



ISLINGTON

Environment and Regeneration

Development Management Service
Planning and Development Division
Environment & Regeneration Department
PO Box 3333
222 Upper Street
LONDON N1 1YA

ATT: Mr Matthais Hamm
Space
52 Great Eastern Street
London
EC2A 3EP

T 020 7527 2000
F 020 7527 2731
E planning@islington.gov.uk
W www.islington.gov.uk

Date: 06 October 2014
Our ref: Q2014/3537/SM
Your ref:
Please reply to: Joe Aggar

Dear Mr Matthais Hamm

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990:
RE: 265 CALEDONIAN ROAD

I refer to the correspondence, plans, elevations and documents that form your pre-application submission and our pre-application meeting held on the 24 July regarding the potential redevelopment of the site at the above address, I apologise for not being able to respond sooner to your request.

For the ease of reference I have listed the documents which form the basis for this response at the last page of this pre-application response.

This response is my pre-application advice relating to the above site and is given specifically in relation to the potential redevelopment of the site as suggested by your pre-application documentation submitted and includes the content of our discussion at the pre-application meeting. Should your pre-application scheme be altered this advice may become redundant; and this advice may no-longer be considered relevant if adopted planning policies at national, regional or local level are changed or amended; other factors such as case-law and subsequent planning permissions may also affect this advice.

The following advice has been broken into sections for the ease of dealing with each of the planning considerations.

PROPOSAL AND LOCATION

The pre-application proposal put forward for comment is for (officer's description):

'Erection of rear ground floor extension and partial width first floor extension plus the subdivision of the maisonette to create 2x1 bed flats'



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONSTRAINTS AND GUIDANCE

You may be aware that the site is the subject of the following designations/restrictions:

- Barnsbury Conservation Area

For ease of reference a list of the currently adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents (SPG's / SPD's) to the Development Plan and also Council guidance notes which are relevant to this site is provided below:

Islington LDF

- Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines
- Islington Urban Design Guide
- Small Sites Affordable Housing Contribution

London Plan

- none

RELEVANT HISTORY

Whilst there is no relevant planning history for the subject site itself, the following planning applications relating to surrounding sites are considered particularly relevant to the current pre-application proposal:

- 265, Caledonian Road, approval under ref. P850243 for Continued use of the ground floor as a Chinese hot food take away was given on 24/06/1985.

LAND USE

The proposed alterations would not raise any land use planning issues. The following paragraphs examine the remaining elements of the proposal.

CONSERVATION AND DESIGN

Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy (CS), 2011 and Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LP), 2013, accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in seeking to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, which include Conservation Areas (CA), through development which makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Taken together, they seek to ensure that heritage assets are conserved and enhanced through development which, amongst other things, respects and responds positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context, including local architecture and character, surrounding heritage assets, and locally distinctive patterns of development. In particular the Islington Urban Design Guide, 2006, emphasises the importance of reinforcing rhythm and uniformity to the rear of buildings as well as Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines, 2002, which sets out specific guidance on rear additions within the Barnsbury CA and makes clear that full width rear extension should be no higher than one storey or half width rear extensions no higher than two storeys.

Rear extensions should avoid disrupting the existing rhythm of the existing rear elevations, or dominate the main building. From the site visit it can be seen that there has been informal development to the rear lower ground floor. Nonetheless, the proposal for the ground floor extension whilst large in scale, it is important to note that there are significant rear extensions at these levels along this section of Caledonian Road. Bearing in mind this context the rear ground floor extension is considered acceptable.

The first floor addition would project more than half width of the rear elevation (2.7m). This would be considered contrary to the Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines para. 10.18. The principle however of a partial width two storey extension and full width single storey extension is considered acceptable in this instance. The half-width, two storey element should ideally be located on the stairwell side of the building.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposal is considered subordinate to the host building in terms of height and depth and would not be harmful to the rhythm of the rear terrace.

Notwithstanding this, the massing of the proposed rear extension may have to be amended to address the concerns highlighted in the section, 'amenity' below.

The removal of the render to the front elevation would be welcomed. A trail patch should be pursued first to ensure the brickwork is not damaged.

A terrace to the front elevation would likely be resisted on design grounds. This would require balustrades and screening to prevent overlooking to adjoining properties and its use would create clutter. This uncharacteristic feature would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

AMENITY

It is important to note that any extension should not prejudice the daylight, sunlight or outlook both of the property itself and those nearby. If the proposals are considered to be overbearing, reduce outlook or cause a harmful loss of light then the application may be refused. It is acknowledged there are adjacent terraces to the front elevation. The provision of a terrace to the front elevation would offer views backwards to what are believed to be habitable rooms and would lead to overlooking.

As you may know, the standard method for calculating loss of light to properties is contained within the BRE Guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (BRE Guidelines). The BRE Guidelines suggest a three stepped approach to measuring whether there might be a real and noticeable loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. If the 'first test' is met then it is considered that sufficient light is achieved and the remaining two, quite technical tests, would not normally be required.

The 'first test' in such circumstances would be the '45 degree rule' test. In short, a 45 degree angle line is drawn out from the centre point of the window or 1.6m high on glazed door on the elevation and also on the floorplan. The BRE Guidelines state that if a proposed neighbouring extension obstructs both of these 45 degree lines (i.e in height and depth) then the extension may cause noticeable loss of light. If it obstructs one of these lines but not both then sufficient light should be maintained. The partial width extension at first floor level (as proposed) would not obstruct this angle in elevation of plan.

It is acknowledged from the plans the flue as proposed would remain in situ. It should be explained if there are any mitigation measures proposed in terms of noise or vibration to not adversely impact the adjoining bedroom wall.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING SMALL SITES CONTRIBUTIONS

The Affordable Housing Small Site Contributions document was adopted on the 18th October 2012. This document provides information about the requirements for financial contributions from minor residential planning applications (below 10 units) towards the provision of affordable housing in Islington. As per the Core Strategy policy CS12, part G and the Affordable Housing Small Sites Contributions SPD, we would require a contribution of £50,000 per new residential unit in off-site

contributions in lieu of on-site provision, subject to viability. As discussed, there is the option to submit viability information which is then assessed independently by a Council appointed Surveyor. The applicant is expected to cover the costs of the independent review.

The Affordable Housing Small Sites Contribution SPD and supporting documents can be viewed on the Council's website. Further information can be provided on request from the Planning Policy team on 020 7527 1869.

QUALITY OF ACCOMMODATION

In terms of new residential development, as well as having concern for the external quality in design terms it is vital that new units are of the highest quality internally, being, amongst other things of sufficient size, functional, accessible, private, offering sufficient storage space and also be dual aspect. London Plan (2011) policy 3.5 requires that housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and the wider environment. Table 3.3 of the London Plan prescribes the minimum space standards for new housing, which is taken directly from the London Housing Design Guide space standards. Islington's Development Management policy DM3.4 also accords with these requirements, with additional requirements for storage space.

The proposed 2x1 bed units each exceed the London Plan 2011 / Table 3.2 of the Council's internal space standards. The internal layouts of the proposed residential units are considered to be generally acceptable and a satisfactory mix of unit sizes has been provided.

The proposed development will need to provide appropriate refuse arrangements to store and manage refuse and recycling. Waste storage and recycling facilities should be integrated into developments, in locations within the site that are accessible to all.

ACCESSIBILITY

Any residential development should be designed to meet the standards for flexible homes and wheelchair accessible homes contained within the Council's guidance 'Accessible Housing in Islington' (which incorporates and refines Lifetime Homes Standards). In the case of a development being proposed that does not meet these standards the specific issues should be clearly identified within the submission and the justification put forward for consideration.

Two options for access have been presented. It would be preferred for access to be gained from the front (Caledonian Road) with provision made with a separate residential access door. The Islington Urban Design Guide highlights the importance of coherent and active street frontages and the provision of access via Caledonian Road would enhance this. Entering the property from the rear may lead to concerns over safety and future concerns of residents.

HIGHWAYS

Islington policy identifies that all new development shall be car free. Car free development means no parking provision will be allowed on site and occupiers will have no liability to obtain car parking permits, except for parking needed to meet the needs of disabled people. Residents of the development will not be eligible to attain on-street parking permits, unless required to meet the needs of occupiers registered disabled.

The provision of secure, sheltered and appropriately located cycle parking facilities (residents) will be expected in accordance with Transport for London's guidance: 'Cycle Parking Standards – TfL Proposed Guidelines'. Subject to there being sufficient capacity, the secure and integrated location of the proposed cycle storage on the ground floor is acceptable. Policy DM8.4 of the Development

Management Policies supports sustainable methods of transport and requires the provision of 1 cycle space per bedroom and 1 cycle space per 250sqm of business floorspace.

MAYORAL (CIL), CROSSRAIL AND S106

Policy 8.3 of the London Plan and CIL legislation sets out Mayoral CIL requirements. This proposed development would be liable for the Mayoral CIL payment, which in Islington is calculated at £50sqm (GIA). Policy 6.5 of the London Plan 2011, seeks Crossrail contributions to help to deliver this strategically important infrastructure. Guidance 'Use of Planning Obligations in the Funding of Crossrail' advises on the handling of applications including setting out the charges and formulae. Policy 8.2 sets out that Crossrail and affordable housing contributions as well as other public transport improvements should be given the highest importance. It does state that Crossrail contributions should be given higher priority than other public transport improvements.

The Islington Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was adopted on 1st September 2014. This will apply to any application which is liable for CIL which was granted planning permission on or after 1st September 2014 or permitted development which becomes liable on or after this date. This will apply in addition to the Council adopted planning policies (including small sites affordable housing contribution) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy. For details of charging rates and other information please see:
http://www.islington.gov.uk/services/planning/planningpol/community_infrastructure_levy/Pages/islington-community-infrastructure-levy-cil.aspx.

ENERGY AND SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

It is council's and the Mayor's objective that all developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. The incorporation of a green roof would be welcomed.

WAY FORWARD

It is my opinion that the principle of a ground and partial width rear extension would be considered acceptable in principle, albeit subject to concerns over the location and massing of the partial width element. The provision of a terrace to the front would not be supported. I suggest that you review the pre-application proposal in light of the concerns raised at this stage.

DOCUMENTS REQUIRED IN ORDER TO VALIDATE A FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATION

Should you wish to submit a planning application without pursuing the above matters further at pre-application stage please note, in accordance with our local validation requirements, the following documents are likely to be required for validation before the application is considered valid. More detail is available on our website (www.islington.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/Applications). Some necessary documents have already been mentioned within this response. Please note that the list below forms an initial list and may be altered / added to depending on the nature of the submission made:

- Design and Access Statement
- Existing and proposed drawings (elevations, plans, sections, including neighbouring properties)
- Site map
- Photographs/photomontages (as necessary)

This information is required for validation of the application but it is not essential that it is organised exactly in the way suggested above.

CONSIDERATION OF THIS PRE-APPLICATION RESPONSE

Please be advised that this response is given at officer level and does not form a formal decision of the council with regard to future planning application(s) or other formal approaches. The views expressed above are given in good faith, to the best of ability, and without prejudice to the formal consideration of any future planning application, which will be subject to formal consultation and ultimately decided on by the council. Should you require any further information or advice, please do not hesitate to contact me via email or on the telephone number below.

Yours sincerely



Joseph Aggar

Development Management Service
Planning and Development Division
Environment & Regeneration Department
T: 0207-527-2449
F: 0207-527-2731
E: joe.aggar@islington.gov.uk

Documents, Plans, Elevations, Correspondence Forming the Applicant's Submission:

- Site Location Plan
- Design and Access Statement (pre-app)
- CAL_E01; CAL_P01c
- CAL_P02c
- CAL_P03c

Attendees at Meeting of 15/07/14:

Matthias Hamm
Joe Aggar