

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

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

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE B	AGENDA ITEM NO:
Date: 15 th July 2014	NON-EXEMPT

Application number	P2014/1863/FUL
Application type	Full Planning Application
Ward	Finsbury Park
Listed building	N/A
Conservation area	N/A
Development Plan Context	Core Strategy Key Area; Nags Head and Upper Holloway Road
Licensing Implications	None
Site Address	Pakeman Primary School, Hornsey Road, London N7 6QN
Proposal	The removal of the existing single storey canopy, adjacent to the Hornsey Road frontage, and the construction of a single storey extension with roof lights to provide a dedicated Two-Year-Old Facility for pre nursery infants.

Case Officer	Ashley Niman
Applicant	Sachin Desai, LB Islington
Agent	Charles Barclay Architects

1. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is asked to resolve to **GRANT** planning permission:

1. subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1;

2. SITE PLAN (site outlined in black)



3. PHOTOS OF SITE/STREET



Image 1: The school and site, north east elevation fronting Hornsey Road.



Image 2: The existing canopy (left) and the church (right), with the acacia at centre.

4.0 SUMMARY

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for the removal of the existing open canopy, its replacement with a single storey mono-pitched structure and the relocation of the open canopy to its rear, to provide a dedicated Two Year Old Facility.
- 4.2 The application is brought to committee because it is a Council-own development.
- 4.3 The principal of the land use is acceptable. Although there is a loss of external playspace of 52m², this is balanced against the clear need to provide for the Two-Year-Old Facility.
- 4.3 The new structure would sit well within the streetscene, being relatively modest. However, the Design & Conservation Officer has required a better quality roof material in order to relate satisfactorily to the neighbouring chapel.
- 4.4 The new structure will not materially affect the amenity of adjacent residents.
- 4.5 The Tree Officer objects to the loss of the acacia tree but if it is removed, a minimum of three trees would be required to replace it and this has been agreed.
- 4.6 It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

5.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING

- 5.1 Pakeman School is a 1890s Victorian Board School of three storeys and of characteristic design, including large areas of glazing and a prominent roof form. The building is not listed nor in a conservation area.
- 5.2 The school buildings occupy about half of its own site, with play areas to the north, south and west of the main building. Access is from the main entrance on Hornsey Road, and there is another access to Pakeman Street.
- 5.3 The surrounding area is in mixed use, with residential use being the primary land use, some retail use to ground floor along Hornsey Road, and the Sobell Centre facing the site to the south east.

6.0 PROPOSAL (in Detail)

- 6.1 The removal of the existing open canopy, its replacement with a single storey mono-pitched structure and the relocation of the open canopy to its rear, to provide a dedicated Two Year Old Facility.

7.0 RELEVANT HISTORY:

Planning Applications:

- 7.1 P120236 Erection of a single storey building in playground next to 141 Hornsey Road and 65 Arthur Road. Approved 21/03/2012.
- 7.2 P080073 Erection of a bicycle shelter. Approved 08/04/2008
- 7.3 P060854 Adaptation of ground floor forming new structural opening. Relocation of toilet and main entrance. Approved 05/07/2006.
- 7.4 P042531 Addition of a first floor mansard roof extension to existing single storey play centre annexe. Refused 23/12/2004.
- 7.5 **Pre-application Advice:** A site visit was held on the 11th March 2014 with the applicant, agent and the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer and the Tree Officer. The advice was that the proposal was acceptable in principle subject to considerations of the play area to be lost and how this would be recovered elsewhere on site, and secondly, consideration of the materials of the new roof. The Tree Office objected to the loss of the acacia tree but if it was removed, at least three trees should be planted as replacements on the school site.

Enforcement:

- 7.6 None

8.0 CONSULTATION

Public Consultation

- 8.1 Letters were sent to occupants of 116 adjoining and nearby properties at Pakeman Street, Hornsey Road, Arthur Road and Kinloch Street on 27th May 2014. A site notice was displayed on 5th June 2014. The public consultation of the application therefore expired on 26th June 2014; 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 no responses had been received from the public with regard to the application.

External Consultees

- 8.3 None

Internal Consultees

- 8.4 **Access Officer:** No objection to the proposal subject to detail.
- 8.5 **Policy Officer:** Discusses the principal of loss of playground space but also the provision of additional space for pre-nursery.
- 8.6 **Conservation and Design Officer:** No objection subject to conditions.

- 8.7 **Tree Officer:** objects to loss of the acacia tree, and any potential root damage to the adjacent lime.
- 8.8 **Designing out Crime Office:** No comments regarding the design. Recommends Secured by Design standard
- 8.9 **Sport England.** Response received advising no objections or comments.

9.0 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.

Development Plan

- 9.2 The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2011, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013. The policies of the Development Plan are considered relevant to this application and are listed at Appendix 2 to this report.
- 9.3

Designations

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

Islington Local Plan

Core Strategy Key Area; Nags Head and Upper Holloway Road

London Plan

Mayors Protected Vista (Alexandra Palace to St Paul's Cathedral)

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)

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

10.0 ASSESSMENT

The main issues arising from this proposal relate to:

- Land Use and Need
- Design Considerations
- Neighbouring amenity
- Accessibility.

- Trees and Landscaping

Land-use and Need

- 10.1 Pakeman Primary School is a former Victorian Board School, now a primary school.
- 10.2 On 1 September 2013, education became a statutory entitlement for around 130,000 two-year olds in England (some 20% of two year olds), with local authorities having a duty to secure provision. From 2014, this will extend to 40%. The programme will improve life chances for some of the most vulnerable children and allow parents to parent to return to or extend their work or training.
- 10.3 In Islington, 781 children were eligible under September 2013 criteria, rising to 1117 in September 2014. There are currently 550 places available in Islington, rising to about 700 by September 2014. This sets the background for the application.
- 10.4 The loss of the playground space will require a balanced judgement against the need for greater educational provision and the levels of playground space and quality of provision that will continue to be provided. There is separate guidance issued by DoE about the loss of playing fields, with a loss requiring a separate Section 77 application. This has been applied for. Section 77 consent is considered outside the planning application process, however it is important as it will consider if the loss can be justified based on the submission of evidence.
- 10.5 London Plan policy 3.19 states that “Proposals that result in a net loss of sports and recreation facilities, including playing fields should be resisted.” Further guidance is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that: “open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless,
- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
 - the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
 - the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.
- 10.6 Policy DM6.3 of the Development Management policies seeks to protect existing play space across the borough by resisting their loss unless a replacement play space of equivalent size and functionality is proved to meet the needs of the local population. The new extension to provide for 2 year olds will reduce the nursery playground from 274sqm to 199sqm. The part of the nursery playground that would be built over is in the north east corner and is in shadow at most times of day and is currently under used by the children. It is also a priority to keep the very young children in the Two Year Old Facility and the children in the Nursery grouped together in the north east corner of the school. This approach is less costly than a wholesale reorganisation of the main school layout. Furthermore, the existing play equipment in the Nursery playground will be rearranged and updated to make more efficient use of the space. Whilst there is a net loss of playground, this is balanced against the need to provide space for two year olds and assists the Council in

delivering an enhanced educational provision for residents in the Borough. The benefits to educational provision are offset against the loss of playground space and the improved facility albeit reduced playground area. In these circumstances, it is not considered that planning permission should be withheld. This is considered to comply with the provisions of the NPPF and the Council's policies in this regard.

- 10.7 Should the reduced Nursery play area prove problematic, the school has the option of moving the sports pitch from its current location to elsewhere in the main playground and enlarging the western part of the Nursery playground by moving the dividing fence towards the south.
- 10.8 The provision of the new facility can be classified as the provision of new social infrastructure. Development Management Policy DM4.12 therefore applies. The policy has particular relevance in regard to inclusive access, avoiding adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding uses, and seeking to ensure the safety and amenity of children. These matters are covered below under Access and Amenity.
- 10.9 The London Plan supports new and expanded education facilities. Policy 3.18 states "Development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported including new build, expansion of existing facilities or change of use to educational purposes. Those which address the current projected shortage of primary schools places will be particularly supported". There is therefore in principle support for additional education facilities for primary schools.
- 10.10 The intake is expected to be around twelve children with three to four carers. Given that the children are very small, it is important that they have their own dedicated space close to the nursery area. It is also important for these infants and their parents to have their own entrance door from the street to avoid jostling from bigger children.

Design and Heritage Considerations

- 10.11 The building is a former Board School, dating from the late 1880s and was designed for the London School Board. The principal elevation is to the south east fronting Hornsey Road.
- 10.12 There is no objection to the removal of the existing canopy. Although it is a lightweight structure it protrudes considerably above the boundary wall and detracts from the appearance of both the school and the adjacent listed part of the church. The removal of chicken wire fencing on top of the canopy will be a further visual benefit.
- 10.13 The new single storey structure will rise as a monopitch extending rearwards to adjoin the re-sited existing canopy. From a streetscape point of view, this structure will be less dominant and provide a better setting for the school and the church. Internally, it will provide a lofty space and the various rooflights will ensure a well lit interior. The material for the roof will be conditioned but the colour will closely reflect the slate roof of the church. The visible vertical side panel to the roof will be constructed of timber, and again considered sympathetic to the setting of the church.

10.14 The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies 2013, and policy CS9 of the Core Strategy 2011.

Accessibility

10.15 The proposal has been reviewed by the Inclusive Design Officer. The functioning of the space has been improved to ensure the ramps are useable and comply with Building Regulations, including gradient levels. The WC within the Two Year Old Facility is designed to accessible standard. The width of the general access door to the front is 1060mm clear. A historic gateway in the brick playground wall as the entrance to the new Two Year Old space will be opened up; this is a conscious design and conservation decision that has already been agreed with planning officers. The new door inside the opening in the brickwork will be detailed so that the 1060mm clear opening is maintained through the actual doorway, and so that the door can be opened well beyond 90 degrees. This should be sufficient for wheelchair access to the new space. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy DM2.2 of the Development Management Policies 2013.

Landscaping and Trees

10.16 The treescape of the site is defined by three mature pollarded lime trees and one False Acacia. The acacia lies directly on the site proposed to be constructed on. It is of apparent good health, form and vitality and has no irredeemable defects. The trees are not currently protected by a tree protection order nor are they within a conservation area but are considered to have merit.

10.17 Policy DM6.5 seeks to ensure development has minimum impact on tree, shrubs and other significant vegetation. Any loss or damage, or adverse effect on their growing conditions, will only be permitted where there are over-riding planning benefits, and must be agreed with the Council and suitably provided elsewhere.

10.18 The proposal will lead to the loss of the acacia and potential damage to the root system of the one adjacent lime tree. The Tree Officer objects to the loss of the acacia and is concerned about the potential damage to the roots of the closest lime tree.

10.19 However, if the acacia is agreed to be removed, the Council would wish to see a minimum of three trees to be planted to replace the environmental and amenity loss. The location and species of tree would be agreed in consultation with the Tree Officer. The loss of the trees has to be balanced against the enhanced and improved education provision on the site. Whilst the losses are unfortunate, suitable replacement planting will help to ameliorate the loss of trees on this site. It is considered the scheme would accord with [policies](#): CS7, CS15A, B and F of the Islington Core Strategy 2011 and 6.5 of the Development Management [policies](#) 2013.

Neighbouring Amenity

10.20 The Council seeks to ensure that new development does not harm the amenity of adjacent residents or other occupiers, either from loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy

and overlooking, sense of enclosure or noise. The proposed structure will be single storey and will be set behind a retained boundary school wall to the Hornsey Road frontage. The only immediately adjacent property is the side (long elevation) of the Emanuel Church. There will be no material amenity impact to the church. The proposal is therefore considered not to prejudice the amenity of neighbouring properties in line with policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies.

11.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

- 11.1 The principle of the land use is acceptable. There is an overall loss of external playspace of 52m² but the report has given consideration to the particular character of the area of playspace affected the upgrading of playspace elsewhere and the balancing of this loss against the clear need for the Two-Year-Old Facility as an enhanced educational facility.
- 11.2 The new design would provide an improved setting for the adjacent listed church and the school by providing a more distinct gap between the properties.
- 11.3 It is accepted that the proposal would involve the loss of the acacia tree but this would be mitigated by the planting of three new trees within the school site.
- 11.3.1 As such, the proposed development is considered to accord with the policies in the London Plan, Islington Core Strategy, Islington Development Management Policies, and the National Planning Framework and is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

Conclusion

It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in Appendix 1 - RECOMMENDATIONS.

APPENDIX 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION A

That the grant of planning permission be subject to conditions:

List of Conditions:

1	Commencement
	CONDITION: The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
	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).
2	Approved plans list
	<p>CONDITION: The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>(P)01 X, (P)02 X, (P)03 A, (P)04 X, (P)05 X, (P)06 X, (P)07 X, (P)08 X, (P)09 X, (P)10 X, (E)00 X, (E)01 X, (E)02 X, (E)03 X, (E)04 X, (E)05 X, (E)06 X, (E)07 X, (E)08 X, (E)09 X, Design and Access Statement (Charles Barclay Architects 12 May 2014), Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report (GHA Trees, 17 March 2014, Ref GHA/DS/1960:14).</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>
3	Materials and samples (details)
	<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 commencing on site. The details and samples shall include:</p> <p>a) Timber side elevation treatment;</p> <p>b) roofing material.</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 securing sustainable development and to ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard..</p>
4	Trees (root protection)
	<p>CONDITION: An Arboricultural Method statement (AMS) shall be submitted prior to the commencement of work on site to determine the impact of the excavation and the methods proposed to minimise damage to the adjacent lime tree, and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed methodology.</p> <p>REASON: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained.</p>
5	Trees (replacement trees)
	<p>CONDITION: Three replacement trees are to be planted within the first planting season of removal of the existing tree (November to March).</p> <p>The position, size, species, soil preparation, tree pit detail (to include a minimum of one metre cubed rooting area per tree), staking and a three year scheme of maintenance/watering provision for the trees are to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to planting taking place.</p> <p>In the event of the tree dying within 5 calendar years form the completion of works a tree of the same species and size or an</p>

	<p>approved alternative shall be planted to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure the continued amenity and environmental benefits provided by the trees and the planting of appropriate species. In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained.</p>
6	Playspace Provision
	<p>CONDITION: The relocated children's playspace area shall be provided/installed prior to the first occupation of the Two-Year-Old Facility and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To secure the appropriate provision of children's playspace.</p>

List of Informatives:

1	Positive Statement
	<p>To assist applicants in a positive manner, the Local Planning Authority has produced policies and written guidance, all of which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>A pre-application advice service is also offered and encouraged. 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 accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>

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 2011, 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 2011 - Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London

3 London's people Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all Policy 3.18 Education facilities	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 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology Policy 7.18 Protecting local open space and addressing local deficiency
---	--

B) Islington Core Strategy 2011

Spatial Strategy Policy CS8 (Enhancing Islington's Character)	Policy CS15 (Open Space and Green Infrastructure) Policy CS16 (Play Space) Policy CS17 (Sports and Recreation Provision)
Strategic Policies Policy CS9 (Protecting and Enhancing Islington's Built and Historic Environment)	Infrastructure and Implementation Policy CS18 (Delivery and Infrastructure) Policy CS19 (Health Impact Assessments)

C) Development Management Policies June 2013

Design DM2.1 Design DM2.2 Inclusive Design	Energy and Environmental Standards DM7.4 Sustainable design standards
Health and open space DM6.3 Protecting open space	Infrastructure DM9.1 Infrastructure DM9.3 Implementation

DM6.4 Sport and recreation
DM 6.5 Landscaping, trees and
biodiversity

DM 4.12 Social & strategic infrastructure
& cultural facilities.

Designations

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

Islington Local Plan

Core Strategy Key Area; Nags Head and
Upper Holloway Road

London Plan

Mayors Protected Vista (Alexandra
Palace to St Paul's Cathedral)

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)

The following SPGs and/or SPDs are relevant:

Islington Local Plan

Environmental Design
Urban Design Guide
Accessibility SPD

London Plan

Accessible London: Achieving and
Inclusive Environment
Providing for Children and Young
Peoples Play and Informal Recreation
Planning for Equality and Diversity in
London