

COUNCIL STATEMENT

Chapter 2 – Design and character

1. DM3 – Part A.a. Public Art – does it require planning permission – should it be agreed by the Council in every case. ‘Maintained in perpetuity’ will require a legal agreement – see my comment on planning obligations in Inspector’s note 1.

The policy relates to only to Major Development proposals and the Council would expect the provision of public art to form part of the planning application as an integrated component of the overall high quality urban realm offer. The nature of ‘public art’ is that it is intended to materially affect the visual experience of users, and the Council will wish to ensure such visual effects are positive in all circumstances, and that the public art provided across the borough is of an equivalent quality.

2. DM3 – Part B. Privately owned public spaces. This is a blanket policy – is it appropriate in all circumstances? Where is the evidence that this is an appropriate matter to control in every case?

The policy is required to be a blanket policy as the requirements therein are applicable to a wide range of potential developments of all scales from the forecourt of a single new retail unit, to a tube station entrance, through to a major mixed use scheme. The trigger is therefore any new development that includes privately owned public space, and would therefore not be applicable to the vast bulk of applications received by the Council that relate to householder applications and minor development.

There is no specific evidence, rather it reflects the existing practice by Haringey’s urban design and development management planners in pre-application discussions and in their assessment of planning applications. It also reflects the proposals in the Site Allocations DPD and Tottenham AAP for comprehensive redevelopment of sites in multiple ownership where the Council is seeking provision of a network of privately own public open spaces, for which we would wish to ensure the quality and management arrangement are consistent across ownership boundaries and within neighbourhoods.

3. DM5 – Is this policy flexible enough? Would it conflict with other regeneration/development aims of the Council, for example in Wood Green? How could criteria A.a be met?

DM5 is considered to provide sufficient flexibility for development to come forward whilst protecting locally significant views. The policy does not set a blanket restriction on new development within identified viewing corridors. Rather, it requires that proposals seek to avoid and minimise obstructions to views, with impacts of development to be considered on a case by case basis having regard to the quality of views in individual site circumstances. Whilst provision is made for more intensive development in Haringey’s Growth Areas, it is considered that the quantum of development planned for these areas can be delivered through a rigorous, design-led process which takes account of locally

significant views. To assist with policy implementation, the Council will prepare a Tall Buildings and Views Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in DM5.A(c).

Proposals can satisfy the criteria of DM5.A(a) by applying deliberate design treatments to avoid obstructing or blocking of views or vistas, for example, by incorporating gaps in clusters of tall or taller buildings or in site landscaping (e.g. trees), or through the reconfiguration of buildings to enhance viewing corridors in larger comprehensive development schemes, including from public spaces within and without of the development site.

4. DM6 – Part B. The term ‘community benefit’ is not clear, nor is it explained in the text. What is it? Does the Council intend that for every ‘taller’ building, a community benefit (whatever that may be) is derived, if so, where is the justification for this?

The term ‘community benefit’, also referred to as ‘public benefit’ is not a new term in a planning context. Typically, if a development results in adverse impacts that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, the assessment of the application will weigh any community benefits offered by the development proposal to offset these. This is particularly the case for development adversely impacting on heritage assets.

Meeting increasing housing and employment needs in a constrained urban borough such as Haringey necessarily means an intensification of land uses. While ‘taller’ buildings will play an important functional role in helping Haringey meet its growth requirements, by their very nature, they are a prominent building form within the local context. Consideration therefore needs to be had to the impact of proposals for ‘taller’ buildings on, and their contribution to, local communities. The former can be addressed by compliance with the criteria of Part B of the Policy, while the latter justified by the achievement of outcomes which benefit the local community (i.e. beyond meeting housing needs and contributing to physical infrastructure via CIL). Community benefits may therefore comprise any range of tangible economic, social and/or environmental benefits, including but not limited to:

- Employment and training opportunities;
- Use of local supply chains;
- Support for local community initiatives;
- Community liaison and engagement; and
- Provision of local amenities/improvement beyond that required of the development

The Council does intend that every ‘taller’ building proposal set out its contribution to the local community, with the benefits offered tailored to the local community’s needs and proportionate to the size and type of the development.

5. DM6 – Part C. Is this policy too restrictive? It uses the words ‘only be acceptable’ implying that everywhere else tall buildings will be unacceptable. Is that the case? Where is the justification showing that tall buildings are unacceptable elsewhere?

DM6 gives effect to London Plan policy 7.7 which encourages Boroughs to give consideration to and identify locations appropriate for tall buildings, recognising that not all locations will be suitable for development of this type. DM6.C provides that tall buildings will only be acceptable in areas identified in DM Figure 2.2, meaning that proposals for tall buildings located elsewhere in the Borough will not be considered acceptable.

The policy has been prepared taking account of the requirements of the London Plan and informed by local evidence, including the Urban Characterisation Study (2015) and the Tall Buildings Locations Validations Study (2015), with the latter study including a detailed appraisal of locations across Haringey. As inappropriately located and poorly designed tall buildings can result in significant adverse impacts (including on local character, townscapes, the historic environment, strategic views, amenity and microclimate) a rigorous approach is needed to manage this type of development. The requirements are considered proportionate to achieving policy objectives, whilst providing sufficient scope for proposals to come forward within appropriate locations in Growth Areas and Areas of Change, consistent with the spatial strategy. To assist with policy implementation the Council will prepare a Tall Buildings and Views Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in DM6.C(c).