

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.0 The Approved Scheme</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0 Proposed Revisions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.0 Key Issues</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.0 Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>

## **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This report is submitted in support of the full planning application and Listed Building application, which together propose alterations to the scheme previously approved as part of planning permission P00/2501 and Listed Building Consent P00/2502.

1.2 The report provides a brief summary of the approved scheme, identifies the proposed revisions and evaluates the issues before concluding.

1.3 Other documents submitted in support of the planning and Listed Building Consent applications and referred to as part of this report, are as follows:

- Environmental Report – Hepher Dixon
- Design Statement – Allies and Morrison
- Draft Conservation Plan – Purcell Miller Tritton
- Landscape Statement – Christopher Bradley-Hole Landscape
- Transport Assessment – Steer Davies Gleave
- Daylight and Sunlight Report – Drivers Jonas
- Structural Report – Buro Happold
- Drainage Report – Buro Happold
- Energy Statement – Hoare Lea
- Acoustic Report – Hoare Lea

## 2.0 The Approved Scheme

- 2.1 In May 2002, two applications were approved in respect of the Highbury site. The first (Ref: P00/2502), a Listed Building Consent application, related solely to the East Stand and dealt with all the changes to the Listed building. The second (Ref: P00/2501) was a part full and part outline application. The full element covered the Listed East Stand, the pitch area (and underground car park), the West Stand and the retained buildings namely 191 Highbury Hill, 58 Avenell Road and 89 Gillespie Road. The outline element covered the rest of the site.
- 2.2 The uses for which planning permission and listed building consent were obtained are summarised in the table below.

Use	Number/Area
Residential <sup>1</sup>	557 units (including 11 refurbished)
1 bedroom	182 (inc 8 refurbished)
2 bedroom	302 (incl 3 refurbished)
3 bedroom	56
4 bedroom	17
Car Parking	486 spaces (476 for residential)
Nursery	630m <sup>2</sup> plus 300 m <sup>2</sup> outdoors
B1	1812m <sup>2</sup>
D2 Gym	1001m <sup>2</sup>
Health Centre	1050m <sup>2</sup>

- 2.2 Since the scheme was approved, the architects Allies & Morrison have continued to refine the design. The outcome of this process has resulted in a number of alterations to the scheme and these are set out in the following section.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that although the total number of dwellings was approved, the size and mix of the dwellings was not.

### **3.0 Proposed Revisions**

- 3.1 The approved scheme included a number of peripheral properties on Highbury Hill, Avenell Road and Gillespie Road. The only peripheral properties to form part of the revised submission are 133-135 Highbury Hill.

#### **East Stand**

- 3.2 Overall, the design, height, massing and use of the East Stand remain virtually the same as that previously approved. The main differences are as follows.
- 3.3 The extent of the basement underneath the East Stand will be less than that previously approved, in order to avoid the need for underpinning of the Avenell Road façade. This is viewed as a positive alteration as it helps to minimise the level of disturbance to the Listed Building.
- 3.4 The B1 element of the approved scheme has been removed from the basement and as a consequence the layout has changed. The gym/health club is larger than that previously approved (1991m<sup>2</sup> compared to 1001m<sup>2</sup>) and the remainder of the basement provides accommodation for plant and cycle spaces.
- 3.5 To improve circulation throughout the East Stand the single core arrangement has been replaced by four cores. This approach has enabled the long central corridor that provided access to all of the units on each level, to be omitted and replaced with an improved localised access core arrangement.
- 3.6 The change to the core arrangement required the internal layouts of the residential units to be re-planned. This has enabled units to face onto Avenell Road and therefore allows the East Stand to address the street frontage, something that the approved scheme did not do.
- 3.7 The internal re-planning has also resulted in a change to the mix of units, which is summarised in the table below.

<b>Size of flat</b>	<b>Number of flats Approved</b>	<b>Number of flats Proposed</b>
Studios	0	5
1 bedroom	32	46
2 bedroom	51	56
3 bedroom	4	4
4 bedroom	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>111</b>

- 3.8 The proposed changes result in a better mix of accommodation by introducing studio accommodation and increasing the number of one bedroom units. The number of two bedroom units has increased marginally and the number of three bedroom units has remained the same.
- 3.9 The change to the layout has altered the appearance of the units behind the glazed elevation onto the main garden. The approved unit layout generated a vertical rhythm that could be seen behind the glazed elevation. The revised unit layout will generate a horizontal and vertical rhythm that will be visible behind the glazed facade. It is considered that this alteration will add interest to the garden façade, and so is an improvement.
- 3.10 In order to maximise the level of natural daylight to the units on the top floors, it is proposed to introduce openings into the roof on both the main garden and Avenell Road sides of the stand. These openings will be recessed and therefore will not be visible from the street. This approach ensures that appearance of the existing roof structure remains intact whilst enabling best use to be made of the new space within.

### **West Stand**

- 3.11 The design, height, massing and use of the West Stand remain virtually the same as that previously approved. The main differences are as follows.

- 3.12 The extent of the basement underneath the West Stand will be less than that previously approved in order to avoid the need for underpinning. This is viewed as a positive alteration as it helps to minimise the level of disturbance to the retained structure.
- 3.13 The layout of the basement in this location has changed from a storage area to one that will accommodate plant and cycle parking.
- 3.14 The provision of four cores described above in respect of the East Stand, will also be implemented in the West Stand. As a consequence of the internal re-planning, the mix of units has changed as summarised below.

<b>Size of flat</b>	<b>Number of flats Approved</b>	<b>Number of flats Proposed</b>
Studios	0	3
1 bedroom	40	42
2 bedroom	48	69
3 bedroom	6	2
4 bedroom	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>116</b>

- 3.15 The alterations have enabled studio accommodation to be introduced and allowed the number of two bedroom units to be increased, whilst the number of three bedroom units has decreased.

### **North Stand**

- 3.16 One of the main alterations to the approved scheme is the proposal for the redevelopment of the North Stand. The changes are explained below.
- 3.17 As previously approved the North Stand and the associated buildings and structures will be demolished. However, rather than develop the three separate buildings previously approved, it is proposed to develop a series of linked buildings (the north blocks) around three courtyards.

- 3.18 Unlike the approved scheme, the basement will extend underneath the new north blocks in order to provide direct access to the residential accommodation above. The basement will accommodate vehicle and cycle parking spaces, plant and core areas.
- 3.19 As can be seen from the proposed site roof plan (drawing number 260/00/07/053), the height to the blocks varies. As with the previously approved scheme, the block facing the main garden consists of seven storeys (which is set back from the garden elevation) stepping down to six and falling to four storeys at the east and west ends. The ‘fingers’ linking this block to the rear block are four storeys, whilst the rear block is three storeys. The buildings between the main part of the north block and the nursery block are between one and three storeys.
- 3.20 The block facing the main garden has two entrance points that provide access into the courtyard. These entrance points are the equivalent of two storeys in height and are approximately 7.5 metres wide and provide a valuable visual and physical link between the internal courtyards and the main garden at the centre of the site. A smaller entrance point, at the Avenell Road end, links a third courtyard to the main garden area.
- 3.21 The courtyard arrangement represents an improvement over the approved scheme as it allows for both a physical and visual link to be created between the north blocks and the main garden, thus allowing for a more integrated development.
- 3.22 In terms of use, the B1 element (1812m<sup>2</sup>) has been removed and the number and mix of residential units has altered. The following table summarises the position in respect of the residential accommodation.

<b>Size of flat</b>	<b>Number of Flats Approved</b>	<b>Number of Flats Proposed</b>
Studio	0	0
1 bedroom	53	110 (including 8 shared equity units)
2 bedroom	106	100 (including 1 social rented unit and 11 shared equity units)
3 bedroom	17	6 (including 2 social rented units)
4 bedroom	1	1 (social rented unit)
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>217 (including 4 social rented and 19 shared equity)</b>

3.23 As highlighted in the table above, the north block provides a mix of private and affordable accommodation (social rent and shared equity). The 23 affordable units will consist of 19 shared equity units and 4 social rented wheelchair units. The wheelchair units are located on the ground floor facing onto the open shared surface in front of the nursery and have been designed to comply with Islington Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance on Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair User Housing. Each unit will have a dedicated car parking space at ground level in front of the units.

**South Stand**

3.24 The other main alteration to the approved scheme is the proposal for the South Stand. The changes are explained below.

3.25 As previously approved, the South Stand and the associated buildings and structures will be demolished. It will now be replaced by a series of linked buildings (south blocks) around three courtyards. This approach reflects that proposed for the northern part of the site. It also removes the need for access to be taken from Aubert Court (and the potential for adverse effect on the amenities of residents of Aubert Court), as the development will be contained within the existing site boundary.

- 3.26 Unlike the approved scheme, the basement will extend underneath the new south blocks in order to provide direct access to the residential accommodation above. The basement will accommodate vehicle and cycle parking, plant and core areas
- 3.27 As can be seen from the proposed site roof plan 260/00/07/053, the height of the blocks varies. As previously approved, the block facing the main garden will be seven storeys in height (set back from the garden façade), stepping down to six storeys. The finger and rear blocks will all be five storeys.
- 3.28 The main garden elevation provides two defined entrance points that are the equivalent of two storeys in height and approximately 7.5 metres wide. They will provide access to the courtyards and as with the north blocks, will provide a valuable visual and physical link with the main garden area. A smaller entrance point, at the Avenell Road end, links a third courtyard to the main garden area.
- 3.29 As previously approved, the southern part of the site will provide residential accommodation, with a general practitioners' health centre (GPHC). The GPHC remains in the same location as previously approved, facing onto Avenell Road. The facility, which will be larger (1217m<sup>2</sup>) than that previously approved (1050m<sup>2</sup>), will be accessed directly from Avenell Road.
- 3.30 In addition, it is proposed to introduce a small (174m<sup>2</sup>) retail (A1) unit next to the GPHC. This unit is of such a scale that it will provide a useful facility to the new and existing community, for example as a pharmacy or newsagents, without having an adverse impact on the existing retail outlets in the area.
- 3.31 As summarised in the table below, the number and mix of residential units on the southern part of the site has changed from that previously approved.

<b>Size of flat</b>	<b>Number of flats Approved</b>	<b>Number of Flats Proposed</b>
Studio	0	0
1 bedroom	48	138 (12 of which are shared equity)
2 bedroom	88	101 (18 of which are shared equity)
3 bedroom	29	4
4 bedroom	6	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>243 (30 of which are shared equity)</b>

3.32 The above table shows that the south block will accommodate predominately one and two bedroom accommodation on a mixed tenure basis.

#### **Nursery Block**

3.33 The location, height and massing of this block remains the same as that previously approved. The uses also stay the same, in that a nursery will be provided over two floors, with residential accommodation occupying the rest of the space.

3.34 The size of the nursery and its external space has changed. The proposed provision is for a larger nursery (732m<sup>2</sup> compared to 630m<sup>2</sup>) with a smaller external area (225m<sup>2</sup> compared to 300m<sup>2</sup>). It is considered that the larger internal space will be more beneficial to a nursery operator than a larger outdoor area. As previously intended, the access route from Gillespie Road into the site will provide a drop off and pick up point for the nursery.

3.35 As shown in the table below, the mix of accommodation has altered from that previously approved.

<b>Size of flat</b>	<b>Number of flats Approved</b>	<b>Number of flats Proposed</b>
Studio	0	0
1 bedroom	1	9
2 bedroom	6	8 (2 of which will be social rented wheelchair units)
3 bedroom	0	0
4 bedroom	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>

3.36 The change to the accommodation mix has allowed a greater balance of one and two bed units to be achieved.

**Main Garden Area (Former Pitch - including Basement)**

3.37 The shape and layout of the basement is different to that previously approved. It is now rectangular as it extends underneath the north and south blocks at either end of the site. Also the extent to which it extends underneath the East and West Stand is less than before. Like the previous scheme, it will provide accommodation for vehicle and cycle parking, plant and storage.

3.38 As previously approved, the deck above the new basement will be laid out as a communal garden for all the residents of the proposed development. The layout and design of this space in essence remains the same as that previously approved.

3.36 The main difference is that the two children’s play spaces will be located in the northwest and southwest corners of the garden.

3.37 In addition to the main garden area, the proposal makes provision for six new courtyards. The landscape architect, Christopher Bradley-Hole, who was responsible for the original design of the main garden, has devised the

landscape design for the courtyards. Full details of the approach are set out in the Landscape Statement.

### **Car and Cycle Parking**

- 3.38 In terms of the residential element only, the approved scheme made provision for 476 spaces for 557 units, providing a ratio of 0.86. The current proposal seeks to provide 558 spaces for 711 units, which equates to a ratio of 0.78.
- 3.39 The current proposal does not provide car parking for the commercial accommodation.
- 3.40 It is proposed to increase the number of cycle spaces by 188 from 528 (which was less than one space per unit) to 711 (more than one space per unit).

### **Access Routes**

- 3.41 The vehicle and pedestrian access point to the nursery from Gillespie Road will remain the same as previously approved.
- 3.42 The other access routes into the site have altered from those previously approved.
- 3.43 The main vehicular access point from Avenell Road into the basement has been moved further north, away from the East Stand. This change benefits the setting of the Listed building.
- 3.44 The previous scheme provided for route from Avenell Road to the nursery forecourt across the northern part of the site. A similar route forms part of the proposed scheme but the location has changed slightly as it now runs along the north side of the garden area.
- 3.45 The public pedestrian route through the site from Avenell Road, past the West Stand and out onto Gillespie Road will be replaced with a more direct route linking Avenell Road to Highbury Hill. The Avenell Road entrance point will remain the same as previously approved (in between the East Stand and south

block), but the route will end through the existing covered passageway between 133-135 Highbury Hill. The proposed route will increase permeability by dividing the development (and a large urban block) in two, whilst still giving pedestrians the opportunity to experience the central part of the scheme.

- 3.46 The newly created routes into the courtyard areas will be accessible by residents only and have been specifically designed to accommodate delivery and emergency vehicles.

### **Peripheral Properties**

#### **133 to 135 Highbury Hill**

- 3.47 As previously proposed, this property will be re-clad and refurbished to provide residential accommodation. The difference is that the mix of units has changed from 8 x 1 bedrooms and 3 x 2 bedrooms, to 7 x 1 bedrooms.

## **4.0 Key Issues**

### **Impact on the Listed Building**

- 4.1 The proposed scheme involves the interior of the East Stand being sub-divided differently from the approved scheme. However, the parts of the interior which were to have been retained (primarily the main stairs and the ‘Marble Hall’) are still to be retained, and the changes will have no significant effect on the external appearance of the building.
- 4.2 Great care has been taken when planning the internal arrangements to ensure that original features are respected and maintained wherever possible. For example, a triplex unit has been specifically incorporated into the north and south ends of the elevation, in order to ensure that the existing sun ray glazing is preserved.
- 4.3 There are small differences from the approved scheme: the principal ones are the internal re-planning and the consequential horizontal element that will be visible behind the main garden façade (it is considered that this will add greater interest to the façade) and the introduction of glazing into the roof (which is recessed and therefore will not be visible from the street). All of these have been the subject of close consultation with the Council’s Conservation Officer and English Heritage.
- 4.4 The curtilage of the Listed building does not extend beyond the footprint of the building itself. However, the treatment of the former pitch area and the buildings adjoining it to the north, west and east will have an effect on the setting of the Listed building.
- 4.5 What is now proposed does not differ significantly from what has already been approved. The treatment of the West Stand is almost unchanged. The design of the new north and south blocks is a little different, but the height and mass of the blocks facing the main garden area are hardly altered, and the design is by the same architects and to the same high quality. The treatment of the

former pitch area is virtually identical to the approved scheme, with a landscaping treatment designed by the same award-winning designer.

### **Change to Unit Mix**

4.6 The table below summarises the change to the number and mix of units (excluding the peripheral properties).

<b>Type of units</b>	<b>Approved (excluding all of the peripheral properties except 133-135 Highbury Hill)</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Studio</b>	0	8
<b>One bedroom</b>	182	352
<b>Two bedroom</b>	302	334
<b>Three bedroom</b>	56	16
<b>Four bedroom</b>	9	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>711</b>

4.7 As can be seen from the above table, the revised proposal makes provision for studio accommodation. It also shows that the number of one and two bedroom units have increased whereas the number of three and four bedroom units have decreased.

4.8 The change in mix reflects the need within the community for smaller accommodation, as reflected in market demand. This is a reflection of changing social patterns, that has seen a rise in the number of small households.

4.9 The proposed change of mix is therefore considered to be appropriate as it has the effect of bringing the development more closely into line with community requirements.

**Density**

- 4.10 As a consequence of the increase in accommodation, the density of the development has increased marginally. The approved application had a density of 465 habitable rooms per hectare whereas the revised scheme produces a density of 485 habitable rooms per hectare. This represents an increase of 4%.
- 4.11 Whilst both density figures exceed those set out in UDP policy, the proposed density is consistent with national and strategic policy, which seeks to achieve the best use of brownfield land in accessible locations. In particular, paragraph 2.9 of the London Plan states that Areas of Intensification (of which Arsenal/Holloway is one) have the potential for increasing the level of residential units through higher densities.
- 4.12 In addition to the above designation, the site’s accessible location, close to local public transport links (it has a Public Transport Accessibility Location rating of 4), makes it an appropriate location for high density development. Indeed, the proposed density is at the lower end of the acceptable range set out in Table 4B.1 of the London Plan (Urban location, Public Transport Accessibility Location of 4-6).
- 4.13 There has been a general movement away from specific density limits/targets in recent times, and the recently published Planning Policy Statement 1, ‘Creating Sustainable Communities’, promotes “more efficient use of land through higher densities”. It is now generally accepted that development should be led by good design, with the density figure being an output rather than a pre-determinant. There can be little dispute that this scheme, by architects renowned for the high quality and sensitivity of their work, is a work of good quality design.

## **Overlooking**

### ***The East Stand***

- 4.14 The windows in the East Stand will remain in virtually the same positions as they are at present. The difference between the approved and proposed schemes should therefore be negligible.

### ***West Block***

- 4.15 The proposed windows on the western (outward) elevation of the West Block are in very similar positions to those in the approved scheme. Given this fact, and that the West Stand is a minimum of 18.5 metres (the Council's standard is 18 metres) and up to 36 metres away from the nearest residential properties on Highbury Hill, it is not considered that this element of the scheme should generate any issues.

### ***North Block***

- 4.16 The north block has two interfaces with surrounding properties. The first is where the eastern end of the block fronts onto Avenell Road. Since the separation distance is the same as that previously approved it is not considered that this element of the scheme will generate any overlooking issues.
- 4.17 The second interface is where the rear of the block looks out onto the rear of the properties along Gillespie Road. The distance between the proposed and existing properties at this point is more than 18m at the upper levels, and so no overlooking issues should arise there. However, the distance falls to between 12m and 22m at lower ground, ground and first floor levels. It is considered that any potential overlooking issues can be successfully mitigated by the implementation of an appropriate boundary treatment.

### ***South Block***

- 4.18 The south block has three interfaces with surrounding properties. The first is the eastern elevation that faces Avenell Road. The distance between the proposed and existing properties is the same as that previously approved and therefore it is not considered that any overlooking issues will arise.

4.19 The second interface is with Aubert Court. The distance between the proposed building and the existing building at the Avenell Road end of the block is 20m, but the remainder of the façade falls below the 18m standard – it falls to 12 metres in two points so should leave as it is. It should be noted that the units in Aubert Court that face north appear to be dual aspect, with only the kitchens and bedrooms facing onto the application site. The proposal has responded to this position by including recessed balconies that maximise the distance between the proposed and existing units. This, combined with the retention of the mature trees along the Aubert Court access route, means that the potential for overlooking will be minimised.

4.20 The third interface is with the rear of the properties along Highbury Hill. The overlooking distance between the existing and proposed buildings is a minimum of 23m and therefore well in excess of the Councils’ guidelines. It is therefore considered that no overlooking issues will arise.

#### ***Nursery Block***

4.21 As previously approved, this block complies with the 18m standard and therefore no overlooking issues will be raised.

#### ***Peripheral Properties***

4.22 It is proposed that the peripheral properties will be designed to continue the existing building lines along Highbury Hill. As infill development, it is not considered that they will generate any overlooking issues.

#### **Affordable Housing Provision**

4.23 The proposal includes 6 social rented units and 49 shared equity units. The units are located across the site, in the south, north and nursery blocks. All of the affordable units comply with the Council’s Lifetime Home Standards and will have access to the courtyard spaces as well as the main

garden area. The social rented units are also designed to wheelchair standards<sup>2</sup>.

- 4.24 The original planning permissions for the whole of the Arsenal on the Move scheme were secured on the basis that 25% of all habitable rooms across all three sites would be affordable (i.e. 18.75% social rented and 6.25% shared equity). This was confirmed in the original main Committee report (paragraph 18.9.2, Table A18), and subsequently reflected in the s106 agreement, and the Council has consistently accepted that it should continue to be the basis for the scheme as it evolves.
- 4.25 Taking into account the current proposed changes for Highbury (but continuing to exclude the Northern Triangle and HN5 sites, as per the original approach), the affordable housing position across all three sites is as follows: 19.2% social rented and 8.0% shared equity (total 27.2%, which exceeds the s106 agreement requirement).

### **Accessibility**

- 4.26 As explained above, the re-routing of the public pedestrian route will bring a major benefit. The approved route would enable pedestrians to experience the urban space and communal garden within the heart of the development scheme, but would not open up a new linkage and would not reduce the walking distance between the middle of Avenell Road and Gillespie Road (its start and finish points). The proposed route would increase permeability by dividing the development, and the large block in which it sits, in two, whilst still giving pedestrians a full opportunity to experience the central part of the scheme.

---

<sup>2</sup> The s106 agreement for the site known as HN1-4 ref: P04/1231 requires that six wheelchair units consisting of two 3 beds, three 2 beds and one 4 bed be made available on a social rent basis within the Highbury Stadium redevelopment.

### **Loss of B1 Space**

- 4.27 The approved scheme provided a total of 1,812m<sup>2</sup> of B1 floorspace in the northwest and northeast corners of the site and in the basement of the East Stand. The current proposal does not make provision for B1 floorspace.
- 4.28 As explained above, the basement no longer extends under the entire East Stand. The available area is therefore less than that of the approved scheme. It is considered that the gym use, which has been extended under the landscaped area to provide a swimming pool, will provide greater all-round benefits than a B1 unit in a very secondary commercial location.
- 4.29 The B1 space in the northwest and northeast corners of the site has been removed in order to provide residential accommodation. This is in line with Government advice that greater emphasis should be put on housing development unless there is a demonstrable case for retaining land or buildings for employment purposes. Notwithstanding this, the amount of B1 space will be more than compensated by the B1 development proposed at the Northern Bridge Building on Drayton Park.

### ***Car Parking and Vehicle Movement***

- 4.30 The approved scheme provided a total of 476 residential parking spaces for 557 units. This equates to a ratio of 0.86 spaces per unit.
- 4.31 The proposed scheme provides for a total of 558 residential parking spaces for 711 units. This equates to a ratio of 0.78.
- 4.32 The current proposal therefore reduces the ratio of car parking space per unit from that previously approved.
- 4.33 The overall ratio of 0.78 is consistent with guidance set out in the London Plan, which states that residential developments consisting of mostly flats should provide “*1 to less than 1 space per unit*”. It exceeds the 0.5 ratio contained in the Council’s car parking standard, but to a lesser extent than before. It has always been accepted by the Council that it is appropriate to

average the residential car parking across the entire Arsenal on the Move scheme, which will involve the standard being exceeded in some places and not others.

- 4.34 No car parking provision is made for the commercial space.
- 4.35 The Transport Assessment examines the proposed layout of the car park and confirms that it is both safe and efficient.
- 4.36 In addition, the Assessment examines the impact that the additional vehicles may have on the surrounding highway network. The report concludes that there is sufficient capacity of the existing highway network to accommodate the additional vehicle movements.

### **Cycle Space**

- 4.37 The proposal makes provision for 711 cycle spaces. This doubles the Council's requirement of 0.5 space per unit. It also achieves the Mayors requirement of one space per unit.
- 4.38 The majority of the spaces will be located in the basement, with stands also being made available in the courtyards of the north and south blocks, as well as in the nursery forecourt.

### **Amenity**

- 4.39 Like the approved scheme, the main provision of amenity space for residents will be the main garden area. All of the residents will have access to the space, which will include the two dedicated play areas.
- 4.40 The introduction of the six landscaped courtyards within the scheme has increased the amount of amenity space from that previously approved. All of the residents in the north and south blocks will have access to one of the courtyards in addition to the main the garden.

- 4.41 It is clear that all of the amenity space within the scheme will be of the highest quality and the central space itself will be a unique piece of urban landscape design.
- 4.42 Where possible, balconies, terraces and gardens have been provided in order to maximise the level of private amenity space.
- 4.43 In addition to the spaces within the site, the residents will also have access to the nearby opens spaces of Gillespie Park, Finsbury Park and Highbury Fields, all of which are within easy walking distance of the site.
- 4.44 Overall, it is clear that the proposal represents an improvement on the approved scheme and that the amenity space provided will be of the highest quality.
- 4.45 In terms of the size of the proposed units, they all comply with the Council’s standards. In addition, all of the units in the north and south blocks comply with the Councils Lifetime Home Standards. The majority of the units in the East and West Stands also comply, with only a small proportion (8 units) failing to meet the standards in full. This is because of the need to address conservation issues.

#### **Daylight and Sunlight**

- 4.46 Drivers Jonas have undertaken a daylight and sunlight study of the effects of the proposed scheme on the surrounding residential properties and the internal daylighting standards of the proposed habitable rooms. A copy of their report forms part of the planning submission.
- 4.47 In terms of the surrounding properties, it concludes that potential effects to properties on Gillespie Road previously identified in relation to the permitted have been designed out of the revised scheme. A minor effect is noted in relation to an area of Aubert Court, however the affected properties are thought to be dual aspect with bedroom, kitchen and toilet areas at the northern side of the building. These areas are considered to be less important

than living room areas in terms of daylight requirements. On this basis it is considered that the effect on daylight to those units would not be significant.

- 4.48 In terms of the internal daylight and sunlight levels of the proposed scheme, the report concludes that the scheme achieves good daylight levels to the proposed habitable rooms for an inner city residential development.

### **Mix of Uses**

- 4.49 A GPHC, gym and nursery all formed part of the approved scheme.
- 4.50 It is considered that such uses are entirely appropriate in a predominantly residential environment. The size of each of these uses is now proposed to be greater than previously approved and their inclusion in the scheme will contribute towards sustainability and the level of vitality within the development and the surrounding area.
- 4.51 Also, since the non-residential uses are expected to be available to the public, both the existing community and new residents will benefit from increased access to valuable facilities.
- 4.52 The introduction of the small retail unit is considered to be entirely appropriate as it has the potential to complement the health centre or indeed act as a small convenience store to serve the immediate community. Its small scale means that it will not have a significant effect on existing shops in the surrounding area.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

- 5.0 The revised proposal retains the essential characteristics of the approved scheme, namely a series of buildings (including the retained East and West Stands) around a central garden area. The design continues to be by the award winning architects Allies and Morrison.
- 5.1 The revised proposal seeks to make better use of the site and consequently increases the density above that previously approved. This approach is entirely consistent with strategic guidance, which promotes the use of higher densities in order to achieve more efficient use of land, particularly on accessible sites such as this. However, it should be noted that the density level proposed is at the lower end of the acceptable range set out in the London Plan.
- 5.2 The proposed change to the unit mix to provide predominantly one and two bedroom accommodation also represents a positive change. The revised mix better reflects the needs within the community for smaller accommodation. This is a reflection of changing social patterns that has seen a rise on the number of smaller households.
- 5.3 The proposal removes the potential adverse daylight/sunlight effects on properties on Gillespie Road previously identified. A minor effect is noted in relation to an area of Aubert Court, but the net effect on neighbouring properties is beneficial.
- 5.4 The re-routing of the public pedestrian route will bring a major benefit by offering a direct route through the site from Avenell Road to Gillespie Road. The revised route will therefore increase the level of permeability in the neighbourhood whilst still giving the public a full opportunity to experience the central part of the scheme.
- 5.5 Overall, it is considered that the revised proposal represents an improvement on that previously approved. It makes better use of the site and provides a

more logical organisation of the buildings within It is therefore requested that the scheme be recommend for approval.