, and heat charging arrangements.
  - Heating and hot water supply to commercial unit;
  - Additional details of solar PV system and consideration of increased output;
  - Submission of a Draft GPP.

A revised Energy / Sustainability Statement with appended feasibility studies has been submitted. The revised strategy deals with the issues previously raised and conditions are recommended to secure these changes (*conditions 8 and 12*).

- 8.18 **Sustainability Officer** – raised no objections to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions on sustainability (*conditions 9-11*).
- 8.19 **Transport Planning Officer** – no issues were raised.
- 8.20 **Highways** – standard clauses and conditions apply. All highways works to be carried out by the highways team. Demarcations of what is housing and highways land is needed, as well a draft of the Construction Management Plan.
- 8.21 **Parks and Open Spaces** – the overhang needs to be addressed. This is discussed in more detail within the report and officers consider that this has been resolved
- 8.22 **Tree Preservation / Landscape Officer** – no objections were raised subject to appropriate conditions on landscaping and tree protection (*conditions 13-15*).
- 8.23 **Biodiversity and Nature Conservation** – no objections subject to bird boxes being installed and landscaping to maximise biodiversity (*condition 21*).
- 8.24 **Refuse and Recycling** – no objections or issues raised subject to adherence to Islington guidance.

**Public Protection** – No objections raised subject to conditions on air pollution, sound insulation, air quality and construction management (*conditions 16, 17, 19 and 20*).

#### **Other Consultees**

- 8.25 **The 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society** – Support the design of the proposal
- 8.26 **Emily Thornberry MP for Islington and South Finsbury** – raised no objection to the proposal.
- 8.27 **Members' Pre-application Forum** – the proposal was presented and discussed at Members' Forum on the 21<sup>st</sup> July 2015.
- 8.28 **Design Review Panel** – At pre-application stage the proposal was considered by the Design Review Panel on the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The Design Review Panel provides expert impartial design advice following the 10 key principles of design review established by the Design Council/CABE. The panel's observations are attached at Appendix 3 but the main points raised in the most recent review are summarised below:
- The Panel was presented with two options, one involving a roof-top addition alongside the infill extensions and the other involving additional 5-storey corner additions instead of the roof-top additions. The panel felt that all elements of both options had merit and that both options could be pursued simultaneously.
  - The removal of the podium deck was supported, as was the creation of ground floor gardens and the rationalisation of access into the estate.
  - The panel felt that a balance needed to be struck between the expressed wishes of certain residents and the overarching objective to make long-term improvements to the estate. This would require strong client leadership and decision-making.

- Panel members were unconvinced by the design of the proposed northern block which seemed to be unnecessarily at odds with the character of the existing architecture.
- It was felt that the quality of the overall scheme will be very dependent on the quality of the landscaping scheme.
- Any development on the scale envisaged will cause significant disruption and this must be spelt out clearly alongside the mitigation measures that would be taken and the longer term benefits that would be achieved.
- The panel felt that improvements to the dwellings of existing residents should be explored.

8.29 The proposal was significantly altered and amended following the Design Review Panel in response to the panel's suggestions. The points raised have been addressed as follows:

- The application incorporates both roof additions as well as infill housing as suggested by the Design Review Panel;
- The design team have pursued the approach involving the removal of the podium, the creation of ground floor gardens and the rationalisation of access into the estate and have kept residents informed of progress made;
- The design of the corner building has evolved, is significantly improved from earlier iterations and now picks up on the architectural language of the adjacent Davina House on the opposite corner of Goswell Road.
- The landscaping scheme has now been developed and provides a successful solution for the site including an enhanced courtyard space, community growing garden, visual link with Compton Park and an enhanced public realm.
- The proposal now successfully achieves a balance between the potential impacts of increasing the number of residents on the estate and the benefits of having an enhanced communal garden area and improved access and security.

## 9 RELEVANT POLICIES

Details of all relevant policies and guidance notes are attached in Appendix 2. This report considers the proposal against the following development plan documents.

### National Guidance

- 9.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals. Since March 2014 planning practice guidance for England has been published online.
- 9.2 Under the Ministerial Statement of 18 December 2014, the government seeks to increase the weight given to SuDS being delivered in favour of traditional drainage solutions. Further guidance from the DCLG has confirmed that LPA's will be required (as a statutory requirement) to consult the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) on applicable planning applications (major schemes).
- 9.3 On 1 October 2015 a new National Standard for Housing Design was introduced, as an enhancement of Part M of the Building Regulations, which will be enforced by Building Control or an Approved Inspector. This was brought in via:

- Written Ministerial Statement issued 25th March 2015
- Deregulation Bill (amendments to Building Act 1984) – to enable ‘optional requirements’
- Deregulation Bill received Royal Assent 26th March 2015 cohesion

### **Development Plan**

- 9.4 The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2016, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013. The policies of the Development Plan that are considered relevant to this application are listed at Appendix 2 to this report.

### **Designations**

- 9.5 The site has the following designations under the London Plan 2016, Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Development Management Policies 2013.
- Bunhill & Clerkenwell Key Area
  - Central Activities Zone
  - Major Cycle Routes
  - Adjacent to the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area
  - Within 50m of a Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) – King Square Gardens
  - Mayor’s Protected Vista – Alexandra Palace

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)**

- 9.6 The SPGs and/or SPDs which are considered relevant are listed in Appendix 2.

## **10 ASSESSMENT**

- 10.1 The main issues arising from this proposal relate to:

- Land use
- Affordable housing (and financial viability)
- Design and Appearance
- Density
- Accessibility
- Open Space and Landscaping
- Neighbouring amenity
- Quality of residential accommodation
- Dwelling mix
- Energy conservation and sustainability
- Highways and transportation
- Planning obligations/mitigations

### **Land Use**

- 10.2 The Triangle Estate is located within the Bunhill & Clerkenwell Key Area and within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ). Given its location, the following planning policies



are of particular importance in assessing the planning application: London Plan Policy 2.12 (Central Activities Zone – Predominantly Local Activities) and Policy 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply); Islington Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Bunhill and Clerkenwell) and Policy CS12 (Meeting the housing challenge); and Finsbury Local Plan (FLP) policy BC4 (Northampton Square, Goswell Road and Spencer Street).

#### London Plan

- 10.3 London Policy 2.12 requires for Council's to identify, protect and enhance predominantly residential neighbourhoods within the CAZ. Policy 3.3 states that boroughs should seek to achieve and exceed the relevant minimum borough annual average housing target and to identify and seek to enable development capacity to be brought forward to meet these targets having regard to the other policies of the London Plan and in particular the potential to realise brownfield housing capacity through sensitive renewal of existing residential areas.

#### Islington Core Strategy (ICS)

- 10.4 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy seeks to meet the housing challenge by identifying sites which can significantly increase the supply of good quality residential accommodation across the borough. Policy CS7 seeks to secure housing growth across the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Key Area to provide a wide range of dwelling types, affordable tenures and family-sized homes to meet the needs of the current population and to cater for increased demand. Improvements will be sought to three housing estates (Triangle, St Luke's high rise and Redbrick), with the aim of providing good quality housing in an improved local environment.

#### Finsbury Local Plan

- 10.5 Policy BC4 'Northampton Square, Goswell Road and Spencer Street' expects new developments to enhance the legibility and character of this area, strengthening the identity of its streets and spaces, and building on its diverse mix of uses, including through the delivery of new affordable homes.
- 10.6 Furthermore, the policy encourages an improved public realm, including tree planting and highways improvements along Spencer Street and Goswell Road. The retention and enhancement of active ground floor uses fronting Goswell Road is also supported. A range of housing types and sizes, provided in appropriate locations and on currently under-used sites and which exhibit a high standard of amenity is expected.
- 10.7 For the Triangle Estate in particular, Policy BC4 supports proposals that improve the quality of the living environment, and would result in better quality ground floor frontage, improved safety, enhanced definition between public and private space, improved accessibility and appropriate permeability. The expansion of, and connection, to the existing Decentralised Energy networks is encouraged and developments should maximise the use of green roofs or walls as well as other natural features within and between new buildings.

#### Proposed Development

- 10.8 The development proposes a mix of high quality residential accommodation, including family-sized homes, in the form of infill housing and development on underused spaces and garage conversions in accordance with the aims and objectives of London Plan and Islington Core Strategy Policies. Whilst 6 two-bed units would be demolished, 54 new units are proposed resulting in an uplift of 48 units. The development delivers a significant increase in affordable homes in accordance

with Finsbury Local Plan policies which seek to ensure that existing residents are provided for.

- 10.9 The application also proposes significant improvements to the landscaping, security, safety and accessibility to the estate in accordance with the aims of the Finsbury Local Plan. The proposal includes improvements to ground floor frontages and an enhanced definition between public and private space as well as improved accessibility and appropriate permeability. Moreover, the application proposes connection to the DHN. It is considered that the aims of Policy BC4 have been successfully met. Further details are outlined in the subsequent sections of this report.
- 10.10 Finally, the proposal replaces an existing retail shop with new A1 retail floorspace in accordance with Development Management Policies DM4.1 and DM4.7. In land use terms, the proposal is considered to meet the objectives of adopted planning policy.

### **Affordable Housing and Financial Viability**

- 10.11 The London Plan, under policy 3.11 identifies that boroughs within their LDF preparation should set an overall target for the amount of affordable housing provision needed over the plan period in their area with separate targets for social rented and intermediate housing that reflect the strategic priority afforded to the provision of affordable family housing. Point f) of this policy identifies that in setting affordable housing targets, the borough should take account of "*the viability of future development taking into account future resources as far as possible.*"
- 10.12 Policy CS12 of the Islington Core Strategy sets out the policy approach to affordable housing. Policy CS12G establishes that "*50% of additional housing to be built in the borough over the plan period should be affordable*" and that provision of affordable housing will be sought through *sources such as 100% affordable housing scheme by Registered Social Landlords and building affordable housing on Council own land.*" With an understanding of the financial matters that in part underpin development, the policy states that the Council will seek the "*maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, especially social rented housing, taking into account the overall borough wide strategic target. It is expected that many sites will deliver **at least** 50% of units as affordable subject to a financial viability assessment, the availability of public subsidy and individual circumstances on the site.*"
- 10.13 The Affordable Housing Offer The proposed development would provide a total of 54 residential units (both for private sale and affordable housing). Of the 54 units (148 habitable rooms, hr), 27 of these units (81 hr) would comprise affordable housing (social rent tenure). Affordable housing provision is typically calculated with reference to the number of habitable rooms provided and in this instance the scheme would provide 55% affordable housing.
- 10.14 Within the affordable housing provision there is a policy requirement for 70% of the provision to be social rent and 30% as intermediate/shared ownership. The proposal however does not include any shared ownership units as this form of housing is considered 'unaffordable' in this part of the borough given excessively high property values.
- 10.15 The proposal fails to provide the aspiration of 100% affordable housing as sought by policy CS12 for developments on Council's own land. In accordance with policy requirements, a financial assessment has been submitted with the application to justify the proportion of affordable housing offered. In order to properly and

thoroughly assess the financial viability assessment, the documents were passed to an independent assessor to scrutinise and review.

- 10.16 The applicant's Viability Assessment identified that the development as proposed is unviable in a purely commercial sense as it still requires an amount of public subsidy to address the shortfall between the revenues generated by the development and the costs of providing it. The independent assessor has considered the information submitted and has agreed that the scheme would be unviable without such a subsidy. This is attached as a redacted version of the Council's independent advisor's report at Appendix 4.
- 10.17 It is apparent that in a typical commercial sense, the proposed scheme and level of affordable housing is unviable. However the applicant LBI Housing is not a commercial developer and in line with Council corporate objectives, is primarily seeking to deliver housing and public realm improvements to meet identified needs. The affordable housing offer on this site in terms of the quantity, quality and mix is considered to make a positive contribution to the housing needs of the borough.
- 10.18 Although Core Strategy Policy CS12 seeks 100% affordable housing schemes from development on Council land, it is not considered that a failure to provide 100% affordable housing on Council owned land is contrary to that policy where it is shown that public subsidy is required to support the lower provision as detailed above. It should be noted that in a standard commercial viability appraisal an existing use value of the site and its buildings is included to calculate a scheme's viability. In this instance, no existing use value has been factored in.
- 10.19 The proposal forms part of a wider Islington Housing New Build programme to provide affordable housing to meet identified needs within the borough. The current programme includes 33 schemes across the borough at various stages of progress with the aim of delivering 500 new affordable social rented units within the borough by 2019. The programme factors in Right-to-Buy receipts, s106 contributions, some GLA grant and receipts from the sale of private build units. The level of these resources informs the amount of HRA (Housing & Revenue Account) subsidy required to balance the financing of the programme.
- 10.20 One of the key drivers in terms of determining the level of resources generated and hence the level of HRA subsidy required to balance the programme is the ratio of private sale to affordable units. In addition, schemes of less than 10 units do not contribute any private sale receipts as they are built as 100% social rented and as such need to be subsidised wholly by the HRA and excess private sale receipt of larger schemes.
- 10.21 The introduction (as part of the Welfare Reform & Work Bill) of the 1% rent reduction over the next 4 years has severely restricted the capacity within the HRA to subsidise the new-build programme. The overriding strategy is to maximise the number of social rented properties delivered as part of each scheme whilst at the same time ensuring that the subsidy called upon from the HRA to balance the funding of the overall new build programme remains affordable in the context of the financial viability of the wider HRA, i.e. does not jeopardise their ability to continue to provide & resource the functions relating to our existing stock; housing management, repairs and the long-term investment.
- 10.22 The proposal provides good quality affordable housing, estate-wide improvement and a new retail unit and is considered to contribute towards delivering mixed and balanced communities. In this context, the offer of 55% affordable housing is considered to deliver a good mix of tenures and is considered to be acceptable and

in accordance with policy. This provision is secured with a Directors Level Agreement.

### **Design & Appearance**

- 10.23 The National Planning Policy Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. All proposals for development in Islington are expected to be of good quality design, respecting their urban context in accordance with planning policy and guidelines.
- 10.24 The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6 expects architecture to make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityspace. It should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context. Moreover, buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality, be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm and comprise details and materials that complement, not necessarily replicate, the local architecture.
- 10.25 Islington's Core Strategy Policy CS7 identifies the Bunhill and Clerkenwell area as having a rich character and significant historic value. The policy confirms that "throughout Bunhill and Clerkenwell, a number of buildings, monuments, spaces and townscape attributes contribute positively to its character. This includes some locally important street level views to St Paul's Cathedral and other local landmarks. Policy CS9 states that high quality architecture and urban design are key to enhancing and protecting Islington's built environment, making it safer and more inclusive. The borough's unique character will be protected by preserving the historic urban fabric and by promoting traditional street patterns in new developments. The aim is for new buildings to be sympathetic in scale and appearance and to be complementary to the local identity.
- 10.26 Finsbury Local Policy BC9 expects proposals to reflect predominant building heights and respond positively to the existing townscape context. Moreover, it is expected that new buildings are of high architectural quality and local distinctiveness, of a height, scale and massing that respects and enhances the immediate and wider context, consistent with the predominant building heights. Policy BC7 of the Finsbury Local Plan states that roof extensions, plant rooms and lift overruns should conform to prevailing building heights and should not harm the character and appearance of the existing building as seen from streets and public open spaces.
- 10.27 Finally, Islington's Development Management Policy DM2.1 requires all forms of development to be of a high quality, incorporating inclusive design principles while making positive contributions to the local character and distinctiveness of an area, based upon an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. All new developments are required to improve the quality, clarity and sense of space around or between buildings, reinforce and complement local distinctiveness and create a positive sense of place.

### **The Application Site**

- 10.28 The Triangle Estate, built in 1973, is made of three six storey blocks of brick construction with large areas of fenestration. The three blocks address the three surrounding streets (Compton Street, Goswell Road and Cyrus Street) on one side and look onto a triangular shaped courtyard space occupied by a first floor podium, on the other side. In terms of the buildings' elevations, the somewhat complex sections, with their combination of vertical walk up stairwells and horizontal deck

access, are expressed on the elevations, producing modelled facades. Horizontal strip windows are punctuated by private balconies, contributing to a series of well-composed elevations. In summary, the Triangle Estate is composed of modest, but not unattractive, buildings.

10.29 However, despite its many strengths, the Triangle Estate also suffers from some obvious weaknesses. A total of 28 separate public entrances to the blocks make it very difficult to effectively manage and secure the estate, leaving the communal areas vulnerable to vandalism and anti-social behaviour. The three blocks are linked by unattractive high level corridors, allowing intruders access from one block to another. Moreover, internal corridors and storage areas as well as numerous blind corners and dark spaces in the garages beneath the podium, provide inviting undercover congregation spaces which are difficult to police. Finally, the concrete podium structure which serves as a communal garden does not provide residents with a good level of amenity. The podium is in poor structural condition, is predominantly paved creating a sterile environment and has in the past served as a gathering point for gangs.

10.30 Any application for development at this location should look to address the weaknesses on the estate and to build on the strengths. Proposals should, where feasible, secure improvements to the overall urban design of the estate while at the same time improving the landscaping, access and security on the estate. In order to achieve its aims and objectives, the proposal should also ensure the integration of all new built form into the existing character and townscape of the estate as well as its wider urban context.

#### Securing the perimeter



existing Cyrus Street garage entrance



proposed Cyrus street secure entrance and private gardens

#### **Existing and Proposed arrangement at Cyrus / Goswell Road**

10.31 The creation of a secure boundary to the estate through the demolition of the podium, garages and link bridges as well as construction of infill blocks and perimeter

walls is a key feature of the design strategy and would result in a tidier and more legible appearance. The improvements are particularly apparent on the junction of Cyrus Street and Goswell Road blocks. In its current form, the frontage to the street at this point is characterised by a confusing assortment of walkways, staircases, vehicular entrances, bin-stores and ramps that are neither attractive nor legible or coherent.

- 10.32 The proposal removes the vehicular access at this point and replaces it with a new single storey dwelling and two new entrances serving the Goswell Road and Cyrus Street block as well as the landscaped courtyard beyond. The infill building would be built in materials to match the existing estate and would provide two new clear entrances with a high quality finish as well as defensible space to the new residential unit. The boundary treatment of the garden to this dwelling follows the existing pattern of low walls and visually permeable railings that already exists on the estate. The details of this would be required by condition (*condition 3*).

#### Demolition of podium

- 10.33 The demolition of the podium is considered to be a benefit for existing and new residents and would result in the provision of an improved communal garden area. It also provides the opportunity of securing the perimeter in a clear and legible way as described above. The three blocks would have direct access to the space, with a new communal residents' entry off the remodelled Cyrus Street frontage. The removal of the podium deck allows for the creation of new ground floor elevations facing onto the courtyard serving the new residential units. The facades of these units have been designed to match the rhythm and architectural language of the existing estate.



***Proposed Landscape Courtyard***

- 10.34 The defining element of the semi-private communal garden is the circular lawn, surrounded by paving and planting which break down the strict linearity of the built form surrounding it. A section of the courtyard space would be dedicated as a communal growing space for residents, with raised beds, gated railings and a storage area. The adjoining boundary with Compton Park is visually permeable to allow shared views and more light into the space. Furthermore, raised beds around the perimeter of the courtyard would reinforce the private garden spaces, which are enclosed by visually permeable perimeter railings set on low walls.

- 10.35 Overall, the new landscaped courtyard provides a new green space which is lacking from the existing podium deck with the potential of providing greater amenity benefits, biodiversity value and sustainable urban drainage features. The details of the landscape strategy for the courtyard space will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent sections of the report.

#### Infill dwellings

- 10.36 The ground floor of the existing blocks is lined with garages facing towards the inner courtyard. With the demolition of the podium and the removal of parking from the site, the application proposes to replace the garages with new homes facing the courtyard. In a similar way, it is also proposed to replace redundant storage spaces and the link bridges at first floor level with new infill housing.
- 10.37 On the Cyrus Street elevation, the infill housing at first floor level involves two protruding overhangs over the existing entrance. Whilst this is a new and unfamiliar feature to the estate, the overhangs would be designed using high quality triple glazed schuco windows, which are considered appropriate subject to further details being provided at conditions stage. It is proposed for the rest of the infill housing to be designed in a sympathetic way with materials to match the existing estate.

#### Extending the Blocks



***Compton Street Block overlooking Compton Park***

- 10.38 In accordance with the aims of securing the perimeter, the blocks would be extended into the existing gaps to provide new housing. The three extensions would all be built using materials and an architectural language that is sympathetic to the existing estate. However, all three sites would also respond to their specific context which naturally varies from one to the other.
- 10.39 The gap on the western end of the Compton Street Block is a narrow space which adjoins Compton Park. The extension is consequently a relatively narrow addition which delivers one duplex and one triplex apartment. The brickwork and fenestration onto Compton Street would match the existing estate and the white horizontal bands which are a feature of the estate's elevations would be carried through onto the

extension. The elevation onto Compton Park includes a protruding window bay over five floors framed in powder coated aluminium and a green wall, details of which would be required by condition (*condition 3*). The extension would be six storeys in height to match the existing estate. Objections to this element have been raised by Greenspace on the basis that the extensions would overhang public open space and access to the park would be needed for construction purposes. This is dealt with further in the landscape section.

- 10.40 On the eastern end of the Compton Street block, adjacent to the Goswell Road block, a further six storey extension is proposed. Again, the brickwork and fenestration onto Compton Street would match the existing estate with the white horizontal bands carried through. On the Goswell Road elevation, a large expanse of fenestration is proposed which would be framed in GRC (glass-reinforced concrete). The design of the framed windows allows for small balcony space behind a steel railing. The design of this addition is considered to be a modest yet elegant architectural approach.



**Compton Street / Goswell Road extension**

- 10.41 Finally, the gap between the freestanding lift tower and the Cyrus Street block would be infilled by a six storey extension so that the tower essentially becomes part of the block. The brickwork and fenestration would match the existing estate and inset balconies would provide a modest amount of amenity space for future residents. Overall, the design of the three 6-storey extensions is considered to enliven the elevations and help secure the corners.

#### Roof-top extension

- 10.42 The roof extension has undergone extensive consideration involving the Design Review Panel, planners, design officers as well as residents. While some residents have previously objected to the proposal, any concerns around privacy have been addressed through additional screening and planters, the details of which would be required by condition (*condition 3*).
- 10.43 The extension would be significantly set back from the elevations in order to lessen its impact (by 2.20 metres on one side and 5.60 metres on the other). The height of



the proposed roof extension is 40.97 metres AOD, which is an increase of 3.35 metres over the current height of 37.62 metres AOD of the existing parapet. The roof addition would be clad in a recycled glass resin which is considered a high quality design solution that would further lessen the impact of the extension.

### New Corner Building

- 10.41 The corner building involves a new 8-storey corner block which would replace the existing two-storey retail unit. The new building would comprise of a retail unit on the ground and first floors with six storeys of residential accommodation above. The design of the corner is quite distinct from the existing estate and provides a contemporary addition to the estate with a subtle nod to the rhythm and architectural features of the period building on the opposite corner, known as Davina House.



***New corner building***

- 10.42 The terracotta cladding proposed on this building picks up on the colour of the brickwork of Davina House and the white horizontal bands reflects the horizontal emphasis of this adjacent building which is also expressed through white horizontal bands. Portland stone cladding is used to separate the existing estate from the new corner building, while a recessed roof addition framed in similar stone cladding finishes off the building at roof level. The double height retail unit at ground/first floor level is considered appropriate given its prominent location on a relatively busy and wide junction.

### Overall Development

- 10.43 Overall, the proposal is considered to deliver an appropriate balance between respecting the integrity of the estate on the one hand and providing high quality contemporary design on the other. The same architectural language has been adopted where suitable and matching materials in the form of brickwork and fenestration has been proposed where this is considered appropriate in order to protect the integrity of the existing buildings. The proposal is not considered to have a negative impact on the adjacent Hat and Feathers Conservation Area.
- 10.44 The new corner building delivers a high quality contemporary addition to the estate, while the set-back roof extensions are a well-considered and subtle addition.

Samples of materials would be required by condition (3) in order to ensure that the development is built out to the highest quality. The proposal is considered to be well-designed and in accordance with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy CS7 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, Finsbury Plan Policies BC7 and BC9 and the aims and objectives of Development Management Policy DM2.1 and DM2.3.

### **Density**

- 10.45 The London Plan encourages developments to achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with the local context. The existing Triangle Estate comprises a total of 130 residential units across a site of 0.64 hectares. The development scheme proposes a total of 54 new residential dwellings, while 6 dwellings would be lost, leaving a total of 178 dwellings on the estate. This equates to 485 habitable rooms on the estate.
- 10.46 In assessing the appropriate housing density for the application site and the wider estate it is necessary to consider the London Plan which notes that it would not be appropriate to apply these limits mechanistically. In particular, the local context as well as design considerations should be taken into account when considering the acceptability of a specific proposal.
- 10.47 The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a (Excellent). For central areas with such a high PTAL, the London Plan Policy 3.4 (Table 3.2) suggests that a density level of between 650 and 1100 habitable rooms per hectare would be most appropriate.
- 10.48 The proposed development would result in a residential density of some 755 habitable rooms per hectare across this part of the estate. This level of housing density is considered to be well within the suggested range and is considered to be appropriate in this urban context.

### **Accessibility**

- 10.49 As a result of the changes introduced in the Deregulation Bill (Royal Assent 26th March 2015), Islington is no longer able to insist that developers meet its own SPD standards for accessible housing, therefore the Council can no longer apply its flexible housing standards nor local wheelchair housing standards.
- 10.50 The new National Standard is broken down into 3 categories; Category 2 is similar but not the same as the Lifetime Homes standard and Category 3 is similar to our present wheelchair accessible housing standard. Planning is required to check compliance with these standards and condition the requirements. If they are not conditioned, Building Control will only enforce Category 1 standards which are far inferior to anything applied in Islington for 25 years.
- 10.51 Planners are only permitted to require (by Condition) that housing be built to Category 2 and or 3 if they can evidence a local need for such housing i.e. housing that is accessible and adaptable. The GLA by way of Minor Alterations to the London Plan 2015, has reframed LPP 3.8 Housing Choice to require that 90% of new housing be built to Category 2 and 10% to Category 3 and has produced evidence of that need across London. In this regard, as part of this assessment, the London Plan policy is given weight and informs the approach below. Moreover, all residential developments are required to achieve the standards of the Islington Inclusive Design SPD and provide 10% (by habitable room) of residential units as wheelchair

accessible units, in accordance with Islington's Development Management Policy DM2.1 and DM2.2.

- 10.52 Development Management Policy DM3.4 'Housing Standards' provides various standards in housing including for accessibility and inclusive design. The policy states that the overall approach to all entrances should be logical, legible and level or gently sloping; and common entrances should be visible from the public realm, clearly identified and illuminated and have level access over the threshold. Moreover, the number of dwellings accessed from a single core must not be more than eight and communal circulation corridors should be a minimum of 1200mm wide. Finally, in terms of circulation within new homes, space for turning a wheelchair should be provided in living rooms, dining rooms and in at least one bedroom and dwellings over more than one floor are required to provide space for a stair lift.
- 10.53 It should be noted at this point that the existing estate suffers from poor accessibility in that floors 2, 3 and 5 do not have lift or step-free access and are only accessible via a narrow staircase. The demolition of the podium would also result in a loss of step-free access to the existing 1<sup>st</sup> floor flats which are currently accessed via the ramp and podium. In response to this, the applicant has proposed a number of platform lifts in all three blocks to maintain level access to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.
- 10.54 Additional lift access will be provided to 4<sup>th</sup> floor level so that two lifts are provided for each block. It is however not proposed to provide additional lift access to the existing flats on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floor levels as this would necessitate comprehensive remodelling of the buildings. Existing flats on 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floor level do not have deck access and are not accessed via a corridor. Instead they are accessed directly from narrow staircases and landings that do not provide space for additional lift provision.
- 10.55 The application provides 4 new wheelchair accessible units across the estate (2 x 3 bed units, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 1 bed) amounting to 9.8% as measured by habitable rooms. Permission would be subject to conditions requiring that these units comply with the standards of Category 3 housing, while the remaining new dwellings would need to meet Category 2 Housing standards. This is secured through condition (7).
- 10.56 The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement and has outlined how inclusive design principles have been considered and addressed. The number of entrances on the estate would be reduced from some 28 uncontrolled access points to 12 controlled entrances. While many of the existing entrances are neither visible from the public, nor particularly legible or clearly identifiable, all entrances provided in the proposed development would be clear and legible and would deliver level access from the public realm.
- 10.57 Despite the obvious constraints in working within the envelope of the existing building, all common entrances and shared circulation space provide sufficient space for residents to manoeuvre with ease. Moreover, all access cores would provide an access control system, with entry phones in all dwellings linked to a main front door. With regard to external space, the open space and landscaping, including surfaces and seating, would comply with the principles of inclusive design. The inclusive design measures within the landscaped courtyard would be secured through the landscape condition (13).
- 10.58 All areas would have step-free access and access to amenity facilities such as the bin store would also be fully accessible. In the event of planning permission being granted, the above measures would be secured by planning condition to ensure that the proposed development is genuinely accessible and inclusive.

## **Open Space and Landscaping**

- 10.59 Islington's Core Strategy Policy CS15 on open space and green infrastructure states that the council will provide inclusive spaces for residents and visitors and create a greener borough by protecting all existing local spaces, including open spaces of heritage value, as well as incidental green space, trees and private gardens. Policy DM6.5 states that development should protect, contribute to and enhance the landscape, biodiversity and growing conditions of the development site and surrounding areas. Developments are required to maximise provision of soft landscaping, including trees, shrubs and other vegetation. Furthermore, developments are required to minimise any impacts on trees, shrubs and other significant vegetation. At the same time any loss of or damage to trees, or adverse effects on their growing conditions, will only be permitted where there are over-riding planning benefits.
- 10.60 Regarding open space, Development Management Policy DM6.3 states that development is not permitted on semi-private amenity spaces, including open space within housing estates and other similar spaces in the borough not designated as public open space within this document, unless the loss of amenity space is compensated and the development has over-riding planning benefits. Moreover, both Development Management Policies DM2.1 and DM8.4 encourage greater permeability by improving movement through areas and seeking an improved pedestrian environment following Islington's 'Streetbook' SPD.
- 10.61 The removal of the podium, the securing of the perimeter with controlled access and the creation of a landscaped courtyard for residents of the estate ultimately removes public access from the space between the three housing blocks. Though on the face of it this approach goes against the aims of the policies which seek to promote greater permeability, the particular circumstances of the Triangle Estate need to be fully understood when considering the impacts of the proposal. It should be stressed at this point that a desire to address the crime and anti-social behaviour issues that had blighted the estate was, from the outset, the key driver behind the proposal.
- 10.62 The residents expressed the aspiration to deal with the considerable issues they were having on the estate by securing the perimeter. When the proposal was first developed, it was on the understanding that there would not be public access to the landscaped courtyard. Whilst this goes against the principles of the Streetbook SPD which seeks to create better routes through places and improve permeability, it should be stressed that the existing podium deck to be demolished does not function as a public space as such. There are no desire lines through the estate and access to it by the general public serves no real wider purpose.
- 10.63 Unlike estate developments at Dover Court, King Square or Redbrick Estate where public routes through make sense as they are large estates which occupy a significant amount of urban space, the Triangle Estate lends itself far more readily to a courtyard development with perimeter blocks and a communal garden for estate residents.
- 10.64 What has been developed by the applicants involves building in the gaps with new housing. As a result, the proposal delivers a significant increase in social housing while at the same time securing the perimeter. So instead of erecting gates around the outside of the estate, the new infill buildings have been designed to create a perimeter with a courtyard for residents. The spaces that have been built on to create the perimeter are largely small areas of hardstanding which have served as access points to the courtyard and are not considered to constitute open space as such.

- 10.65 On the western end of the Compton Street block the proposed building overhangs the adjacent Compton Park. The park is designated open space and thus its impact needs to be considered. The new building would oversail the park by some 1.5 metres from 1<sup>st</sup> floor up to 5<sup>th</sup> floor and so the overhang is not insignificant. That being said, the building would overhang an area that is currently occupied by gravel and low-level planting adjacent to the entrance from Compton Street in the corner of the park. The overhang would provide a comfortable head height of approximately 2.5 metres for anyone wishing to pass underneath it.
- 10.66 The elevation of the building facing onto the park would be covered in a green wall, details of which would need to be considered and agreed by condition (13). Moreover, the removal of the podium and the provision of landscaping at ground floor level of the Triangle Estate would provide a more open aspect to the park. Finally, it is considered that the introduction of overlooking and passive surveillance would be a benefit to the park. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extension to the Compton Street block and its associated overhang would negatively impact the amenities provided by the park.

#### Landscaping

- 10.67 Given the site and policy context referred to above, the quality of the landscaping on the Triangle Estate is of fundamental importance to this planning application. Though the existing podium does include a small fenced off area with a number of trees in it, the space is generally quite sterile with mainly hardstanding. Its demolition provides the opportunity to deliver a greener more useable space with better amenities for residents and improvements to the estate's biodiversity and sustainable urban drainage features (SUDS).
- 10.68 The proposed landscape design intends to create a clear hierarchy of well-defined spaces for the residents of the estate. A new standalone entrance from Cyrus Street to the courtyard is accessible to all residents and the separate access points for each block give a better sense of ownership to the common parts, in particular the communal courtyard space in the centre of the estate. The defining element of the semi-private communal courtyard is the circular lawn surrounded by bands of circular paving and planting which help to break down the strict linear form of the surrounding buildings. A community growing area with raised beds would also be provided in the western end of the courtyard, adjacent to Compton Park.
- 10.69 To enable the new ground floor dwellings to embed into the existing estate, layouts for private ground floor gardens follow the existing precedent of low perimeter walls topped with railings and backed by planting to provide a green buffer. A simple palette of high quality materials is proposed for all paved areas to reinforce the transition from public to private spaces. This approach is supported in principle subject to further details being required by condition (13).

#### Trees:

- 10.70 As discussed, the trees on the podium would be lost as a result of the development as it is proposed to demolish the podium. The trees to be lost include 3 Cherry trees, 2 Bay Laurels and a Lawson Cypress. Whilst a number of these trees are healthy and provide amenity benefits to residents, they have a limited lifespan due to their position on an elevated concrete podium. The new landscaped courtyard would deliver ten new trees including Field Maples, Mountain Ash and Tibetan Cherry trees. In the context of the removal of the podium and the tree planting strategy, the loss of the existing trees within the courtyard is considered acceptable, particularly given the variety of species proposed which would guarantee leaf coverage throughout the year.

- 10.71 A number of trees within private gardens on the estate would also be lost as a result of the development. A Cherry Laurel, a Bay Laurel and two Lawson Cypress which are within gardens facing Compton Street, as well as a Leyland cypress in a garden facing onto Goswell Road are proposed to be removed. In the case of the trees on Compton Street, their removal is required to enable development to take place. Four new trees are proposed along Goswell Road and Compton Street in order to mitigate the loss of these trees.
- 10.72 A further tree is proposed to be removed on the junction of Percival Street and Cyrus Street in order to make way for the new corner building. This tree removal would be mitigated by additional tree planting along Cyrus Street. A plan has been submitted, which shows the potential for 5 new trees to be planted along this street. The planting of these trees would be required through the section 106 agreement (Director's Letter).
- 10.73 The proposal includes an overall increase in green space with a greater variety of plant and tree species which would enhance the overall ecological value of the site. The application also includes a significant improvement to private, semi-private open space and communal garden space which would provide an enhancement to the amenity of local residents. The proposal is thus considered to be in accordance with the Core Strategy Policy CS15 and Development Management Policy DM6.5 as well as the aims and objectives of Finsbury Local Plan BC4.
- 10.74 To ensure the protection of the trees to be retained at the site and secure a high quality landscape scheme conditions are recommended which require the submission of and compliance with an agreed Landscape Management Plan (13), an Arboricultural Method Statement (14) and a Scheme of Site Supervision (15).

### **Neighbouring Amenity**

- 10.75 All new developments are subject to an assessment of their impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy and an increased sense of enclosure. A development's likely impact in terms of air quality, dust, safety, security, noise and disturbance is also assessed. In this regard, the proposal is subject to London Plan Policy 7.14 and 7.15 as well as Development Management Policies DM2.1 and DM6.1 which requires for all developments to be safe and inclusive and to maintain a good level of amenity, mitigating impacts such as noise and air quality.
- 10.76 Moreover, London Plan Policy 7.6 requires for buildings in residential environments to pay particular attention to privacy, amenity and overshadowing. In general, for assessing the sunlight and daylight impact of new development on existing buildings, Building Research Establishment (BRE) criteria is adopted. In accordance with both local and national policies, consideration has to be given to the context of the site, the more efficient and effective use of valuable urban land and the degree of material impact on neighbours.
- 10.77 Daylight / Sunlight The loss of daylight can be assessed by calculating the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) which measures the daylight at the external face of the building. Access to daylight is considered to be acceptable when windows receive at least 27% of their VSC value or retain at least 80% of their former value following the implementation of a development. Daylight is also measured by the no sky-line or daylight distribution contour which shows the extent of light penetration into a room at working plane level, 850mm above floor level. If a substantial part of the room falls behind the no sky-line contour, the distribution of light within the room may be considered to be poor.

- 10.78 In terms of sunlight, a window may be adversely affected by a new development if a point at the centre of the window receives in the year less than 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours including at least 5% of annual probable sunlight hours during the winter months and less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period. It should be noted that BRE guidance advises that sunlight to a neighbouring property is only considered where the new development is located within 90 degrees of due south.
- 10.79 The VSC has been assessed for all existing surrounding residential properties. The vast majority of windows serving existing properties retain good levels of daylight following the development and would not lose more than 20% of their former value. For example, windows within Tompion House, Harold Lasui House, Cyrus House, 101 Goswell Road as well as 142-186 Goswell Road would all retain 80% of their former VSC value. As such, loss of daylight to these properties would not be noticeable. This is unsurprising given that development proposes a modest increase in height and the substantial number of new dwellings is proposed in infill developments that would not affect daylight.
- 10.80 Some windows located in closer proximity to the proposed corner building on the junction of Goswell Road, Percival and Cyrus Streets however suffer losses that are slightly higher than 20%. For example, at 1-5 Cyrus Street, four of the existing windows on the corner of this building would lose between 22% and 32% of their existing daylight. It should be noted that these windows are disadvantaged by the building's own design as the windows are set back behind a balcony and have reduced daylight because of an existing overhang. Some of the windows within 188-192 Goswell Road also suffer losses slightly above the 20% mark. But these losses vary between 20-23% and most of the windows retain the 27% threshold which indicates that they will continue to enjoy good levels of daylighting.
- 10.81 In terms of the daylight distribution, these tests have also been carried out to ascertain how much of the affected rooms would be beyond the sky-line contour, i.e. would no longer be able to see the sky. In particular, the rooms serving the windows with the biggest loss of VSC in 1-5 Cyrus Street have been tested. It can be confirmed that the effect on the daylight distribution would be negligible as the rooms are served by a number of windows on three sides and thus only some of the windows would suffer a loss of daylight. The daylight distribution test has also been carried out for the most affected windows on the lower levels of the Triangle Estate. None of the rooms would suffer a loss of daylight distribution of greater than 20% and all would achieve good levels of daylighting.
- 10.82 Overall, of the 306 windows tested, 289 (94%) will continue to meet the target values for daylight as set out in the BRE guidelines. In terms of sunlight, the 222 windows which face south onto any part of the proposed development have been tested. All of these windows would meet the target values for sunlight as defined by the BRE guidelines.
- 10.83 Overlooking / Privacy: Development Management Policy 2.1 identifies that 'to protect privacy for residential developments and existing residential properties, there should be a minimum distance of 18 metres between windows of habitable rooms. This does not apply across the public highway, overlooking across a public highway does not constitute an unacceptable loss of privacy'. In the application of this policy, consideration has to be given also to the nature of views between habitable rooms. For instance where the views between habitable rooms are oblique as a result of angles or height difference between windows, there may be no harm.
- 10.84 The new corner building does result in potential overlooking issues as it introduces window-to-window distances of below 18 metres. For example, the new corner

building on Goswell Road and Percival Street is 15.5 metres away from 1-5 Cyrus Street and 11 metres from Davina House. However, the relationship between these buildings is over a highway and so overlooking is not considered to constitute an unacceptable loss of privacy. Moreover, Davina House is mainly in office use and no residents' privacy in that building would be affected by this development.

- 10.85 There are also the overlooking distances within the estate itself to be considered. At roof level, new balconies potentially overlook existing balconies on the floor below. However, a green planter/buffer has been provided to prevent overlooking and maintain privacy. Details for this feature would be required by condition, which would also require these features to be maintained as such thereafter. The new infill building between Cyrus Street and the lift / stair core includes new windows facing the internal courtyard. The new windows would be some 15 metres away from existing windows on the Goswell Road block. Whilst the windows are positioned at an oblique angle to the windows most affected, it is considered prudent to require further details of screening to minimise overlooking and privacy impacts (*condition 5*).
- 10.86 Safety / Security: Development Management Policy DM2.1 requires for developments to be safe and inclusive, enhance legibility with a clear distinction between public and private space and to include safety in design, such as access, materials and site management strategies. One of the key objectives of this proposal is to create a safe and secure environment for residents of the estate.
- 10.87 The rationalisation of entrances onto the estate by significantly reducing their number is considered to contribute significantly towards creating a safer and more secure environment for residents on the estate. The securing of the perimeter and the removal of public access from the courtyard space further adds to the security of the estate. The proposal also results in a clearer distinction between private, semi-private and public space and provides clearer legibility around access.
- 10.88 Views / Outlook: Proposal for development are considered against their visual context, such as location and scale of landmarks, strategic and local and other site specific views, skylines and silhouettes. DM2.4 requires local and strategic views to be protected.
- 10.89 Residents of the estate have commented that the set-back roof addition would blight their view of St Paul's. This is not a planning matter and cannot be considered as part of this assessment. However, the site does intersect a strategic viewing corridor from Alexandra Palace to St Paul's Cathedral. The building heights have been assessed against the protected vista datum of the St Paul's viewing corridor and it can be confirmed that the proposal would not impinge on the view of St Paul's from Alexandra Palace.
- 10.90 Air Quality: Existing and future residents' exposure to air pollution from the Goswell Road needs to be considered as part of this application. In particular the two new blocks on the corner of Goswell Road and Compton Street on the one side and Percival Street on the other side would introduce new dwellings in close proximity to Goswell Road where levels of NO<sub>x</sub> are quite high. The air quality assessment submitted as part of the application provides a satisfactory scheme of mitigation with MVHR (mechanical ventilation heat recovery) fitted and air intakes on the cleaner courtyard side "wherever possible". The MVHR will be fitted with NO<sub>2</sub>/NO<sub>x</sub> filtration and a residents' manual supplied with advice on limiting exposure. Further details of this will be required by condition (*19*).
- 10.91 Exposure to air pollution, noise, vibration and other pollutants during the construction process will be managed and mitigated through a Construction Environment management Plan which will be required by condition (*4*).



- 10.92 Noise and Disturbance: adequate sound insulation would be provided to all new units to protect the amenities of existing residents (*condition 16*) and the opening hours of the new retail units would be controlled by condition (18) in order to protect the living environment of residents.
- 10.93 In summary, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, increased overlooking, loss of privacy, sense of enclosure and is considered to result in a marked improvement in terms of safety and security.

### **Quality of Resulting Residential Accommodation**

- 10.94 Islington Core Strategy policy CS12 identifies that to help achieve a good quality of life, residential space and design standards will be significantly increased and enhanced from their current levels. The Islington Development Management Policies DM3.4 sets out the detail of these housing standards. In accordance with this policy, all new housing is required to provide functional and useable spaces with good quality amenity space, sufficient space for storage and flexible internal living arrangements.
- 10.95 Unit Sizes: All of the proposed residential units comply with the minimum unit sizes as expressed within this policy. Two of the new dwellings at first floor of the Cyrus Street Block are single bedroom flats of 39sqm in size, which exceed the 39sqm minimum required by policy for single bedrooms and studios. The policy states that single bedroom flats will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, where a larger unit is not possible or this would result in better aspect.
- 10.96 The two flats in question would replace a currently disused and inaccessible storage area and include a modest overhang in order to increase the internal area and provide better outlook. The size of these units cannot be increased as this would either result in a greater overhang resulting in loss of light to existing residents or a reduction in an already constrained circulation core. On this basis, the single bed units are considered acceptable.
- 10.97 Aspect/Daylight Provision: Policy DM3.4 part D sets out that 'new residential units are required to provide dual aspect accommodation, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated'.
- 10.98 Six new units are proposed at ground floor level facing onto the courtyard space. The dwellings would occupy space that currently accommodates parking spaces. Although these units have been designed to maximise natural daylight, all six units are essentially single aspect. However, the design is quite substantially restricted by the constraints of the existing building. Creating dual aspect accommodation out of these dwellings would involve building over the courtyard space and this is not considered to be justified.
- 10.99 The average daylight factor (ADF) of these new dwellings has been calculated to ascertain whether they would be afforded sufficient natural daylight. The minimum levels of daylight as measured by ADF require 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms. It can be confirmed that all new habitable ground floor rooms would achieve the ADF targets. Given the site constraints involved here and the good levels of daylight achieved in the new ground floor units, the principle of single aspect accommodation is considered acceptable.
- 10.100 All other new dwellings proposed would achieve both dual aspect and good levels of natural daylight.

- 10.101 Amenity Space: Policy DM3.5 of the Development Management Policies Document 2013 within part A identifies that 'all new residential development will be required to provide good quality private outdoor space in the form of gardens, balconies, roof terraces and/or glazed ventilated winter gardens'. The policy in part C then goes on to state that the minimum requirement for private outdoor space is 5 square metres on upper floors and 15 square metres on ground floor for 1-2 person dwellings. For each additional occupant, an extra 1 square metre is required on upper floors and 5 square metres on ground floor level with a minimum of 30 square metres for family housing (defined as 3 bed units and above).
- 10.102 The private amenity space proposed for almost all of the proposed units would exceed minimum requirements. However, with the exception of the top floor dwelling, there is no private amenity space proposed for the units in the new building on the corner of Goswell Road and Percival / Cyrus Street. It is considered however that the building's design does not lend itself to balconies or roof terraces. Moreover, the two 1-bed single person units on Cyrus Street as well as a 2-bed and 4-bed unit on the Compton Street block would not have access to private amenity space.
- 10.103 The constraints of the site which have fixed the floorplates available to work with are considered to restrict the potential of providing private amenity space to all new dwellings. Moreover, the proposed improvements to the landscaped courtyard and shared spaces on the estate are considered to provide adequate alternative provision to private amenity space.
- 10.104 Air Quality: New dwellings on the corner of Compton Street and the corner of Percival / Cyrus Street face onto Goswell Road. The surrounding area records levels of NOx which would necessitate mitigation levels which will be appropriately conditioned (*condition 19*).
- 10.105 Noise: A condition (16) is recommended requiring all residential units to include sufficient sound insulation to meet British Standards. As such a scheme for sound insulation and noise control measures would be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site.
- 10.106 Refuse: Dedicated refuse and recycling facilities/chambers are provided for the residential uses. The location and capacity, and management of these facilities have been developed in consultation with the Council Street Environment Department and are acceptable (*condition 23*).
- 10.107 Playspace: The development includes sufficient space for informal play space within the landscaped courtyard. There is also a playground directly adjacent to the Triangle Estate within Compton Park. Details of any playspace provided within the landscaped courtyard would be required by condition (13).

### **Dwelling Mix**

- 10.108 Part E of policy CS12 of the Islington Core Strategy requires a range of unit sizes within each housing proposal to meet the needs in the borough, including maximising the proportion of family accommodation in both affordable and market housing. In the consideration of housing mix, regard has to be given to the constraints and locality of the site and the characteristics of the development as identified in policy DM3.1 of the Development Management Policies. The policy also requires for provision to be made for intermediate or shared ownership housing.
- 10.109 The scheme proposes a total of 54 residential units with an overall mix comprised of:

<b>Dwelling Type</b>	<b>Social Rent (Units / %)</b>	<b>Policy DM3.1 Target Mix</b>	<b>Private (Units / %)</b>	<b>Policy DM3.1 Target Mix</b>
1 Bed	9 / 33%	0%	17 / 62%	10%
2 Bed	9 / 33%	20%	8 / 30%	75%
3 Bed	9 / 33%	30%	1 / 4%	15%
4 bed +	0 / 0%	50%	1 / 4%	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

- 10.110 The dwelling mix proposed for the private and social rented units is not strictly speaking in accordance with dwelling mix required by policy. However, the social rented mix has been based on actual current demand rather than long-term Council aspirations and the application has been accompanied by information on housing waiting lists which shows that one-bed dwellings are a very sought-after housing type.
- 10.111 Moreover, infill developments, by virtue of their physical constraints cannot always achieve the preferred housing mix set out within the Development Management Policies. A number of infill dwellings lend themselves to smaller 1- and 2-bed units and cannot physically deliver larger family units. Where family units are possible though, they have been provided.
- 10.112 The supporting text of policy DM3.1 within Development Management Policies relates to this objective stating 'There may be proposals for affordable housing schemes that are being developed to address short term changes in need/demand as a result of specific interventions (for example, efforts to reduce under-occupation). In these situations deviation from the required policy housing size mix may be acceptable. In such cases registered providers will need to satisfy the council that the proposed housing size mix will address a specific affordable housing need/demand and result in an overall improvement in the utilisation of affordable housing units in Islington'.
- 10.113 Changes in housing legislation to address the under occupation of social housing have created a greater demand for smaller social housing units, as reflected by the high proportion of 1 bedroom units proposed. The applicant, LBI Housing proposes this dwelling mix to allow mobility within the social housing sector to accommodate these national changes to the welfare system. Furthermore, the provision of smaller units will allow for mobility within the estate which would address under occupation. Nomination rights will prioritise those transferring from within the estate. Given this, a deviation from the policy is considered reasonable and the housing mix can be accepted.

### **Sustainability, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy**

- 10.114 The London Plan (2016) Policy 5.1 stipulates a London-wide reduction of carbon emissions of 60 per cent by 2025. Policy 5.2 of the plan requires all development proposals to contribute towards climate change mitigation by minimising carbon

dioxide emissions through energy efficient design, the use of less energy and the incorporation of renewable energy. London Plan Policy 5.5 sets strategic targets for new developments to connect to localised and decentralised energy systems while Policy 5.6 requires developments to evaluate the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems.

- 10.115 All development is required to demonstrate that it has minimised onsite carbon dioxide emissions by maximising energy efficiency, supplying energy efficiently and using onsite renewable energy generation (CS10). Developments should achieve a total (regulated and unregulated) CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction of at least 27% relative to total emissions from a building which complies with Building Regulations 2013 (39% where connection to a Decentralised Heating Network is possible). Typically all remaining CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should be offset through a financial contribution towards measures which reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the existing building stock (CS10).
- 10.116 The Core Strategy also requires developments to address a number of other sustainability criteria such as climate change adaptation, sustainable transport, sustainable construction and the enhancement of biodiversity. Development Management Policy DM7.1 requires for development proposals to integrate best practice sustainable design standards and states that the council will support the development of renewable energy technologies, subject to meeting wider policy requirements. Details and specifics are provided within Islington's Environmental Design SPD, which is underpinned by the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction Statement SPG. Development Management Policy DM7.4 requires the achievement of BREEAM 'Excellent' on all non-residential major developments. Major developments are also required to comply with Islington's Code of Practice for Construction Sites and to achieve relevant water efficiency targets as set out in the BREEAM standards.

#### Carbon Emissions

- 10.117 The applicant proposes a reduction in overall emissions of 44.9%, compared to a 2013 Building Regulations baseline, secured by condition (12). This exceeds Islington's policy requirements for a building that is connecting to the Bunhill Energy Network. The development also exceeds the London policy requirement of 35% reduction on regulated emissions as the development is predicted to achieve a 53.6% reduction in regulated carbon emission. In order to mitigate against the remaining carbon emissions generated by the development a financial contribution of £64,292 will be sought by way of Director's Letter (pursuant to section 106).

#### Sustainable Design Standards

- 10.118 Council policy DM 7.4 A states "Major non-residential developments are required to achieve Excellent under the relevant BREEAM or equivalent scheme and make reasonable endeavours to achieve Outstanding". The council's Environmental Design Guide states "Schemes are required to demonstrate that they will achieve the required level of the CSH/BREEAM via a pre-assessment as part of any application and subsequently via certification.
- 10.119 The residential element of the development has been assessed against the Code for Sustainable Homes, although this has been withdrawn. A Code Pre-assessment has been provided, showing the development achieving a score of 69.6%, and therefore a rating of Level 4. This is in line with the Council's guidance and is therefore supported. All reasonable measures should be taken to ensure the development as built achieves this level. The commercial element has an area of <500m<sup>2</sup>, so a full BREEAM assessment is not required. The commercial element would be expected to achieve the relevant BREEAM water efficiency credits.

### Heating and CHP

- 10.120 London Plan Policy 5.6B states that Major development proposals should select energy systems in accordance with the following hierarchy:
1. Connection to existing heating or cooling networks;
  2. Site wide CHP network
  3. Communal heating and cooling
- 10.121 The applicant proposes that the development will connect to the Bunhill Energy Network. This is consistent with the London and Islington policy hierarchies, and a connection is strongly supported. Discussions between the Council's Housing Department, DE team and other relevant parties are ongoing and details will form part of the application's section 106 agreement (Director's Letter)
- 10.122 For the dwellings, it is proposed that heating and hot water will be provided via connection to the Bunhill energy network. It is thought that the development may be completed slightly before a connection is made. If so, all heat demand will be met via on-site back-up boilers until a connection is completed.
- 10.123 For the commercial unit, an air source heat pump is proposed, to provide both heating and cooling, while hot water will be provided via an electric point-of-use heater. This is based on the assumption that the final occupier (as yet unknown) will fit out the commercial unit.

### Renewables

- 10.124 The Mayor's SD&C SPD states that major developments should make a further reduction in their carbon dioxide emissions through the incorporation of renewable energy technologies to minimise overall carbon dioxide emissions, where feasible. The Council's Environmental Design SPD (page 12) states "use of renewable energy should be maximised to enable achievement of relevant CO<sub>2</sub> reduction targets."
- 10.125 The renewables analysis recommends solar PV as the most suitable technology for the development, and this is supported. The proposed PV array has an output of 47kWp, with an area of 329m<sup>2</sup> and anticipated annual savings of 18.55 tCO<sub>2</sub>. This would be secured by condition (8). The solar PVs will be optimally angled to maximise output.
- 10.126 As the development meets the carbon reduction requirement through the use of renewable energy, energy efficiency measures and clean energy, the proposal is considered acceptable.

### Sustainable Urban Drainage System

- 10.127 A drainage and SUDS strategy has been submitted with the application. The details indicate a 50% reduction in surface water run-off. Whilst this fails to achieve the greenfield water run-off rate suggested by policy, the nature of the development proposed, which essentially involves infill housing within an established housing estate, limits the potential of achieving more substantial water run-off rate reductions. The drainage and SUDS strategy will be secured by condition (11) and the responsibility of maintenance placed on the applicant, in this case Islington Housing.

### Green Performance Plan

- 10.128 A draft Green Performance Plan has now been submitted as an acceptable draft. A final version would be required through the Director's Letter (section 106).
- 10.129 The energy and sustainability measures proposed are in accordance with policy and would ensure a sustainable and green development that would minimise carbon emissions in the future.

### Highways and Transportation

- 10.130 The site is PTAL 6a (very high public transport accessibility) and has a major cycle route running alongside it. The site is within close proximity to several London Underground stations and there are a number of bus routes running adjacent to the estate.

### Pedestrian / Cycle Improvements

- 10.131 Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Sustainable design), Part H seeks to maximise opportunities for walking. Policy BC4 of the Finsbury Local Plan supports highway improvements around Goswell Road that promote pedestrian and cyclist movement and safety. Cycle parking requirements apply for any new residential/commercial units, and extensions of 100 square metres or more. Development Management Policy DM8.4 (Walking and cycling), Part D requires the provision of secure, sheltered, integrated, conveniently located, adequately lit, step-free and accessible cycle parking. For residential land use, Appendix 6 of the Development Management Policies requires cycle parking to be provided at a rate of 1 space per 1 bedroom.
- 10.132 The proposal provides an improved pedestrian environment by providing an enhanced definition between public and private space, by improving accessibility as well as safety and security. In terms of cycle parking, a total of 94 cycle spaces will be provided across all three blocks, which equates to one per bedroom (*condition 24*). Sufficient space has been provided outside the retail unit for additional cycle parking details of which would be required by condition (*18*).

### Servicing, deliveries and refuse collection

- 10.133 Refuse and recycling facilities would be provided for new residents within the boundaries of the site in line with Islington's refuse and recycling storage requirements. The refuse and recycling bins on the corner of Goswell Road and Compton Street would be integrated within the buildings of the estate and the capacity would be increased in line with the increase in residents.
- 10.134 Communal bin stores have been located within each of the blocks on the ground floor of Goswell Road, Cyrus Street and Compton Street. A communal bin store has also been provided for the new block of development on the corner of Goswell Road and Cyrus Street. Further details will be required by condition (*23*).

### Vehicle parking

- 10.135 Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Sustainable development), Part H, requires car free development. Development Management Policy DM8.5 (Vehicle parking), Part A (Residential parking) requires new homes to be car free, including the removal of rights for residents to apply for on-street car parking permits.

- 10.136 Wheelchair accessible parking should be provided in line with Development Management Policy DM8.5 (Vehicle parking), Part C (Wheelchair accessible parking).
- 10.137 There are currently 95 car parking spaces on the estate. The parking in the undercroft will be removed as part of the proposal. It is welcome that the car parking spaces and garages on the estate will be removed in accordance with Islington's Development Management Policies.
- 10.138 An additional 5 disabled parking bays will be provided on street. This will be secured through the legal agreement.

### **Planning Obligations, Community Infrastructure Levy and local finance considerations**

- 10.139 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, part 11 introduced the requirement that planning obligations under section 106 must meet three statutory tests, i.e. that they (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, (ii) directly related to the development, and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), the Mayor of London's and Islington's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be chargeable on this application on grant of planning permission. This will be calculated in accordance with the Mayor's adopted Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2012 and the Islington adopted Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2014. As the development would be phased and the affordable housing is exempt from CIL payments, the payments would be chargeable on implementation of the private housing.
- 10.140 This is an application by the Council and the Council is the determining local planning authority on the application. It is not possible legally to bind the applicant via a S106 legal agreement. It has been agreed that as an alternative to this a letter and memorandum of understanding between the proper officer representing the applicant LBI Housing and the proper officer as the Local Planning Authority will be agreed subject to any approval.
- 10.141 A number of site-specific contributions will be sought, which are not covered by CIL. None of these contributions were included in Islington's proposed CIL during viability testing, and all of the contributions were considered during public examination on the CIL as separate charges that would be required in cases where relevant impacts would result from proposed developments. The CIL Examiner did not consider that these types of separate charges in addition to Islington's proposed CIL rates would result in unacceptable impacts on development in Islington due to cumulative viability implications or any other issue.
- 10.142 The letter and memorandum of understanding (pursuant to section 106) will include the contributions listed in Appendix 1 of this report.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

- 10.143 The scheme is considered to accord with the aims of the NPPF and to promote sustainable growth that balances the priorities of economic, social and environmental growth. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing and require good design from new development to achieve good planning.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

### Summary

- 11.1 The application proposes the creation of 54 new homes (an uplift of 48) across the Triangle Estate, of which 55% would be affordable (social rented and shared ownership). The proposal also includes a new retail unit, new landscaping including community and growing gardens, as well as improved access arrangements, removal of car parking and additional cycle parking across the estate.
- 11.2 The development proposes a mix of high quality residential accommodation, including family-sized homes, on underused land, car parking and garage spaces in accordance with the aims and objectives of London Plan and Islington Core Strategy Policies. Moreover, the development offers a significant increase in affordable homes as well as a replacement retail unit.
- 11.3 The development proposes a number of additions to the existing estate in the form of side and roof extensions, conversions and infill housing. The additions are well-designed and are considered to each respond successfully to their respective context and surroundings. The designs proposed are considered to provide a successful intermediary between the existing estate buildings and the surrounding urban context. The proposal would deliver significant landscape improvements within the courtyard space that would enhance biodiversity and provide significant amenity improvements for residents. While some of the existing trees would be lost, the proposal would result in a substantial number of additional trees that is considered to mitigate the loss of existing trees.
- 11.4 Despite the site constraints, the development would result in the delivery of high quality residential accommodation with well-considered internal layouts, good levels of natural light and a significant amount of private and communal amenity space. All of the proposed residential units would comply with the minimum unit sizes required by planning policy. The development would secure the perimeter and create a safer and more secure environment for residents.
- 11.5 The proposal's housing density is considered to be within acceptable limits and the proposed dwelling mix is considered satisfactory given current demand for housing and the physical constraints of the site. The housing mix provides a good mix of tenures and the affordable housing offer is considered to be the maximum amount achievable without rendering the scheme unviable. Furthermore, the application proposes a sustainable form of development which would suitably minimise carbon emissions. Finally, the proposal's transportation and highways impacts are considered to be acceptable, subject to conditions and the planning obligations.
- 11.6 The proposal is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to conditions and the completion of a Directors' Agreement to secure the necessary mitigation measures.

### Conclusion

- 11.7 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and director level agreement securing the heads of terms for the reasons and details as set out in Appendix 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS.



## **APPENDIX 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **RECOMMENDATION A**

That planning permission be granted subject to a Directors' Agreement between Housing and Adult Social Services and Environment and Regeneration or Planning and Development in order to secure the following planning obligations to the satisfaction of the Head of Law and Public Services and the Service Director, Planning and Development / Head of Service – Development Management:

- On-site provision of affordable housing in line with submission documents including a provision of 55% affordable housing. All measured by habitable rooms.
- The repair and re-instatement of the footways and highways adjoining the development. The cost is to be confirmed by LBI Highways, paid for by the applicant and the work carried out by LBI Highways. Conditions surveys may be required.
- Compliance with the Code of Employment and Training.
- Facilitation, during the construction phase of the development, of 3 work placements with each placement lasting a minimum of 13 weeks. London Borough of Islington Construction Works Team to recruit for and monitor placements. Developer/ contractor to pay wages (must meet London Living Wage).
- Compliance with the Code of Construction Practice, including a monitoring fee (£5,410) and submission of site-specific response document to the Code of Construction Practice for approval of LBI Public Protection, which shall be submitted prior to any works commencing on site.
- A contribution towards offsetting any projected residual CO2 emissions of the development, to be charged at the established price per tonne of CO2 for Islington (currently £920). The figure is £64,292.
- Connection to a local energy network, if technically and economically viable (burden of proof will be with the developer to show inability to connect). In the event that a local energy network is not available or connection to it is not economically viable, the developer should develop an on-site solution and/or connect to a neighbouring site (a Shared Heating Network) and future proof any on-site solution so that in all cases (whether or not an on-site solution has been provided), the development can be connected to a local energy network if a viable opportunity arises in the future.
- Submission of a Green Performance Plan.
- The provision of 5 accessible on-street parking bays;
- Removal of eligibility for residents' on-street parking permits for future residents.
- Submission of a draft framework Travel Plan with the planning application, of a draft Travel Plan for Council approval prior to occupation, and of a Travel Plan for Council approval 6 months from first occupation of the development or

phase (provision of travel plan required subject to thresholds shown in Table 7.1 of the Planning Obligations SPD).

- Council’s legal fees in preparing the Directors Agreement and officer’s fees for the preparation, monitoring and implementation of the Directors Agreement.

That, should the Director Level Agreement not be completed prior to the expiry of the planning performance agreement the Service Director, Planning and Development / Head of Service – Development Management may refuse the application on the grounds that the proposed development, in the absence of a Directors’ Level Agreement is not acceptable in planning terms.

**RECOMMENDATION B**

That the grant of planning permission be subject to **conditions** to secure the following:

**List of Conditions:**

<b>1</b>	<p><b>Commencement (Compliance)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Chapter 5).</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Approved plans list (Compliance)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>Drawing Numbers: 001 (Site Location Plan); Existing Plans 002; 003; 004; 005; 006; 007; 008; 009; 010; 011; 012; Proposed Drawings 013 Rev D; 014 Rev E; 015 Rev C; 016 Rev D; 017 Rev D; 018 Rev D; 019 Rev D; 020 Rev C; 021 Rev D; 022 Rev C; 023 Rev C; 024 Rev D; 025 Rev D; 026 Rev C; 027 rev C; 028 Rev C; 029 Rev C; 030 Rev B; 031 Rev B; 032 Rev A; 033 Rev B; 034 Rev B; 035 Rev B; 036 Rev B; 037 Rev B; 038; 039; 040 Rev B; 041 Rev B; 042 Rev B; 043 Rev B; 044 Rev B; 045; 046; 047; 048; 049; 050; 051; 052; 053; 054; 055; 056; 057; 058; 100 Rev A; 101; 102; 103; Site Plan M&amp;E Services Strategy Drawing Number M/E 100 Rev P3.</p> <p>Air Quality Assessment dated November 2016;</p> <p>Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Tamla Trees dated November 2016;</p> <p>Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment by CGMS dated March 2017;</p> <p>Below Ground Drainage Report Stage 2 by Ellis &amp; Moore dated October 2016;</p> <p>Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment Report dated October 2016;</p> <p>Daylight &amp; Sunlight Assessment by Malcolm Hollis revision 2;</p> <p>Daylight Study by Baily Garner dated 6<sup>th</sup> October 2016;</p> <p>Design &amp; Access Statement dated November 2016;</p> <p>Draft Green Performance Plan dated 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017</p> <p>Energy Statement by Baily Garner dated 28<sup>th</sup> March 2017;</p> <p>Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey by D F Clark dated November 2016;</p> <p>Environmental Noise Assessment by Bureau Veritas dated November 2016;</p> <p>Planning Statement by HTA dated November 2016;</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement by HTA dated November 2016;</p> <p>Structural Engineering Stage 2+ Report by Ellis &amp; Moore;</p> <p>Thermal Comfort Assessment by Baily Garner dated 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016;</p> <p>Transport Statement by Lime Transport dated October 2016;</p>

	<p>Travel Plan by Lime Transport dated September 2016; Triangle Estate Residential Development Design Note dated 31<sup>st</sup> August 2016;</p> <p>REASON: To comply with Section 70(1)(a) of the Town and Country Act 1990 as amended and the Reason for Grant and also for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Materials and Samples (Details)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: Details and samples of all facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure work of the relevant phase commencing on site. The details and samples shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Facing Brickwork(s); Sample panels of proposed brickwork to be used showing the colour, texture, pointing and perforated brickwork including the glazed brick and boundary walls shall be provided;</li> <li>b) Window (Schuco triple glazed) details and balconies / balustrades;</li> <li>c) Roof cladding;</li> <li>d) Portland stone cladding;</li> <li>e) Terracotta cladding;</li> <li>f) GRC frame;</li> <li>g) Doors and access points;</li> <li>h) Concrete / stone string course;</li> <li>i) Canopies;</li> <li>j) Green procurement plan; and</li> <li>k) Any other materials to be used.</li> </ul> <p>The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of securing sustainable development and to ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Construction Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>CONDITION: A Construction Environmental Management Plan assessing the environmental impacts (including (but not limited to) highways impacts, noise, air quality including dust, smoke and odour, vibration and TV reception) of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site. The report shall assess impacts during the construction phase of the development on nearby residents and other occupiers together with means of mitigating any identified impacts. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: In the interests of residential amenity, highway safety and the free flow of traffic on streets, and to mitigate the impacts of the development.</p>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Obscure Glazing and Privacy Screens</b></p> <p>CONDITION: Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, further details of obscured glazing and privacy screens to prevent overlooking within the estate shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure work of the relevant phase commencing on site.</p> <p>The obscure glazing and privacy screens shall be installed prior to the occupation of the relevant units and retained as such permanently thereafter.</p>

	<p>REASON: In the interest of preventing undue overlooking between habitable rooms within the development itself, to protect the future amenity and privacy of residents.</p>
6	<p><b>Piling Method Statement (Details)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to minimise potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water.</p> <p>Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.</p> <p>REASON: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.</p>
7	<p><b>Accessible Homes (Compliance)</b></p> <p>ACCESSIBLE HOUSING – MAJOR SCHEMES (DETAILS): Notwithstanding the Design and Access Statement and plans hereby approved, 50 of the new residential units shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Category 2 of the National Standard for Housing Design as set out in the Approved Document M 2015 ‘Accessible and adaptable dwellings’ M4 (2) and 4 units shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Category 3 of the National Standard for Housing Design as set out in the Approved Document M 2015 ‘Wheelchair user dwellings’ M4 (3).</p> <p>A total of 1 x 1-bed, 1 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed, units shall be provided to Category 3 standards.</p> <p>The development shall be constructed strictly in accordance with the details so approved.</p> <p>REASON – To secure the provision of visitable and adaptable homes appropriate to meet diverse and changing needs.</p>
8	<p><b>Solar Photovoltaic Panels</b></p> <p>CONDITION: Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed Solar Photovoltaic Panels on existing buildings at the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location;</li> <li>- Output of panels</li> <li>- Area of panels; and</li> <li>- Design (including elevation plans).</li> </ul> <p>The solar photovoltaic panels as approved shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development and retained as such permanently thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development.</p>
9	<p><b>Water Use (Compliance)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The development shall be designed to achieve a water use target of no more than 95 litres per person per day, including by incorporating water efficient fixtures and fittings.</p>

	REASON: To ensure the sustainable use of water.
10	<b>Green/Brown Biodiversity Roofs (Details)</b>
	<p>CONDITION: Prior to any superstructure work commencing on the development details of the biodiversity (green/brown) roofs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The green/brown roof shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Be biodiversity based with extensive substrate base (depth 80 -150mm);</li> <li>b) Contribute towards a 50% reduction in surface water run-off ; and</li> <li>c) Be planted/seeded with a mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works (the seed mix shall be focused on wildflower planting, and shall contain no more than a maximum of 25% sedum).</li> </ul> <p>The biodiversity (green/brown) roofs should be maximised across the site and shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.</p> <p>The biodiversity roof(s) shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details as approved, shall be laid out within 3 months of next available appropriate planting season after the construction of the building it is located on and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure the development provides the maximum possible provision towards creation of habitats, valuable areas for biodiversity and minimise run-off.</p>
11	<b>Drainage and SUDS</b>
	<p>CONDITION: No development shall take place unless and until a detailed Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) scheme inclusive of detailed implementation and a maintenance and management plan of the SUDS scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>II. a timetable for its implementation, and</li> <li>II. a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.</li> </ul> <p>No building(s) hereby approved shall be occupied unless and until the approved sustainable drainage scheme for the site has been installed/completed strictly in accordance with the approved details. The submitted details shall include the scheme's peak runoff rate and storage volume and demonstrate how the scheme will aim to achieve a 50% water run off rate reduction.</p> <p>The scheme shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that sustainable management of water and minimise the potential for surface level flooding.</p>
12	<b>Energy Efficiency – CO2 Reduction (Compliance/Details)</b>

	<p>CONDITION: The energy efficiency measures as outlined within the approved Energy Strategy (by Baily Garner dated 28<sup>th</sup> March 2017) which shall provide for no less than a 44.9% on-site total C02 reduction in comparison with total emissions from a building which complies with Building Regulations 2013 shall be installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development.</p> <p>Should there be any change to the energy efficiency measures within the approved Energy Strategy, the following should be submitted and approved:</p> <p>A revised Energy Strategy, which shall provide for no less than a 40% onsite total C02 reduction in comparison with total emissions from a building which complies with Building Regulations 2013.</p> <p>The final agreed scheme shall be installed and in operation prior to the first occupation of the relevant phase.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development.</p>
13	<p><b>Landscaping (Details)</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: Notwithstanding the submitted detail and the development hereby approved a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) existing and proposed underground services and their relationship to both hard and soft landscaping;</li> <li>b) proposed trees: their location, species, size and section showing rooting area;</li> <li>c) soft plantings: including grass and turf areas, shrub and herbaceous areas;</li> <li>d) topographical survey: including earthworks, ground finishes, top soiling with both conserved and imported topsoil(s), levels, drainage and fall in drain types;</li> <li>e) enclosures and boundary treatment: including types, dimensions and treatments of walls, fences, screen walls, barriers, rails, retaining walls and hedges;</li> <li>f) hard landscaping: including ground surfaces, kerbs, edges, ridge and flexible pavings, unit paving, furniture, steps and if applicable synthetic surfaces;</li> <li>g) inclusive design principles adopted in the landscaped features;</li> <li>h) phasing of landscaping and planting;</li> <li>i) details of the green walls facing Compton Park;</li> <li>j) all playspace equipment and structures; and</li> <li>k) any other landscaping feature(s) forming part of the scheme.</li> </ul> <p>All landscaping in accordance with the approved scheme shall be completed / planted during the first planting season following practical completion of the relevant phase of the development hereby approved in accordance with the approved planting phase. The landscaping and tree planting shall have a two year maintenance / watering provision following planting and any existing tree shown to be retained or trees or shrubs to be planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of completion of the development shall be replaced with the same species or an approved</p>

	<p>alternative to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within the next planting season.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, playspace and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained.</p>
14	<p><b>Arboricultural Method Statement (Details)</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, no site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until an updated scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan, TPP) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement, AMS) in accordance with Clause 7 of British Standard BS 5837 2012 –Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Specific issues to be dealt with in the TPP and AMS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Location and installation of services/ utilities/ drainage</li> <li>b. Methods of demolition within the root protection area (RPA as defined in BS 5837: 2012) of the retained trees</li> <li>c. Details of construction within the RPA or that may impact on the retained trees</li> <li>d. Tree protection during construction indicated on a TPP and construction and construction activities clearly identified as prohibited in this area.</li> <li>e. The pavement is not to be obstructed during demolition or construction and the RPA of retained trees not to be used for storage, welfare units or the mixing of materials.</li> <li>f. The location of a cross over or method of delivery for materials onto site</li> <li>g. The method of protection for the retained trees</li> </ol> <p>REASON: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained.</p>
15	<p><b>Site Supervision (Details)</b></p>
	<p>Condition: No works or development shall take place until a scheme of supervision and monitoring for the arboricultural protection measures in accordance with para. 6.3 of British Standard BS5837: 2012 – Trees in Relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme of supervision shall be carried out as approved and will be administered by a qualified arboriculturist instructed by the applicant. This scheme will be appropriate to the scale and duration of the works and will include details of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Induction and personnel awareness of arboricultural matters;</li> <li>b. Identification of individual responsibilities and key personnel;</li> <li>c. Statement of delegated powers;</li> <li>d. Timing and methods of site visiting and record keeping, including updates</li> <li>e. Procedures for dealing with variations and incidents.</li> </ol> <p>This tree condition may only be fully discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous monitoring and compliance by the pre-appointed tree specialist during construction.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained.</p>

16	<p><b>Sound Insulation (Compliance)</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: A scheme for sound insulation and noise control measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site. The sound insulation and noise control measures shall achieve the following internal noise targets on proposed and existing units to be affected by the development (in line with BS 8233:2014):</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bedrooms (23.00-07.00 hrs) 30 dB <math>L_{Aeq,8\text{ hour}}</math> and 45 dB <math>L_{max\text{ (fast)}}</math>  Living Rooms (07.00-23.00 hrs) 35 dB <math>L_{Aeq, 16\text{ hour}}</math>  Dining rooms (07.00 –23.00 hrs) 40 dB <math>L_{Aeq, 16\text{ hour}}</math></p> <p>The sound insulation and noise control measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of residential accommodation is provided.</p>
17	<p><b>Noise of Fixed Plant</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: The design and installation of new items of fixed plant shall be such that when operating the cumulative noise level <math>L_{Aeq\ Tr}</math> arising from the proposed plant, measured or predicted at 1m from the façade of the nearest noise sensitive premises, shall be a rating level of at least 5dB(A) below the background noise level <math>L_{AF90\ Tbg}</math>. The measurement and/or prediction of the noise should be carried out in accordance with the methodology contained within BS 4142: 2014.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of residential accommodation is provided.</p>
18	<p><b>Retail Unit (Details)</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: Full details of the operation of the retail unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to superstructure works commencing on site. The details include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opening times;</li> <li>- Inclusive design measures;</li> <li>- Sound insulation between the proposed retail and residential use of the building;</li> <li>- Cycle parking.</li> </ul> <p>The cycle parking, sound insulation and noise control measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of residential accommodation is provided.</p>
19	<p><b>Air Quality (Details)</b></p>
	<p>CONDITION: Prior to the commencement of works on the development hereby permitted, a site report detailing steps to minimise the development’s future occupiers’ exposure to air pollution shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning</p>



	<p>Authority. The approved scheme is to be completed prior to occupation of the development and shall be permanently maintained thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure an adequate air quality to residential occupiers.</p>
20	<p><b>Lighting Plan (Details)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: Full details of the lighting across the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the relevant phase of the development hereby approved.</p> <p>The details shall include the location and full specification of: all lamps; light levels/spill lamps, floodlights, support structures, hours of operation and technical details on how impacts on bat foraging will be minimised. The lighting measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, shall be installed prior to occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that any resulting general or security lighting is appropriately located, designed do not adversely impact neighbouring residential amenity and are appropriate to the overall design of the buildings as well as protecting the biodiversity value of the site.</p>
21	<p><b>Nesting Boxes (Compliance)</b></p> <p>CONDITIONS: Details of bird and/or bat nesting boxes/bricks shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to superstructure works commencing on site.</p> <p>The nesting boxes/bricks shall be provided strictly in accordance with the details so approved, installed prior to the first occupation of the building to which they form part or the first use of the space in which they are contained and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure the development provides the maximum possible provision towards creation of habitats and valuable areas for biodiversity.</p>
22	<p><b>No Plumbing or Pipes (Compliance/Details)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved, no plumbing, down pipes, rainwater pipes or foul pipes other than those shown on the approved plans shall be located to the external elevations of buildings hereby approved without obtaining express planning consent unless submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority as part of discharging this condition.</p> <p>REASON: The Local Planning Authority considers that such plumbing and pipes would potentially detract from the appearance of the building and undermine the current assessment of the application.</p>
23	<p><b>Refuse/Recycling Provided (Compliance)</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The dedicated refuse / recycling enclosure(s) shown on the approved plans shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>The refuse and recycling enclosures and waste shall be managed and carried out at all times in accordance with the details of the approved 'servicing and waste management plan'.</p> <p>REASON: To secure the necessary physical waste enclosures to support the development and to ensure that responsible waste management practices are</p>

	adhered to.
24	<b>Cycle Parking (Details)</b>
	<p>CONDITION: Details of the bicycle storage areas shown on the approved plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved bicycle stores shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the relevant phase of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure adequate cycle parking is available and easily accessible on site, to promote sustainable modes of transport and to secure the high quality design of the structures proposed.</p>
25	<b>Permitted Development Rights (Compliance)</b>
	<p>CONDITION: Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any amended/updated subsequent Order) no works under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the above Order shall be carried out to the dwellinghouses hereby approved without express planning permission.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority has control over future extensions and alterations to the resulting dwellinghouses in view of the limited space within the site available for such changes and the impact such changes may have on residential amenity and the overall good design of the scheme.</p>
26	<b>Access Management Plan</b>
	<p>CONDITION: An Access Management Plan detailing access arrangement across the estate, including details of controlled access points, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: In the interests of providing a high level of amenity and safe and secure living conditions for existing and future residents.</p>
27	<b>Loading / unloading hours (Compliance)</b>
	<p>CONDITION: Deliveries, collections, unloading, loading of the commercial uses shall only be between the following hours:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monday to Saturday – 07:00 – 19:00 Sundays/Bank Holidays – not at all</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the development does not have an undue adverse impact on nearby residential amenity or business operations.</p>
28	<b>Shopfront Details</b>
	<p>CONDITION: Typical elevations of the shopfronts hereby approved at scale 1:50 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the relevant part of the works commencing.</p> <p>The shopfronts shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the elevations so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard.</p>

29	<b>Lifts (Compliance)</b>
	<p>CONDITION: All lifts hereby approved shall be installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the floorspace hereby approved.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that inclusive and accessible routes are provided throughout the floorspace at all floors and also accessible routes through the site are provided to ensure no one is excluded from full use and enjoyment of the site.</p>
30	<b>Archaeology</b>
	<p>CONDITION: No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and</p> <p>A. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;  B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication &amp; dissemination and deposition of resulting material. this part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI</p> <p>The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of archaeology and the protection of archaeological and heritage assets.</p>

## List of Informatives:

1	<p><b>Planning Obligations Agreement</b></p>
	<p>You are advised that this permission has been granted subject to the completion of a director level agreement to secure agreed planning obligations.</p>
2	<p><b>Superstructure</b></p>
	<p>DEFINITION OF 'SUPERSTRUCTURE' AND 'PRACTICAL COMPLETION'  A number of conditions attached to this permission have the time restrictions 'prior to superstructure works commencing on site' and/or 'following practical completion'. The council considers the definition of 'superstructure' as having its normal or dictionary meaning, which is: the part of a building above its foundations. The council considers the definition of 'practical completion' to be: when the work reaches a state of readiness for use or occupation even though there may be outstanding works/matters to be carried out.</p>
3	<p><b>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Granting Consent)</b></p>
	<p>INFORMATIVE: Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), this development is liable to pay the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This will be calculated in accordance with the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012. One of the development parties must now assume liability to pay CIL by submitting an Assumption of Liability Notice to the Council at <a href="mailto:cil@islington.gov.uk">cil@islington.gov.uk</a>. The Council will then issue a Liability Notice setting out the amount of CIL that is payable.</p> <p>Failure to submit a valid Assumption of Liability Notice and Commencement Notice prior to commencement of the development may result in surcharges being imposed. The above forms can be found on the planning portal at: <a href="http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil">www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil</a></p>
4	<p><b>Car-Free Development</b></p>
	<p>INFORMATIVE: (Car-Free Development) All new developments are car free in accordance with Policy CS10 of the Islington Core Strategy 2011. This means that no parking provision will be allowed on site and occupiers will have no ability to obtain car parking permits, except for parking needed to meet the needs of disabled people, or other exemption under the Council Parking Policy Statement.</p>
5	<p><b>Groundwater</b></p>
	<p>A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer.</p> <p>Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing <a href="mailto:wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk">wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk</a>. Application forms should be completed on line via <a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality">www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality</a>.</p>
6	<p><b>Public Sewers</b></p>
	<p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of a public sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new</p>

	buildings, but approval may be granted for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to visit <a href="http://thameswater.co.uk/buildover">thameswater.co.uk/buildover</a> .
7	<b>Working in a Positive and Proactive Way</b>
	<p>To assist applicants in a positive manner, the Local Planning Authority has produced policies and written guidance, all of which are available on the Council's website.</p> <p>A pre-application advice service is also offered and encouraged.</p> <p>The LPA and the applicant have worked positively and proactively in a collaborative manner through both the pre-application and the application stages to deliver an acceptable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF</p> <p>The LPA delivered the decision in a timely manner in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>
8	<b>Materials</b>
	<p>INFORMATIVE: In addition to compliance with condition 4 materials procured for the development should be selected to be sustainably sourced and otherwise minimise their environmental impact, including through maximisation of recycled content, use of local suppliers and by reference to the BRE's Green Guide Specification.</p>
9	<b>Construction Management</b>
	<p>INFORMATIVE: You are advised that condition 4 covers transport and environmental health issues and should include the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. identification of construction vehicle routes;</li> <li>2. how construction related traffic would turn into and exit the site;</li> <li>3. details of banksmen to be used during construction works;</li> <li>4. the method of demolition and removal of material from the site;</li> <li>5. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;</li> <li>6. loading and unloading of plant and materials;</li> <li>7. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;</li> <li>8. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;</li> <li>9. wheel washing facilities;</li> <li>10. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;</li> <li>11. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;</li> <li>12. noise;</li> <li>12. air quality including dust, smoke and odour;</li> <li>13. vibration; and</li> <li>14. TV reception.</li> </ol>

## **APPENDIX 2: RELEVANT POLICIES**

This appendix lists all relevant development plan policies and guidance notes pertinent to the determination of this planning application.

### **National Guidance**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals.

### **Development Plan**

The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2016, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013. The following policies of the Development Plan are considered relevant to this application:

#### **A) The London Plan 2016 as amended - Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London**

## **1 Context and strategy**

Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London

## **2 London's places**

Policy 2.18 Green infrastructure: the network of open and green spaces

## **3 London's people**

Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all

Policy 3.2 Improving health and addressing health inequalities

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 3.7 Large residential developments

Policy 3.8 Housing choice

Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities

Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing

Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets

Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds

Policy 3.14 Existing housing

## **5 London's response to climate change**

Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks

Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals

Policy 5.7 Renewable energy

Policy 5.10 Urban greening

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 5.12 Flood risk management

Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage

Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure

Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste

## **6 London's transport**

Policy 6.1 Strategic approach

Policy 6.2 Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport

Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity

Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity

Policy 6.9 Cycling

Policy 6.10 Walking

Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion

Policy 6.12 Road network capacity

Policy 6.13 Parking

## **7 London's living places and spaces**

Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment

Policy 7.3 Designing out crime

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.5 Public realm

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings

Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

Policy 7.13 Safety, security and resilience to emergency

Policy 7.14 Improving air quality

Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands

## **8 Implementation, monitoring and review**

Policy 8.1 Implementation

Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

## **B) Islington Core Strategy 2011**

### **Spatial Strategy**

Policy CS8 (Enhancing Islington's Character)

### **Strategic Policies**

Policy CS9 (Protecting and Enhancing Islington's Built and Historic Environment)

Policy CS10 (Sustainable Design)

Policy CS15 (Open Space and Green Infrastructure)

Policy CS16 (Play Space)

Policy CS17 (Sports and Recreation Provision)

### **Infrastructure and Implementation**

Policy CS18 (Delivery and Infrastructure)

### **C) Development Management Policies June 2013**

#### **Design and Heritage**

**DM2.1** Design

**DM2.2** Inclusive Design

**DM2.3** Heritage

#### **Housing**

**DM3.1** Mix of housing sizes

**DM3.2** Existing housing

**DM3.4** Housing standards

**DM3.5** Private outdoor space

**DM3.6** Play space

**DM3.7** Noise and vibration (residential uses)

#### **Shops, cultures and services**

**DM4.7** Dispersed Shops

#### **Health and open space**

**DM6.1** Healthy development

**DM6.3** Protecting open space

**DM6.5** Landscaping, trees and biodiversity

**DM6.6** Flood prevention

#### **Energy and Environmental Standards**

**DM7.1** Sustainable design and construction statements

**DM7.2** Energy efficiency and carbon reduction in minor schemes

**DM7.3** Decentralised energy networks

**DM7.4** Sustainable design standards

**DM7.5** Heating and cooling

#### **Transport**

**DM8.1** Movement hierarchy

**DM8.2** Managing transport impacts

**DM8.3** Public transport

**DM8.4** Walking and cycling

**DM8.5** Vehicle parking

**DM8.6** Delivery and servicing for new developments

#### **Infrastructure**

**DM9.1** Infrastructure

**DM9.2** Planning obligations

**DM9.3** Implementation

### **Designations**

The site has the following designations under the London Plan 2015, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013:

- Bunhill & Clerkenwell Key Area
- Central Activities Zone
- Major Cycle Routes
- Adjacent to the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area
- Within 50m of a Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) – King Square Gardens
- Mayor's Protected Vista – Alexandra Palace

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)**

The following SPGs and/or SPDs are relevant:

#### **Islington Local Plan**

- Environmental Design
- Accessible Housing in Islington

#### **London Plan**

- Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment



- Inclusive Landscape Design
- Planning Obligations and S106
- Urban Design Guide
- Conservation Area Design Guidelines

- Housing
- Sustainable Design & Construction
- Providing for Children and Young Peoples  
Play and Informal Recreation
- Planning for Equality and Diversity in  
London

## APPENDIX 3: Design Review Panel



### CONFIDENTIAL

ATT: Mathew Carvalho  
Housing Development and Regeneration  
Islington Council  
Northway House  
257 Upper Street  
London N1 1RU

Planning Service  
Planning and Development  
PO Box 333  
222 Upper Street  
London  
N1 1YA

T 020 7527 2389  
F 020 7527 2731  
E [Luciana.grave@islington.gov.uk](mailto:Luciana.grave@islington.gov.uk)  
W [www.islington.gov.uk](http://www.islington.gov.uk)

Our ref: DRP/75

Date: 04 November 2015

Dear Mathew Carvalho,

#### ISLINGTON DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

**RE: Triangle Estate, Goswell Road, London, EC1V 0AF – in connection with pre-application reference Q2014/3276/MJR**

Thank you for attending Islington's Design Review Panel meeting on 14 October 2015 for a review of the above scheme. The proposed scheme under consideration is for demolition of the existing podium deck and replacement communal garden area; new infill extensions, roof extensions and a new corner building to provide new social rented and private housing (officer's description).

#### Review Process

The Design Review Panel provides expert impartial design advice following the 10 key principles of design review established by Design Council/CABE. The scheme was reviewed by Richard Portchmouth (chair), Charles Thomson, Ben Gibson, Paul Reynolds, Thomas Lefevre and Marcus Lee on 14 October 2015 including a site visit, a presentation from the design team followed by a question and answers session and deliberations at the offices of the London Borough of Islington. The views expressed below are a reflection of the Panel's discussions as an independent advisory body to the council.

#### Panel's observations

The Panel was presented with two options:

- A: involving the demolition of the central podium deck as well as the undercroft garages, allowing for the creation of a new communal garden area; infilling of some of the open spaces in the corners of the estate to provide additional housing; further ground and first floor infill extensions within the courtyard and along the street frontage to provide additional residential accommodation; a new corner building to Goswell Road and Percival Street; an extension at roof level on all three sides of the Triangle Estate to provide further housing; and significant security and access improvements across the estate.
- B: an alternative proposal following consultations with the TRA, which removes the top floor additions from the proposal and in order to maintain the number of units, inserts additional 5-storey corner infill buildings on all three corners of the Triangle.



The Panel was welcoming of the general principles of the development proposals and thought that both options had merit. However, panel members encouraged the design team and the Client to pursue a final development proposal which would be more strategic and which would incorporate improvements to the whole estate.

Panel members were welcoming of the set back penthouses in Option A, and thought that they might be retained within an evolving scheme which could build on the proposal in Option B.

The Panel supported the removal of the podium deck, the creation of ground floor gardens, (both private and communal) and the rationalisation of access into the estate.

Panel members understood that the development of Options reflected the consultation process and the views of some residents. The Panel felt that a balance needs to be struck between the expressed wishes of certain residents and the overarching objective to make long term improvements to the estate. This will require strong client leadership and decision making and it should not fall to the architect to broker a compromise. There may be opportunities to link the penthouse development to the units immediately below to create larger units and at the ground and first floor levels to create maisonettes which would benefit from gardens. This may be a way of providing clearer benefits to some existing residents.

Panel members were unconvinced by the design of the proposed northern block. This seemed to be unnecessarily at odds with the character of the existing architecture without any functional or aesthetic rationale: large full height glazing to bedrooms combined with panels of terracotta, expensive curved glass and inconveniently shaped balconies. The panel would encourage a contemporary solution which recognises the functional needs of the accommodation as well as the architectural character of the estate.

The Panel felt that a great deal of the value of the scheme will be dependent on the quality of the landscaping scheme.

Panel members highlighted the importance of providing the residents with a cost/benefit analysis which would include a construction management plan. Any development on the scale envisaged will cause significant disruption and this must be spelt out clearly alongside the mitigation measures that would be taken and the longer term benefits that would be achieved. The panel sympathised with the dilemma posed by the proposal but felt that the longer term benefits to the residents and the area were well worth the effort.

The Panel asked whether the option of improving the existing dwellings beyond the provision of a better central communal area and security had been investigated. Considering the opportunity for regeneration and a more significant improvement to existing apartments (e.g. energy efficiency) could provide significant benefits and help to convince residents of the merits of the proposals. Looking beyond the 7-year maintenance cycle of the current estate and seeking to maximise the benefits of a single intervention was encouraged by the Panel. The different parts of the Council Housing should discuss this matter in order to provide a more coordinated scheme.

### **Summary**

The Panel welcomed the principle of the proposed scheme and appreciated the complexity of the project, however they felt that in terms of moving forward, strategically it needed to be extended to a wider spectrum of people that live in the estate. Panel members thought both options- A&B, had merits and encouraged the design team to consider the advantages of the provision of duplexes, the provisions of some of the roof additions and to further develop the architectural treatment particularly of the Northern block. The Panel recommended that a



working model be prepared to better communicate the new interventions with the existing building and importantly to help engage residents on what is inevitably a complex inter-woven project.

Thank you for consulting Islington's Design Review Panel. If there is any point that requires clarification please do not hesitate to contact me and I will be happy to seek further advice from the Panel.

**Confidentiality**

Please note that since the scheme is at pre-application stage, the advice contained in this letter is provided in confidence. However, should this scheme become the subject of a planning application, the views expressed in this letter may become public and will be taken into account by the council in the assessment of the proposal and determination of the application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lucy', written in a cursive style.

**Luciana Grave**  
Design Review Panel Coordinator  
Design & Conservation Team Manager

## APPENDIX 4: Independent Viability Appraisal (REDACTED)

### Planning Reference: P2016/4634/FUL

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 BPS Chartered Surveyors has been instructed by the London Borough of Islington (the Council) to review a viability submission for a Council led development at The Triangle Estate. The site measures approximately 1.59 acres as per the application form.
- 1.2 The proposed application is for the:

*“Demolition of six dwellings, the central podium, garages and one retail unit and the construction of 54 new dwellings (including 27 homes for social rent), provided as infill developments, an additional seventh floor on existing residential blocks and a new part 7/part 8 storey corner building with associated private amenity space, bicycle storage, a new landscaped courtyard garden and improvements to the public realm. The application also includes the provision of 146.8sqm of retail floorspace to replace the demolished unit.”*
- 1.3 The proposed scheme involves some demolition and rebuild as well as infill new build development, there is very little refurbishment. In consequence, we have undertaken our review reflecting the value generated by the creation of new dwellings and retail space. This approach effectively ignores the value of existing property which is retained by the development in terms of land value.
- 1.4 Policy CS12 of the Councils Core Strategy outlines that that developments should provide the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing taking into account the borough wide 50% strategic target. Where the Council acts as the developer, we often see affordable levels which surpass this target but we note that in general these schemes are required to be self-financing which limits their ability to deliver 100% affordable housing. In relation to the affordable units the scheme delivers 50% affordable housing of which 100% of the affordable element is provided as social rent tenure which exceeds the Councils target for this tenure - the Core Strategy sets a target for a split of 70:30 for social and intermediate housing respectively. Given this consideration, the proposed scheme effectively exceeds the borough wide target for delivery.
- 1.5 In carrying out our review we have primarily had reference to two Excel models provided by the applicant which detail the proposed costs and values associated with the development. We have also had reference to an order of cost estimate provided by Walker Management Construction Consultants dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 and a valuation report provided by JLL dated 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016. On request, we have been provided with a spreadsheet which includes information in relation to the number and type of residential units currently on site.

## 2.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 2.1 The current proposals are for the development of commercial space and affordable/private residential units at a split of 50:50. The affordable units are to be provided as social rent which exceeds the borough target for this affordable tenure.
- 2.2 Without an allowance for land value, we calculate the scheme generates a negative residual value of approximately -£1.93 million. Therefore, the scheme is not viable by reference to accepted development criteria. This position only deteriorates if an allowance for land value is introduced into this assessment. In reaching this conclusion we have tested viability using profit and finance assumptions which we consider to be generally standard assumption in relation to private development. However, we acknowledge that the Council may have access to preferential finance rates and aside from managing risk does not need to generate a market related profit.
- 2.3 The key difference between the Councils calculation of the residual development value and the opinion detailed within this viability review report is the level of base build costs, fees and contingency levels included. Our report does not make any special allowance for the fact this is a Council-led development. This includes the assessment of development fees.
- 2.4 We have reviewed the proposed costs and note that our assessment of build costs are approximately £2.0 million less than the assumption adopted by the Council. This does not mean that the additional costs are unreasonable, however, the Councils cost plan may allow for additional costs that a private developers plan would not.
- 2.5 This has a compounding effect on the calculation of contingency and fees as these are a percentage of base build costs.
- 2.6 We calculate that the fees included within the viability appraisal are approximately 24% on cost whereas we have included an allowance of say 8%. We understand that the Council seeks to develop this site using a design and build contractor although it engages with its own professional team to work up initial scheme feasibility and to secure planning consent, work which is to some extent replicated by the design build contractor leading to an enhanced fee cost. There are also costs not experienced by private developers such as additional consultation etc. which adds to the total and in this context actual fees may easily be higher than a typical development proxy.
- 2.7 Allowing for a fixed land value of £0 we calculate the scheme profit to reflect 8.18% of scheme GDV which is little more than a project management fee and is considerably below the level we would expect the private developer market to consider acceptable.
- 2.8 We have briefly considered an approach which seeks to compare the value of property currently on site against the value of all property once completed. This may possibly provide an alternative perspective from which to view apparent viability however we do not have sufficient information concerning existing property on site to enable us to complete an assessment on this basis.
- 2.9 We have analysed the proposed private residential unit values applied within the viability review and conclude that they appear broadly reasonable. We acknowledge that the proposed units will not have the benefit of allocated car parking spaces and will be situated within an estate which has historically seen high levels of serious

criminal activity which may impact achievable sales values. We understand that the current proposals aim to improve the estate in this regard and are priced accordingly. In our view the new residential unit's values will be constrained by the existing flats. Given this context and the reputation of the estate, JLL are perhaps optimistic in their assumed values.

- 2.10 We have added revenue from ground rental income into the appraisal at rates we view to be reasonable for this location.
- 2.11 We consider the proposed valuations for the affordable units to be reasonable and in line with our expectations.
- 2.12 The floor area of the proposed retail space at 135 Goswell Road requires confirmation. We have reviewed the opinion of value provided by JLL within their report. Our assessment of value for this unit equates to approximately £475,000. Purchasers costs have been deducted accordingly.
- 2.13 Our Cost Consultant has reviewed the submitted cost plan prepared by Walker Management. This cost plan was prepared in January 2016 so needs to be uplifted by inflation to 1Q2017 which generates a figure of £17,032,246 which contrasts with Walker Management's figure of £16,800,000. Our Cost Consultant has made a further adjustment in respect of the retail unit which reduces his figure to £16,958,246. Walker Management have made a further allowance amounting to £1,370,880 for stores and bike stores which we have excluded as an allowance for this item has already been included within the estate wide costs. The figure included in our appraisal is therefore £16,958,246 before inclusion of fee allowances.
- 2.14 We have allowed for normal developers profit at a rate of 20% for private residential units, 15% for commercial space and 6% for affordable units.

### 3.0 Benchmark Land Value

#### Viability Benchmarking

- 3.1 Development appraisals work to derive a residual value. This approach can be represented by the simple formula below:

$$\text{Gross Development Value} - \text{Development Costs (including Developer's Profit)} = \text{Residual Value}$$

The residual value is then compared to a benchmark land value. Existing Use Value (EUV) and Alternative Use Value (AUV) are standard recognised approaches for establishing a land value as they help highlight the apparent differences between the values of the site without the benefit of the consent sought.

- 3.2 The rationale for comparing the scheme residual value with an appropriate benchmark is to identify whether it can generate sufficient money to pay a realistic price for the land whilst providing a normal level of profit for the developer. In the event that the scheme shows a deficit when compared to the benchmark figure the scheme is said to be in deficit and as such would be unlikely to proceed.
- 3.3 We note the GLA prefer EUV as a basis for benchmarking development as this clearly defines the uplift in value generated by the consent sought. We find the Market Value approach as defined by RICS Guidance Viability in Planning 2012 if misapplied is potentially open to an essentially circular reasoning. The RICS Guidance promotes use of a modified standard definition of “market Value” by reference to an assumption that the market values should reflect planning policy and should disregard that which is not within planning policy. In practice, we find that consideration of compliance with policy is generally relegated to compliance somewhere on a scale of 0% to the policy target placing land owner requirements ahead of the need to meet planning policy.
- 3.4 There is also a high risk that the RICS Guidance in placing a very high level of reliance on market transactions is potentially exposed to reliance on bids which might a) represent expectations which do not mirror current costs and values as required by PPG. b) May themselves be overbids and most importantly c) need to be analysed to reflect a policy compliant position. To explain this point further, it is inevitable that if site sales are analysed on a headline rate per acre or per unit without adjustment for the level of affordable housing delivered then if these rates are applied to the subject site they will effectively cap delivery at the rates of delivery achieved of the comparable sites. This is an essentially circular approach which would effectively mitigate against delivery of affordable housing if applied.
- 3.5 The NPPF recognises at 173, the need to provide both land owners and developers with a competitive return. In relation to land owners this is to encourage land owners to release land for development. This has translated to the widely accepted practice when using EUV as a benchmark of including a premium. Typically, in a range from 5-30%. Guidance indicates that the scale of any premium should reflect the circumstances of the land owner. We are of the view that where sites represent an ongoing liability to a land owner and the only means of either ending the liability or maximising site value is through securing a planning consent this should be a relevant factor when considering whether a premium is applicable.



### Benchmark Land Value

- 3.6 We understand the site currently comprises three 6-storey blocks, a small communal garden located on a central podium at first floor level and car parking garages. As detailed within the submitted Design and Access Statement, there are 130 residential dwellings as follows:
- 1 bed / 2 person flat - 54
  - 2 bed / 4 person flat - 76.
- 3.7 It is unlikely that a party other than the Council would be able to develop this site due to the geographical and ownership restrictions and in light of the protected tenancies. We understand that the development includes airspace, space adjacent to existing residential blocks and some third party land in relation to the commercial space.
- 3.8 We do not generally regard there to be a clear market value that can be attributed to airspace as the development of airspace is usually not possible by a third party, though its potential can generate an element of hope value. We can apply a similar principle to the extension of the existing blocks. The Council have included the costs of purchasing additional land within the appraisal and as such, we have not sought to include this for the purposes of the benchmark land value to avoid double counting.
- 3.9 The third party land amounts to £800,000 and is a relatively nominal element of the overall site. In looking at the price paid for land as a direct development cost we would expect some justification to be provided that the price fairly reflected council planning policies, especially in relation to the borough wide affordable housing target. The current scheme meets and arguably exceeds this policy requirement therefore in that sense the acquisition cost is not put forward as a barrier to meeting policy, consequently and recognising its relatively limited extent we have included this figure as legitimate development cost.
- 3.10 We have suggested to the Council that an alternative way of forming a judgement in relation to development viability for this site is to value all Council owned buildings over the entirety of the site in order to form the benchmark land value. We would then value the site assuming the proposed development had been carried out, including all existing property that will not be modified or demolished. This would form the scheme residual value. The residual value and the benchmark land value could then be compared in order to establish whether the proposed development delivers the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing maintaining viability. We have not explored this option for the current purposes as the scheme is in significant deficit without an allowance for the benchmark land value.
- 3.11 In order to carry out the above exercise we would need to have full details regarding the existing units, including the percentage owned by the Council and any agreements that are currently in place between the occupants and the Council which could impact unit value.
- 3.12 We are aware that a 2 bed ground floor flat sold on the triangle estate for £530,035 in March 2016 which equates to a HPI adjusted value of £544,345 (£7,560 sq.m / £702 sq.ft). This sale provides an indication of the values that could be attributed to the existing residential units.
- 3.13 We have not attributed any value to the benchmark land value although we note that the proposals include the demolition of six residential dwellings. The value of these units could be included within the benchmark land value.

## 4.0 Residential Values

### Private Residential Values

4.1 We understand that the proposed scheme would provide 54 new dwellings as follows:

- 26x 1 bed dwellings
- 17x 2 bed dwellings
- 10x 3 bed dwellings
- 1x 4 bed dwelling

The table below demonstrates the units to be developed.

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed
<b>Private</b>	17	8	1	1
<b>Social Rent</b>	9	9	9	0

4.2 A total of six existing dwellings would be lost as part of the proposed works, giving a net gain of 48 dwellings. We understand that the car park will be removed. The total revenue generated by the private residential units as provided within the appraisal is £18.42 million.

4.3 All of our comparable evidence has been adjusted in line with the Land Registry House Price Index (HPI) where appropriate in order to ensure the evidence is up to date and relevant.

4.4 The one bed units have been valued within a range of £450,000 - £635,000. Based on the Excel viability spreadsheet, the average value ascribed to the one bed units is £605,588 (£1,110 sq.ft / £11,949 sq.m). The applied values are in accordance with the advice provided by JLL. We have compiled the evidence below in order to determine the reasonableness of the proposed unit values.

Unit	Sale Price (+HPI)	sq.m	sq.ft	£sq.m	£sq.ft	Details
72 Worcester Point, EC1V 8AZ	£612,913	45.2	486	£13,560	£1,261	New Build, balcony & concierge. Superior location
Flat 24 Priestley House, EC1V 9JN	£484,228	51	549	£9,495	£882	Refurbished unit. Similar value micro-location
Flat 1 Chronicle Tower, EC1V 1AJ	£534,039	50	542	£10,681	£985	New Build, 14th floor flat, resident gym
16 Angelis Apartments, N1 8LH	£590,524	59	635	£10,009	£930	Modern development
25A Wilmington Square, WC1X 0EG	£611,064	54	581	£11,316	£1,052	LG unit floor, 2nd hand modern unit
Flat 131 Eagle Point, EC1V 1AR	£693,308	56	603	£12,376	£1,150	Very modern unit, 15th floor, higher value location

4.5 On the basis of the information we have seen, we are of the view that the proposed one bed unit values are reasonable. We consider that some of the proposed units have been valued at an optimistic level.

4.6 The proposed two bed units have been valued within a range of £745,000 - £750,000 with an average unit value of £746,625. The overall proposed sales rate is £1,055 sq.ft / £11,352 sq.m. We have compiled sales evidence as shown below.

Unit	Sale Price (+HPI)	sq.m	sq.ft	£sq.m	£sq.ft	Details
Flat 504 Canaletto Tower, EC1V 1AD	£883,219	82	878	£10,824	£1,006	Superior location within modern development
Flat 20 Angel Point, EC1V 2PZ	£748,748	67	721	£11,175	£1,038	Modern unit, penthouse with balcony
4, 10 Eagle Court, EC1M 5QD	£825,000	67	721	£12,313	£1,144	Built 2006, sold in good condition
Flat 92 Angel Southside, EC1V 7JW	£790,789	70	756	£11,265	£1,046	Second hand, 2nd floor & close to Angel underground
Flat 6 Print House, EC1R 0ET	£703,494	81	872	£8,685	£807	3rd floor modern converted unit

- 4.7 We consider the proposed two bed units to be valued at a reasonable level.
- 4.8 The proposed three bed unit has been valued for £1,060,000 which converts to a sales rate of £906 sq.ft / £9,756 sq.m. We have had reference to the following information.

Unit	Sale Price (+HPI)	sq.m	sq.ft	£sq.m	£sq.ft	Details
Flat 87 The Cooper Building, N1 7GR	£1,011,594	82	883	£12,337	£1,146	9th floor penthouse, built 2016
Flat 83 The Cooper Building, N1 7GR	£1,381,313	112	1206	£12,333	£1,146	Built 2016 with private balcony
5, 46 De Beauvoir Crescent, N1 5RY	£1,000,000	100	1076	£10,000	£929	Built 2010, 5th floor, balcony & parking.
Flat 21 Abraham House, E8 3GQ	£770,249	91.3	983	£8,436	£784	Built 2013, excellent condition, 5th floor, residents gym

- 4.9 The private four bed unit is valued at £1,100,000 (£792 sq.ft / £8,530 sq.m). There is limited evidence for four bed flat sales in close proximity of the subject site. We have sought to establish a value ceiling in reference to the sale of 12D Willow Bridge which sold for £1,325,000 (£933 sq.ft / £10,038 sq.m). This is a period conversion in excellent condition. We would not expect the subject units to achieve a superior sales value.
- 4.10 Capitalised ground rental income does not appear to be included within the appraisal. We propose rates of £250 for 1 beds, £300 for 2 beds, £350 for 3 beds, and £400 for 4 beds. We have adopted a capitalisation rate of 6%.

#### Affordable Unit Values

- 4.11 There are 27 affordable units that are allocated as social rent comprising a mixture of unit types (one, two and three beds).
- 4.12 The total calculated value from social rent units is £4.13 million which equates to £196.50 sq.ft / £2,115 sq.m based on the net floor area. We consider this to be reasonable in line with our expectations for the valuation of this tenure.

## 5.0 Retail Values

- 5.1 The approach in relation to retail units has been summarised within the Planning Statement as shown below. As we are only valuing the new retail property, we have paid particular attention to the unit at 135 Goswell Road.

### Retail floorspace provision: existing and proposed

Existing	Proposal	Use Class	Ground floorspace (sqm)	First floorspace (sqm)	Total floorspace
131 Goswell Road	Retain	A1 (general grocery / newsagent)	83.13	82.82	165.95
133 Goswell Road	Retain	A1 (barbershop)	40.43	44.85	85.28
135 Goswell Road	Demolish	A1 (café)	67.93	67.93	135.86
Total					387.09
<b>Proposed</b>					
135 Goswell Road			67.43	79.41	146.09

- 5.2 The proposed replacement unit at 135 Goswell Street appears to total an area of 146.09 sq.m whereas the component parts of the ground and first floor space total 146.84 sq.m. The proposed plans show a total GIA for the unit at 135 Goswell Road of 148.84 sq.m. This requires confirmation.
- 5.3 The report prepared by JLL refers to the value of the proposed commercial space. It appears that JLL have valued 79 sq.m of commercial space. JLL notes that this space could attract an annual rental value of £25,000 which equates to £316 sq.m / £29 sq.ft. We understand that JLL have based this assumption on a ground floor unit.

Address	Rent p.a.	sq.ft	sq.m	£sq.ft	£ sq.m	Date	Details
30 Old Street, EC1V 9AB	£75,000	2,300	214	£33	£351	01/10/16	73% basement space, new build retail space, preferable location
270 St. John Street, EC1V 4PE	£22,500	852	79	£26	£285	02/11/15	Second hand unit, satisfactory condition
121 King's Cross Road, WC1X 9NH	£27,500	821	76	£33	£362	01/05/16	5 year lease, second hand unit

- 5.4 We are of the view that the retail space on the first floor may attract a lower rental value rate. Therefore, we have adopted the rate applied by JLL for the ground floor space as well as a rate of £14.5 sq.ft / £156 sq.m for the first floor space. For 135 Goswell Road this provides a total annual rent of £33,433.

- 5.5 By way of yield evidence, we are aware that 83 Lever Street, EC1V 3RA sold in July 2014 for £545,000 at a net initial yield of 6.9%. This was sold as a Virtual Freehold of a double fronted retail unit. We have selected a yield of 7% for the purposes of the current analysis.
- 5.6 Our appraisal includes a total value for the new retail unit namely 135 Goswell Road of say £477,611. We have also deducted purchaser's costs within our appraisal.

## 6.0 Build Costs

- 6.1 We have been provided with a cost plan prepared by Walker Management which has been reviewed by our Cost Consultant Neil Powling FRICS. Neil has made some adjustments to the proposed costs in accordance with BCIS information. On this basis, the total build cost we have adopted in the appraisal is £16,958,246. Neil has also advised that an 8% allowance for professional fees is appropriate in this instance. The full cost review can be found in Appendix 1.
- 6.2 We have calculated the appropriate level of profit assuming:
- 20% on GDV for private residential units
  - 6% on GDV for affordable residential units
  - 15% on GDV for the new commercial space.
- 6.3 Based on the residential revenue provided by JLL and the Council as well as our assessment of ground rent and commercial values, we calculate a blended profit requirement of 17.40%. This does not take into account the special circumstances of the Council as the applicant.
- 6.4 We have allowed for the following additional costs and fees within the appraisal:
- Leaseholder buyback: [REDACTED]
  - Land acquisition of shop from third party [REDACTED]
  - Home Loss compensation £41,500
  - Public Realm Improvements: £516,750.

We have not seen further information in support of these allowances.

- 6.5 'Other' costs of £120,000 have also been included. We have not seen the basis of these costs so have excluded them for the purposes of this analysis.
- 6.6 We have assumed a construction period of say 18 months including pre-construction, however, we have not seen relevant information in this regard.
- 6.7 We have included finance costs applying an interest rate of 7% which is in line with our expectations of the current market and schemes we have seen in within the locality of the subject site.

# Appendix 1: Build Cost Review

Project: The Triangle Estate

P2016/4634/FUL

## 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The total of the cost plan at 1Q2016 TPI 276 is £16,210,000. The calculation of the update to TPI 291 by WM is £16,800,000. A further adjustment is made for "Adjusted totals in line with Measured Estimate increased cost and to include stores and bike stores floor areas" - we do not understand this addition which results in a total cost of £18,170,880 as it appears stores and bike stores are already included in the estate wide costs included in the £16.21M figure. Our calculation of the uplift to 1Q2017 TPI 290 is £17,032,246. Based on the information provided we consider the latter figure to be the appropriate one for inclusion in the viability appraisal.
- 1.2 The cost plan includes an allowance calculated at 17.5% for preliminaries but based on a calculation of a conventional arrangement of the sums in the analysis amounts to 19.66%. There is a further allowance for site constraints/ access restrictions amounting to 2.17% - this may reasonably be considered as a further preliminaries cost therefore a total preliminaries allowance of 21.83%. This is a very high allowance perhaps in recognition of the construction problems that these works will entail. We don't consider them unreasonable but consider there should be a construction management plan prepared to justify the costs.
- 1.3 The High Rise section includes a retail unit to shell only priced at £1500/m<sup>2</sup>. we consider this too high - the BCIS mean rate for shell only shops adjusted for location is £954/m<sup>2</sup>. We suggest the total of £222,000 is reduced to £148,000. We have excluded this amount from our analysis of the high rise tower as it distorts the analysis (the area is not included in the GIA).
- 1.4 The estate wide amount of £6,910,000 includes items of external works that are treated as abnormal costs for benchmarking purposes, but it also includes allowances such as structural repairs, roof repairs, heat source, door entry and lifts that would generally be included in the building elements. In our benchmarking we have deducted BCIS elemental amounts for heat source, lifts and communications to improve the like for like comparisons.
- 1.5 The benchmarking for the sections of garage infill, upper floor infill, penthouse, new build extension and refurbish extensions show the adjusted benchmark as exceeding the Applicant's cost whilst the Applicants figure for the high rise tower exceeds the adjusted benchmark. Overall the difference amount to c. £158,000 below the adjusted benchmark. Subject to 3.4 and 3.11 below we therefore consider the Applicant's costs to be reasonable.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 The objective of the review of the construction cost element of the assessment of economic viability is to benchmark the Applicant's costs against RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) average costs. We use BCIS costs for benchmarking

because it is a national and independent database. Many companies prefer to benchmark against their own data which they often treat as confidential. Whilst this is understandable as an internal exercise, in our view it is insufficiently robust as a tool for assessing viability compared to benchmarking against BCIS. A key characteristic of benchmarking is to measure performance against external data. Whilst a company may prefer to use their own internal database, the danger is that it measures the company's own projects against others of its projects with no external test. Any inherent discrepancies will not be identified without some independent scrutiny.

- 2.2 BCIS average costs are provided at mean, median and upper quartile rates (as well as lowest, lower quartile and highest rates). We generally use mean or occasionally upper quartile for benchmarking. The outcome of the benchmarking is little affected, as BCIS levels are used as a starting point to assess the level of cost and specification enhancement in the scheme on an element by element basis. BCIS also provide a location factor compared to a UK mean of 100; our benchmarking exercise adjusts for the location of the scheme. BCIS Average cost information is available on a default basis which includes all historic data with a weighting for the most recent, or for a selected maximum period ranging from 5 to 40 years. We generally consider both default and maximum 5 year average prices; the latter are more likely to reflect current regulations, specification, technology and market requirements.
- 2.3 BCIS average prices are available on an overall £ per sqm and for new build work on an elemental £ per sqm basis. Rehabilitation/conversion data is available on an overall £ per sqm and on a group element basis ie. substructure, superstructure, finishings, fittings and services - but is not available on an elemental basis. A comparison of the applicants elemental costing compared to BCIS elemental benchmark costs provides a useful insight into any differences in cost. For example: planning and site location requirements may result in a higher than normal cost of external wall and window elements.
- 2.4 If the application scheme is for the conversion, rehabilitation or refurbishment of an existing building, greater difficulty results in checking that the costs are reasonable, and the benchmarking exercise must be undertaken with caution. The elemental split is not available from the BCIS database for rehabilitation work; the new build split may be used instead as a check for some, but certainly not all, elements. Works to existing buildings vary greatly from one building project to the next. Verification of costs is helped greatly if the cost plan is itemised in reasonable detail thus describing the content and extent of works proposed.
- 2.5 BCIS costs are available on a quarterly basis - the most recent quarters use forecast figures, the older quarters are firm. If any estimates require adjustment on a time basis we use the BCIS all-in Tender Price Index (TPI).
- 2.6 BCIS average costs are available for different categories of buildings such as flats, houses, offices, shops, hotels, schools etc. The Applicant's cost plan should ideally keep the estimates for different categories separate to assist more accurate benchmarking. However if the Applicant's cost plan does not distinguish different categories we may calculate a blended BCIS average rate for benchmarking based on the different constituent areas of the overall GIA.
- 2.7 To undertake the benchmarking we require a cost plan prepared by the applicant; for preference in reasonable detail. Ideally the cost plan should be prepared in BCIS elements. We usually have to undertake some degree of analysis and rearrangement

before the applicant's elemental costs can be compared to BCIS elemental benchmark figures. If a further level of detail is available showing the build-up to the elemental totals it facilitates the review of specification and cost allowances in determining adjustments to benchmark levels. An example might be fittings that show an allowance for kitchen fittings, bedroom wardrobes etc that is in excess of a normal BCIS benchmark allowance.

- 2.8 To assist in reviewing the estimate we require drawings and (if available) specifications. Also any other reports that may have a bearing on the costs. These are often listed as having being used in the preparation of the estimate. If not provided we frequently download additional material from the documents made available from the planning website.
- 2.9 BCIS average prices per sqm include overheads and profit (OHP) and preliminaries costs. BCIS elemental costs include OHP but not preliminaries. Nor do average prices per sqm or elemental costs include for external services and external works costs. Demolitions and site preparation are excluded from all BCIS costs. We consider the Applicants detailed cost plan to determine what, if any, abnormal and other costs can properly be considered as reasonable. We prepare an adjusted benchmark figure allowing for any costs which we consider can reasonably be taken into account before reaching a conclusion on the applicant's cost estimate.
- 2.10 We undertake this adjusted benchmarking by determining the appropriate location adjusted BCIS average rate as a starting point for the adjustment of abnormal and enhanced costs. We review the elemental analysis of the cost plan on an element by element basis and compare the Applicants total to the BCIS element total. If there is a difference, and the information is available, we review the more detailed build-up of information considering the specification and rates to determine if the additional cost appears justified. If it is, then the calculation may be the difference between the cost plan elemental £/m<sup>2</sup> and the equivalent BCIS rate. We may also make a partial adjustment if in our opinion this is appropriate. The BCIS elemental rates are inclusive of OHP but exclude preliminaries. If the Applicant's costings add preliminaries and OHP at the end of the estimate (as most typically do) we add these to the adjustment amounts to provide a comparable figure to the Applicant's cost estimate. The results of the elemental analysis and BCIS benchmarking are generally issued as a PDF but upon request can be provided as an Excel spreadsheet.

### 3 GENERAL REVIEW

- 3.1 We have been provided with and relied upon the following files received:-
- Planning viability with unit information
  - An order of cost estimate prepared by Walker Management (WM) dated 17<sup>th</sup> February 2016
  - A Valuation Advisory issued by JLL dated 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016
  - The Triangle pre-planning LH 271016v1
- 3.2 We have also downloaded a number of files from the planning web site.
- 3.3 The cost plan comprises estimating sheets dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 1Q2016 with a TPI of 276. A further update to a forecast TPI of 291 1Q2017 has been applied. Our benchmarking uses current BCIS data (TPI 290) which is on a current tender firm price basis. The form of this Order of Cost Estimate is not ideal for elemental analysis and therefore for the form of elemental benchmarking we follow.



- 3.4 The total of the cost plan at 1Q2016 TPI 276 is £16,210,000. The calculation of the update to TPI 291 by WM is £16,800,000. A further adjustment is made for "Adjusted totals in line with Measured Estimate increased cost and to include stores and bike stores floor areas" - we do not understand this addition which results in a total cost of £18,170,880 as it appears stores and bike stores are already included in the estate wide costs included in the £16.21M figure. Our calculation of the uplift to 1Q2017 TPI 290 is £17,032,246. Based on the information provided we consider the latter figure to be the appropriate one for inclusion in the viability appraisal.
- 3.5 The cost plan includes an allowance calculated at 17.5% for preliminaries but based on a calculation of a conventional arrangement of the sums in the analysis amounts to 19.66%. There is a further allowance for site constraints/ access restrictions amounting to 2.17% - this may reasonably be considered as a further preliminaries cost therefore a total preliminaries allowance of 21.83%. This is a very high allowance perhaps in recognition of the construction problems that these works will entail. We don't consider them unreasonable but consider there should be a construction management plan prepared to justify the costs.
- 3.6 The allowance for overheads and profit (OHP) is 5.35% based on a calculation of a conventional arrangement of the sums in the analysis. We consider this allowance reasonable.
- 3.7 The allowance for contingencies is calculated at 2% + 2% +1% which based on a calculation of a conventional arrangement of the sums in the analysis is 5.34%. We consider a figure of 5% to be reasonable.
- 3.8 We have downloaded current BCIS data for benchmarking purposes including a Location Factor for Islington of 123 that has been applied in our benchmarking calculations.
- 3.9 The building comprises three blocks in a triangular arrangement each with a ground floor and 6 floors above; we have therefore benchmarked the building as 6+ storey flats. The Walker Management estimate identifies the different elements of the works as garage infill, upper floor infill, penthouse, new build extension, refurbish extensions, high rise tower, plus estate wide works.
- 3.10 Refer to our attached file "Elemental analysis and BCIS benchmarking".
- 3.11 The High Rise section includes a retail unit to shell only priced at £1500/m<sup>2</sup>. we consider this too high - the BCIS mean rate for shell only shops adjusted for location is £954/m<sup>2</sup>. We suggest the total of £222,000 is reduced to £148,000. We have excluded this amount from our analysis of the high rise tower as it distorts the analysis (the area is not included in the GIA).
- 3.12 The estate wide amount of £6,910,000 includes items of external works that are treated as abnormal costs for benchmarking purposes, but it also includes allowances such as structural repairs, roof repairs, heat source, door entry and lifts that would generally be included in the building elements. In our benchmarking we have deducted BCIS elemental amounts for heat source, lifts and communications to improve the like for like comparisons.
- 3.13 The benchmarking for the sections of garage infill, upper floor infill, penthouse, new build extension and refurbish extensions show the adjusted benchmark as exceeding the Applicant's cost whilst the Applicants figure for the high rise tower

exceeds the adjusted benchmark. Overall the difference amount to c. £158,000 below the adjusted benchmark. Subject to 3.4 and 3.11 Above we therefore consider the Applicant's costs to be reasonable.

BPS Chartered Surveyors

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017