



ISLINGTON

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## 5 March 2019

### SECOND DESPATCH

Please find enclosed the following items:

**Item 1** Elthorne Estate: Sunken Play Pitch in between St John's Way and Duncombe Road (site 1); St John's Community Centre, Holland Walk and adjacent caretakers lodge, Nicholay Road (site 2); Zoffany Park (site 3), Holland Walk, London, N19 1 - 4

Enquiries to : Zoe Lewis  
Tel : 020 7527 3486  
Email : [democracy@islington.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@islington.gov.uk)



This page is intentionally left blank



### ADDENDUM PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Development Management Service  
Planning and Development Division  
Environment and Regeneration Department

PLANNING COMMITTEE		AGENDA ITEM NO: B1
Date:	5 <sup>th</sup> March 2019	
Application number	P2018/2269/FUL	
Application type	Full Planning Application	
Ward	Hillrise	
Listed building	N/A	
Conservation area	Within 50m of Whitehall Park Conservation Area	
Development Plan Context	Archway Special Policy Area Local Cycle Routes Zoffany Park Open Space St John's Way Verge Open Space Within 50m of Whitehall Park Conservation Area	
Licensing Implications	None	
Site Address	Elthorne Estate: Sunken Play Pitch in-between St John's Way and Duncombe Road (site 1); St Johns Community Centre, Holland Walk and adjacent caretakers lodge, Nicholay Road (site 2); Zoffany Park (site 3) Holland Walk, LONDON, N19.	
Proposal	<p>The demolition of the sunken play pitch (site1), community centre and adjacent caretaker's lodge (site 2) and the construction of a new community centre [282.42 sqm GIA] (site 2) and 46 new dwellings (private and affordable) in four blocks (sites 1 and 2) ranging in height from two to six storeys with associated amenity space, bicycle parking spaces and improvements to the public realm (including to Zoffany Park, site 3).</p> <p>Additionally, stopping up of an area of existing highway to the north and west of Duncombe Road and land immediately west of 158-178 St Johns Way under Section 247 of the Planning Act 1990 to enable redevelopment of Site 1.</p>	
Case Officer	Stefan Sanctuary	
Applicant	Eleni Tsoskounoglou - New Build and Regeneration Team, London Borough of Islington.	
Agent	Sarah Eley - HTA Design LLP	

## 1. UPDATE FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF REPORT

- 1.1. Since the report was published on 25 February 2019 the following additional consultation responses 10 responses have been received (1 in support and 9 raising objections), which are summarised below, along with reference the paragraph number in the main report which addresses the matters raised:
- The buildings are too high and should be limited to only 2 or 3 storeys (not 6). The proposed height will be overbearing and not in keeping with the present skyline *[10.36 – 10.37 it should be noted that the DRP did not object to the height].*
  - There is concern that stopping up of parts of Duncombe Road would not be conducive to the well-being of local pedestrians who regularly use the footpaths to walk to the local school and surrounding properties. *[The ‘stopping up’ of the parking area between the new building and Duncombe Road would allow this space to be converted to new landscaped amenity space (improving the pedestrian environment). While the footpath adjoining 158 St Johns Way would be built over, this is considered acceptable as it allows for the best use of the site and it resolves existing security issues].*
  - The additional forty-six dwellings will put even more pressure on parking facilities which are already extremely limited in the immediate area. *[10.189 – 10.192]*
  - Traffic congestion will worsen, including during construction. *[10.197 see also condition 4. The use of sustainable forms of transport will be encouraged through the travel plan and the works to improve the pedestrian and cyclist environment]*
  - Previous construction at the school site proved that construction traffic found access problematic, including having to reverse long distances with banksmen (The signs are still attached to street furniture several years later). There were no children attending the school at the time, so this time round the problems could be considerable. *[10.197 see also condition 4.].*
  - Overnight parking has increased in recent times and conversely, the garages under the housing in Buxton Rd seem to be under utilised. This should be considered in a parking/traffic review of the area. *[10.189 – 10.192]*
  - Traffic is dramatically increased during events at the community centre, sometimes with accompanying antisocial behaviour. We are concerned about these issues being exacerbated in the new community centre. *[10.161 see condition 16 and 18]*
  - Future residents should be banned from owning cars *[Future residents will not be eligible for parking permits]*

## External Consultees

- London Fire Brigade: *The Brigade will be satisfied subject to the application meeting the access requirements of Approved Document B5 of the Building Regulations*

## Internal Consultees

Planning Policy and Development Viability Officer:

From my review the scheme cannot support a higher provision of affordable housing due to the following reasons:

- Higher construction costs associated with constructing the (infill) development on three separate sites within an existing housing estate.
- High contingency allowance adopted by the applicant to mitigate against project risks and future costs.
- High construction costs associated with the development of high quality homes, and high quality public realm and external works (landscaping etc.)
- Construction costs associated with the re-provision of a new community building which will be retained by the Council (outlay but no revenue).
- Construction costs associated with the development of affordable housing units (shared ownerships and social rent) (outlay but no revenue as these units are to be retained by the Council).
- Public realm works (Zoffany Park) and works to the estate's roads.

I have tested a theoretical appraisal of a scheme which didn't have to deal with the above issues and such a scheme would be able to deliver 72% of units as affordable housing (split 27% shared ownership and 73% social rent). However, in reality the issues do exist and impact on the scheme viability.

This page is intentionally left blank