

The former Walthamstow Greyhound Stadium site

in the London Borough of Waltham Forest

planning application no. 2011/0898

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral (new powers)

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008

The proposal

Part-demolition of existing buildings, and redevelopment to provide 301 residential units, together with sport and leisure provision, a sixty to eighty space nursery, and a cafe with creche facilities, with open space provision, access and parking.

The applicant

The applicant is **London & Quadrant**, and the architect is **Conran & Partners**.

Strategic issues

The principle of the housing-led redevelopment of the site is acceptable and in accordance with strategic planning policies. However, there are outstanding issues regarding the detailed design of the additional on-site **leisure provision, housing, children's play space, urban design, inclusive design, climate change** and **transport**, that must be addressed before the application can be considered acceptable in strategic planning terms.

Recommendation

That Waltham Forest Council be advised that while the application is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms, the application does not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 124 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 125 of this report could address these deficiencies.

Context

1 On 19 July 2011 the Mayor of London received documents from Waltham Forest Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. On 23 August 2011 the Council formally referred the application to the Mayor. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 3 October 2011 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor's use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under the following Categories of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

- 1A: *“Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats”.*
- 1B: *“Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.”*

3 Once Waltham Forest Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

5 The 3.28 hectare site is located on Chingford Road, approximately two kilometres to the north of Walthamstow town centre. The site is bound to the south by residential properties and privately owned open space, to the west by Chingford Road, to the north by residential properties, and to the east by Rush Croft Sports College, and Council owned open space.

6 The River Ching runs along the southern boundary of the site. The river enters a culvert at the south east corner of the site, remains culverted for approximately 160 metres, before emerging as an open channel to the rear of the residential properties on Empress Avenue, towards the south of the site. The southern boundary of the site is also designated as a green corridor in the Council’s Unitary Development Plan (2006).

7 The site housed the former Walthamstow Greyhound Stadium, which ceased operations in August 2008. The stadium use began in 1933. Previous to this the site was used by a football club. When fully operational, the stadium held five greyhound race meetings a week, and had a capacity of approximately 5,000 people. Prior to its closure, the site also included a nightclub, in addition to the food and drink offer associated with the stadium use. The site has a series of Grade II listed structures connected with its former greyhound use. The listed elements are grouped into two main structures, namely the dog kennels and connected Tote board at the eastern end of the site, and the main Tote board, car park and the west spectator stand, at the western boundary.

8 The site is located on the A112 Chingford Road, which is a borough road, and part of the Strategic Road Network. The nearest part of the Transport for London Road Network is the A406 Southend Road which is located 200 metres to the south of the site, and laid out as a grade separated junction. The nearest station is Highams Park, which is at least 1.3 kilometres to the east and provides rail services on the Liverpool Street to Chingford line. Walthamstow Central Station is approximately two kilometres to the south, which also provides services on the Victoria Line. Blackhorse Road Station on the London Overground (Barking to Gospel Oak) and Victoria Line is located three kilometres to the west of the site. The area is served by eight bus routes with stops located immediately adjacent to the site frontage on Chingford Road, or on the Crooked Billet Roundabout. The site benefits from a moderate level of accessibility with a public transport accessibility level of three, on a scale of one to six, where six is considered excellent.

Details of the proposal

9 London & Quadrant is seeking full planning permission, and listed building consent, for the redevelopment of the site to provide 301 residential units, leisure use, a sixty to eighty space nursery, a cafe (to include creche facilities), and open space provision, including allotments, together with servicing and parking. The application also includes the deculverting of the River Ching along the southern boundary of the site.

10 The proposal includes the demolition of all unlisted buildings on site. With regards to the listed elements, the scheme proposes both part-demolition of some of the listed structures, together with the conversion, alteration and extension to the remaining listed buildings.

Case history

11 Proposals for the redevelopment of the site were first subject to formal pre-planning application discussions with GLA officers in December 2008. The scheme considered here has been subject to formal pre-planning application discussions since December 2010. Issues discussed related to land use, housing, design, climate change, and transport.

12 The proposals were also the subject of a pre-application meeting with Transport for London. Following this meeting, the main outstanding issues were the impact on traffic flow on the Transport for London Road Network, and capacity on the bus network.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

13 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Sport/leisure *London Plan; PPG17; PPS Consultation: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment; the Mayor's A Sporting Future for London*
- Mix of uses *London Plan*
- Retail/town centre uses *London Plan; PPG13, PPS4*
- Housing *London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG; Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG, Housing Strategy; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EiP draft*
- Affordable housing *London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG, Housing Strategy; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EiP draft*
- Density *London Plan; PPS3; Housing SPG; Interim Housing SPG; Housing SPG EiP draft*
- Urban design *London Plan; PPS1*
- Historic Environment *London Plan; PPS5*
- Access *London Plan; PPS1; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)*
- Sustainable development *London Plan; PPS1, PPS1 supplement; PPS3; PPG13; PPS22; draft PPS Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate; the Mayor's Energy Strategy; Mayor's draft Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies; Mayor's draft Water Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG*
- Transport *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy; PPG13*
- Parking *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy; PPG13*

14 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 2006 Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan and the 2011 London Plan.

15 The Council's draft Core Strategy (submission stage 2011), and draft Development Management Policies document (consultation stage 2011) are relevant material considerations. The Council has also produced an Urban Design Guidance document for the former Walthamstow Greyhound Stadium site (2009), although as this has not been the subject of public consultation, and is not adopted, it has little material weight.

Principle of development

Loss of the greyhound stadium use

16 The site is not designated within the Council's Unitary Development Plan, or identified in the London Plan, for a specific land use. The site is not within a town centre, but is located in a predominantly residential neighbourhood. The site has historically been used as a greyhound stadium, with the last race held in August 2008. The site has subsequently been vacant.

17 Policy CS1 of the Council's emerging Core Strategy identifies this site as a key site for development, and states that growth will be distributed and managed by *"encouraging high quality development at key sites including Walthamstow Dogs Stadium... for appropriate uses that will benefit the wider community including housing, employment, leisure and community uses."* Paragraph 5.4 of the Core Strategy provides further guidance in support of this policy and states that *"Other key sites, such as Walthamstow Stadium... have the capacity to provide a minimum of 2,500 homes, which is approximately 22% of total capacity"*.

18 It is recognised that the previous greyhound stadium did provide a stadium-type use, that fulfilled a spectator sport and leisure-type purpose, and its loss therefore needs to be appropriately considered.

19 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"*. Supporting paragraph 3.109 makes clear that this policy should be read in conjunction with Policy 3.16 regarding social infrastructure. Policy 3.16 states that *"Proposals which would result in a loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need for that type of social infrastructure without realistic proposals for re-provision should be resisted"*. Furthermore, London Plan Policy 4.6 states that *"The Mayor will, and boroughs should, support the continued success of London's diverse range of arts, cultural, professional sporting, and entertainment enterprises and the cultural, social and economic benefits that they offer to its residents, workers and visitors"*.

20 London Plan policy resists the loss of sports facilities. This is supported by national planning guidance on open space, sport and recreation. As made clear in London Plan Policy 3.19, the Mayor's strategic objective is to increase participation in, and tackle inequality of access to, sport and physical activity in London. This is supported by the Mayor's *'A sporting future for London'* document, which seeks to build on the legacy of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games by *"...securing a sustained increase in participation in sport and physical activity amongst Londoners"* and by *"...using sport to assist in tackling social problems including ill health, crime, academic under achievement, and lack of community cohesion"*.

21 In considering sporting facilities in the context of London Plan policies, the strategic priority is for facilities which enable use by the public for community and sporting activities, either solely, or through the dual-use of facilities. The existing greyhound stadium provided no opportunities for

visitors or the local community to actively participate in sporting activities at the site. Furthermore, it must be noted that Sport England does not identify greyhound racing as a sport.

22 London Plan Policy 4.6 with regard to supporting arts, culture and entertainment provision, does not state that the loss of any such facilities should be resisted. Nevertheless, supporting such facilities could be considered to include resisting their loss through redevelopment. In other location in London the reprovision of cultural facilities has been required through the planning process. However, in this instance it has to be considered that the use ceased three years ago. In addition, the policy makes clear that the sequential approach must be taken with regard to new facilities, which would prioritise new provision within town centre locations. The supporting text to this policy further prioritises night-time leisure and entertainment-type uses within town centres. In this respect, new large-scale leisure or entertainment facilities on this site would be resisted in favour of town centre locations, or areas of higher public transport accessibility levels, particularly given the residential nature of the immediate surrounding environment.

23 Furthermore, although the Council recognises the greyhound stadium facility as a commercial based leisure use within its Unitary Development Plan, and seeks to retain existing leisure uses (TRL17), its policies seek to direct new leisure provision within town centres (Policy TRL16).

24 London Plan Policy 3.16 does resist the loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need without their reprovision. The policy makes clear that *"The suitability of redundant social infrastructure premises for other forms of social infrastructure for which there is a defined need in the locality should be assessed before alternative developments are considered."* The London Plan does not provide a definition for social infrastructure. In the supporting text to Policy 3.16, a number of uses are provided as examples, including health provision, educational facilities, including nurseries, sports and play facilities, and cultural and community uses. Uses are described as those *"...which contribute to making an area more than just a place to live,"* and those which make *"...residential areas more attractive and turning them into sustainable neighbourhoods and communities"*. Social infrastructure facilities are therefore those which are necessary to support the provision of housing. It is also clear in the policy itself that social infrastructure is infrastructure which has an identifiable need, by virtue that its loss is only resisted in areas of identified need for that type of infrastructure.

25 It is not considered therefore that a greyhound stadium constitutes social infrastructure, in that a defined local need for such a use cannot be identified or measured, and that it cannot be seen to be necessary to support sustainable neighbourhoods. Therefore, the loss of the greyhound stadium use is not deemed to be contrary to London Plan Policy 3.16.

26 It is clear, following an assessment of strategic policies, that the priority for sporting facilities in London is for those which enable community use and provide opportunities for active participation in sport. It is important to note in this context that Sport England does not define greyhound racing as a sport. It is also apparent that the greyhound stadium does not constitute social infrastructure, and that whilst the London Plan seeks to support London's diverse cultural offer, including professional sporting enterprises and entertainment uses, that these uses are generally appropriate to town centre locations, or those with higher public transport accessibility. The loss of the greyhound stadium use is therefore considered on balance not to be contrary to London Plan policy.

27 In recognition of the loss of the existing facility, the application includes a community sports centre on-site to provide facilities for local activities, which could include exercise classes, combat sports, table tennis, and children's gymnastics. The principle of providing on-site leisure and sport-based space for local groups and classes is strongly supported.

28 Through discussions with GLA officers, the applicant has also proposed a number of additional on-site measures, which are set out below:

- A skateboard and BMX track located on the upper deck of the Tote car park.
- A climbing wall within the main Tote building.
- A stadium trail, including a sprint circuit around the greyhound track, linking through to wider routes to the Lee Valley and Epping Forest. The stadium trail will include way-finding measures, as well as outdoor gym equipment.
- Improved links through the existing area of open space to the south-east of the site.
- A financial contribution of £250,000 towards the running of the on-site facilities, which is to be operated by a community sports trust.

29 The principle of these measures is supported. The provision of additional on-site sporting opportunities will increase people's access to opportunities for physical activities, which better accords with Mayoral priorities with regard to sports participation. The relatively small scale nature of the provision responds appropriately to the site's characteristics and the residential nature of the surrounding environment, whilst ensuring that the site maintains a sense of local importance, by providing facilities for the surrounding community.

30 The additional measures are still to be designed in detail, and will need to be the subject of further discussions with the applicant and the Council. The measures will also need to be incorporated in full within the planning application, and appropriately secured by the Council in the section 106 agreement. It is important that the running track and associated equipment is appropriately incorporated into the public realm, particularly within the site, and that conflicts with pedestrians and vehicles are appropriately managed. Furthermore, the provision of the skateboard and BMX park, in addition to the climbing wall, requires further detailed design discussions with regard to impact on the listed elements.

31 Whilst the on-site provision of sport and leisure space is supported, including the additional measures proposed, it does not in itself address the scale of the previous greyhound stadium use. Therefore, Council and GLA officers have sought a financial contribution from the applicant towards the provision of off-site leisure and sport use. The applicant has agreed a financial contribution of £1,750,000. At this stage it is expected that this contribution will be directed towards improving the Council's Waltham Forest Pool and Track facility.

32 Waltham Forest Pool and Track facility is located on Chingford Road, approximately one kilometre to the south of the application site. The Council owned sports centre currently provides an eight-lane sports track, a 25-metre indoor pool, a diving tank and boards up to five metres, a learner pool, a dance studio and a fitness suite. The facility is located approximately half way between the site and Walthamstow town centre. Although not a town centre site, it is an existing leisure centre facility, which is located on the main route from the site to the town centre. This facility will therefore be accessible to the residents of this development, and those existing communities surrounding the stadium site. The existing leisure centre site, in closer proximity to the town centre, will also ensure that the improvements delivered are accessible to those across the borough.

33 The Council has identified a number of potential facilities that could be provided on-site, that are not currently available in existing facilities elsewhere in the borough. The Council has stated that the contribution secured could deliver all of the following improvements:

- A climbing wall – with the potential to build on school-based climbing up to club level opportunities.
- Youth gym and soft play – to assist in the provision of sports facilities for young children and adults, seeking to increase the activity levels of children and young people.
- Athletics track – track refurbishment and provision of a small seated stadium, to help increase participation in athletic related activities.
- 3G sports pitch – the Council’s playing pitch strategy indicates that there is currently a deficit of two full size pitches in the borough. A new pitch at this facility could help address this shortfall.
- Dry dive pit – building on being the only Olympic host borough with diving facilities, the existing facility could be expanded to include dry dive facilities. This would help improve training opportunities and encourage new participation in this sport.
- Spinning studio – build on the existing fitness centre offer to provide a new spinning facility for general fitness.

34 Discussions are ongoing with the applicant and the Council regarding the details of what will be delivered, including further discussions regarding costings and timescales for delivery. However, as demonstrated above, the financial contribution, and the potential improvements that it could provide, will deliver quantitative and qualitative improvements to existing sport and leisure provision in the community, and across the borough as a whole. This accords with the Mayor’s strategic priority to improve participation in sports and recreation. It also provides additional sporting facilities in an Olympic borough, therefore strengthening the ability of London to deliver on the Olympic legacy priorities, as detailed in London Plan Policy 2.4.

Development of the site for housing

35 London Plan Policy 3.3 states that “*The Mayor recognises the pressing need for new homes in London in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford*”. Furthermore, London Plan Policy 3.4 requires sites to optimise housing output.

36 The site is not within a town centre, and is within an existing residential neighbourhood. It is not identified in the London Plan for a particular use. The site is identified within the Council’s emerging Core Strategy for uses including housing, and is included as one of three key sites within the borough that has the ability to deliver up to 22% of the borough’s total housing capacity. The principle of housing on this site is therefore supported in accordance with strategic and local policy.

Other proposed uses

37 In addition to the on-site leisure and sport use, the application also includes a nursery, cafe with creche facilities, and allotments. The provision of allotments is strongly supported in line with London Plan Policy 7.22, whilst the provision of a nursery and cafe, with creche, is supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.16. The provision of these social infrastructure facilities will provide opportunities for the existing community to engage with, and benefit from, the

redevelopment of the site, and provide a range of uses to help activate the site. This provision is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.16.

Conclusion

38 The Council has identified this site as a key site for development, and has indicated that a housing, employment, leisure or community use is appropriate. The site is not within a town centre, and is in a predominantly residential area. The proposal includes housing, leisure and community use, and will provide employment opportunities. Together with the on-site uses, the applicant will provide a substantial financial contribution to improvements to sports provision at an existing sports centre.

39 The existing stadium has been closed since 2008. The proposed redevelopment of the site addresses strategic priorities with regard to housing delivery, and provision of social infrastructure, particularly sports facilities, within an Olympic borough. The loss of the existing facility is appropriately off-set with uses more appropriate to the site's location and characteristics, and the off-site contribution will help to address borough-wide shortfalls in sports provision. The principle of the redevelopment is therefore acceptable in strategic planning terms.

Housing

40 The proposal includes the provision of 301 residential units, 105 of which will be affordable. The proposed mix of units, by tenure, is provided below:

	Private		Affordable rent		Intermediate		Total
	Unit	%	Unit	%	Unit	%	
One-bed	26	(13%)	1	(2%)	4	(8%)	31 (10%)
Two-bed	133	(68%)	15	(29%)	40	(75%)	188 (63%)
Three-bed	26	(13%)	11	(21%)	9	(17%)	46 (15%)
Four-bed	11	(6%)	25	(48%)	0		36 (12%)
Total	196	(65%)	52	(17%)	53	(18%)	301

(Proposed mix of units – taken from Table 6.3 within the applicant's planning statement)

Affordable housing

41 London Plan Policy 3.12 requires borough councils to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes. In doing so, each council should have regard to current and future requirements for affordable housing at local and regional levels, its own overall target for affordable housing provision, and the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development. Policy 3.11 states that borough targets should take account of matters including current and future housing requirements, the strategic targets and priority accorded to affordable family housing, the need to promote mixed and balance communities, and the viability of future development, and that within those targets 60% of affordable housing should be for social rent, and 40% for intermediate rent or sale.

42 The applicant is proposing to provide 52 affordable rent units and 53 intermediate units. The affordable rent product proposed accords with the revised definitions of affordable housing within

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (June 2011), and together with the intermediate units, results in the provision of 35% affordable housing, when measured by units (40% when measured by habitable room).

43 The applicant's financial viability assessment submitted in support of the planning application is required to be independently assessed. This assessment is to be commissioned by the Council, and funded by the applicant. Without this independent assessment, it is not possible to confirm whether the applicant is providing the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12. As part of discussions regarding the applicant's viability assessment, the use of future cascade review mechanisms will need to be addressed.

44 The applicant has indicated that the affordable rent units will be provided at rents ranging from 50% to 80% of market rents. Further information is required from the applicant and the Council regarding the affordability of the units, disaggregated by unit size, and proposed rental level, and how these compare with traditional social rented units with regard to rental costs. It is acknowledged that rent discounts at 50% may result in affordable rent units which would be affordable to a greater proportion of those on the Council's housing waiting list, and in this regard, be comparable to traditional social rented units.

Tenure split

45 London Plan Policy 3.12 seeks to ensure that 60% of the affordable housing delivered throughout the Plan period is social rented housing, and that 40% is intermediate provision. The application provides 59% affordable rent and 41% intermediate provision, when measured by habitable room. The application does not provide any social rented units. The proposed mix does not therefore accord with strategic policy 3.12.

46 The Council, in its Core Strategy, also establishes a broad tenure split for the affordable housing to be delivered over the plan period, seeking 60% of the total housing within the borough to be social rented housing, with 40% as intermediate provision.

47 Planning Policy Guidance 3: Housing formally introduces affordable rent as a new social housing product. This shift in national housing policy is not currently reflected in strategic planning policies for London.

48 Affordable rent, although not operated under the same agreements as social rented housing, is considered an affordable housing product, and is intended to be available to those eligible for social rented housing. It is also solely a rented product, as opposed to intermediate housing, which typically involves an element of sale to the occupier. In the recent funding programme issued by the Homes and Communities Agency for the period 2011 to 2015, it has been made clear that funding for social rented products will only be supported in limited circumstances.

49 It is acknowledged that the target within London Plan Policy 3.12 is not a site specific target, and that the recent shifts in government policy are not currently reflected in strategic policy. The introduction of a new affordable housing product, together with the lack of government funding for social rented housing, will impact on the ability of developments to meet the strategic target within Policy 3.12. Affordable rent is an affordable housing rented product, and the application prioritises this above the provision of intermediate housing, which does acknowledge broad strategic objectives. Furthermore, as discussed in paragraph 44 above, it is likely that the affordable rent units that are targeted at 50% market rent, will in fact be affordable to those tenants who would have previously been allocated social rented housing. On balance, therefore, subject to the caveats set out in paragraph 44, the proposed tenure split is acceptable.

Mix of units

50 London Plan Policy 3.11 accords priority to family housing within affordable housing provision. In addition, London Plan Policy 3.8 requires developments to provide a range of housing sizes and types. This is supported by the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, which seeks to secure family accommodation within residential schemes, particularly within the social rented sector, and sets strategic guidance for councils in assessing their local needs. Also relevant is Policy 1.1C of the London Housing Strategy, which sets a strategic target for 42% of social rented homes to have three or more bedrooms.

51 The Council has established a preferred housing mix within its emerging Development Management Policy Development Plan Document, which is provided below:

	One-bed	Two-bed	Three-bed	Four-bed
Market housing	10%	40%	40%	10%
Intermediate housing	10%	40%	40%	10%
Social housing	10%	30%	50%	10%

(Policy DM5 – Waltham Forest Council Development Management Policy Development Plan Document)

52 The application includes 27% family accommodation across all tenures. In accordance with strategic priorities, family accommodation has been prioritised within the affordable element, with 69% of the affordable rent units being proposed for families, with the majority of these units being four-bed houses with gardens.

53 As discussed above, strategic policy does not currently reflect the recent shifts in affordable housing, particularly the amendments to the definitions of affordable housing to include affordable rent products, and changes to funding priorities. However, it is acknowledged that affordable rent is to be targeted at those eligible for social rented housing, and that it is an affordable housing product markedly different in funding and operation to intermediate housing. In this context, the prioritisation of family accommodation within the affordable rent element does recognise strategic objectives, and is therefore supported.

54 Within the private and intermediate provision, 18% of units are family accommodation. This does not accord with the Council's target of 50% family accommodation within those tenures. The Mayor's Housing SPG (2005) does not establish a specific target for private and intermediate family accommodation, but acknowledges that access to housing within the private sector is in relation to ability to pay, rather than housing requirements. The Mayor's Housing Strategy (2010) provides updated guidance on this issue, and states that *"While there is obviously a significant demand for family-sized market homes in the capital, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment found little net requirement for this type of housing across London, although there are bound to be local variations"*.

55 The Mayor's Housing Strategy provides further updated guidance with regard to intermediate provision and sets a target of 16% of homes within this tenure to be family sized. The application includes nine three-bed intermediate properties, which represents 17% of intermediate provision. This accords with the target within the Housing Strategy.

56 Given that the proposal accords priority to family social housing above other tenures, and the nature of the affordable rent product, together with the limitations to the delivery of traditional social

rent, the proposed mix is broadly in accordance with the strategic objectives established in London Plan Policy 3.11, and as set out in the Mayor's Housing Strategy, and is therefore acceptable.

Density

57 London Plan Policy 3.4 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles and public transport accessibility. The site has a public transport accessibility level of two to three and its immediate setting is suburban in character. The London Plan density matrix therefore suggests a residential density of between 150 and 250 habitable rooms per hectare.

58 The proposal has a density of 329 habitable rooms per hectare. The London Plan density matrix is not intended to set a prescriptive set of densities, however, as made clear in the Mayor's Interim Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance document (April 2010), "*Where proposals are made for developments above the relevant density range they must be tested rigorously*". A range of relevant factors are detailed against which applications should be assessed, including aspects of 'livability' related to proposed dwelling mix, design and quality, amenity provision and space, physical access to services, sustainable design and construction, car parking and the wider context of the proposal.

59 As detailed above, the application provides a significant proportion of family affordable accommodation, a large proportion of which are four-bed houses with gardens. An assessment of the units against the standards within the Mayor's Housing Design Guide (as detailed below) concludes that the units themselves are of a high standard, and the overall approach to play and recreation space provision is supported (see paragraphs 63 to 71). The overall design of the scheme accords with the principles of the London Plan (see paragraphs 72 to 87), and the approach to site layout and building height appropriately takes its cues from the existing built development. The approach to climate change is broadly supported (see paragraph 99 to 113), and as detailed in the transport section of this report, the parking levels proposed are in accordance with London Plan policies. Therefore, on balance, the density of the development is acceptable and appropriately optimises the site's potential.

Housing quality

60 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan introduces a new policy on the quality and design of housing developments. Part A of the policy states that housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to the wider environment. Part C of the policy states that new dwellings should generally conform with the dwelling space standards set out in Table 3.3, have adequately sized rooms and convenient and efficient room layouts. Part E of the policy states that the Mayor will provide guidance on implementation of this policy including on housing design for all tenures. The reasoned justification provides further guidance and explanation. In particular, paragraph 3.32 makes clear that "*Securing new housing of the highest quality and protecting and enhancing residential neighbourhoods are key Mayoral priorities*".

61 The Mayor's draft Housing Design Guide (July 2009) and the Interim Housing SPG (EiP version – August 2010), provides further guidance on the implementation of these policies.

62 The applicant has provided a detailed assessment of the proposed residential units against the standards and policies within the London Plan and the Mayor's draft Housing Design Guide, which demonstrates broad compliance with the necessary standards. A total of 96% of the units meet the minimum space standards within Table 3.3 of the London Plan, with 86% of units exceeding these standards. There are no single-aspect north-facing units, and no family single-aspect units. In addition, all of the units meet the standards for private amenity space, with 93% of the units exceeding these standards. On balance, the units will be of a suitable quality and adequately address London Plan Policy 3.5.

Children's play space

63 Policy 3.6 of the London Plan sets out that *“Development proposals that include housing should make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs”*.

64 Using the methodology within the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance *‘Providing for children and young people's play and informal recreation’*, the development is expected to be home to 167 children. The breakdown of the expected age ranges is provided below.

Age range	Expected child population
0-4	62
5-11	63
11+	42
Total	167

(Expected child population)

65 The guidance sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of usable child playspace to be provided per child, with under-five child playspace expected to be provided on-site. Subject to the condition and location of existing facilities, it may also be necessary to provide facilities for older children.

66 In accordance with strategic guidance, the applicant has submitted a play strategy, which includes a review of existing play facilities. This demonstrates that there are no play facilities within a safe and reasonable route from the site, largely due to the proximity of the A406, which acts as a substantial barrier to movement south, particularly for children. In the light of this assessment, and given the size of the development site, and the total number of residential units proposed, the proposal should therefore be self sufficient with regard to play provision. Consequently, a total of 1,670 sq.m. of play is required, with specific facilities needed for each of the three main age groups, as specified in the Mayor's strategic guidance.

67 The proposal includes a series of dedicated play spaces, amounting to 1,455 sq.m. of provision:

- Six dedicated areas for doorstep play totalling 335 sq.m. These spaces are primarily intended for use by the under fives.
- Two areas of local play space for the five to eleven age group, totalling 710 sq.m.
- Four areas of youth space for those aged over twelve, totalling 410 sq.m.

68 The applicant has provided some indicative sketches to illustrate the design of these spaces, as well as providing details of the types of facilities to be provided. The indicative design of these spaces is promising, and the architects have shown imaginative use of natural features for play. However, the status of these sketch plans is not clear. It is essential that the design approach presented at this stage is carried forward into the detailed design stage. Further discussion with the Council and the applicant is therefore required regarding how these design concepts will be secured.

69 The proposed spaces amount to 1,455 sq.m. This is a shortfall of 185 sq.m. against the requirements within the Mayor's SPG.

70 As detailed in the design section of this report, the overall concept of the proposal is to create a central area of semi-private open space at the centre of the site, together with a series of public plazas. This approach delivers significant areas of open space that have the capacity to provide informal play and recreation opportunities. As recognised in paragraphs 3.27 to 3.30 in the Mayor's SPG, playable spaces, where the wider public realm and public spaces are developed with informal or playful landscaping features, can provide spaces for children's play whilst also being suitable for the whole range of users/residents. The applicant has sought to adopt this approach to the design of the public realm across the scheme, and particularly the central courtyard, and plaza in front of the main Tote board. The approach taken to provide dual-use of public and semi-public spaces for play and general recreation is strongly supported and will ensure that the site has activity throughout. However, as detailed above, whilst the initial concepts for these spaces are supported, further discussion is required to ensure that these design sketches are carried through to the detailed design stage.

71 The applicant has provided a breakdown of the proposed spaces, which demonstrates that in addition to private gardens and terrace spaces, and the proposed dedicated play spaces, the development includes 2,315 sq.m. of communal shared garden spaces, and 4,851 sq.m. of soft and hard landscaped areas. Overall, there is 8,621 sq.m. of public realm and recreation space, including designated play. This is considerably above the 1,455 sq.m. of play space required using the methodology within the Mayor's SPG. This scale of provision is strongly supported, particularly given the site is currently located in an area of deficiency for play and has no existing facilities within a safe walking distance of the site. To ensure that the design of the public realm and recreation spaces is of a sufficient high quality, further discussion is required with the Council and the applicant regarding securing the design concepts presented through to detailed design.

Urban design

72 Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan, and is specifically promoted by the policies contained within chapter seven, which address both general design principles and specific design issues. London Plan Policy 7.1 sets out a series of overarching design principles for development in London. Other design policies in this chapter and elsewhere in the London Plan include specific design requirements relating to optimising the housing potential of sites, the quality of new housing provision, designing out crime, local character, public realm, architecture, heritage assets, and the Blue Ribbon Network.

73 The proposed design has been developed from a thorough analysis of the application site and its context. This analysis has, in particular, considered: the significance of the listed buildings and the historical use of the site; the prevailing character of the surrounding neighbourhood and opportunities to enhance this; and the River Ching and opportunities to enhance this through de-culverting, improving flood mitigation and enhancing footpath links and habitat.

Layout

74 The proposed layout would successfully echo the historic geometry of the site. It would follow the alignment of the stands and curvature of the track in the proposed routes and built form and retain the Tote building and kennels (Grade II listed) in situ, giving these prominence within the area. This would, importantly, promote the understanding and interpretation of the history of the site, the relationship between the individual heritage assets, and assist in promoting a distinct sense of place.

75 The proposal would also be consistent with the pattern of development in the surrounding neighbourhood, which is typified by terraced housing on an east-west alignment perpendicular to Chingford Road, as seen at Empress Avenue and Rushcroft Road.

76 This arrangement would be readily navigable for residents and visitors and allow direct connection to Chingford Road. It also takes account of existing and future pedestrian desire lines in the neighbourhood. In particular it would introduce a north-south route through the site from Empress Avenue to Rushcroft Road and the Rush Croft Sports College, offering a clear improvement to the current route via Chingford Road. This route would also connect with the enhanced riverside path, and thereby allow easy access to this for existing residents of Rushcroft Road and the area beyond, and improve connection to Chingford Road for those walking or cycling along the river corridor.

77 The proposed layout has taken full account of the London Plan Blue Ribbon Network policies, and would de-culvert the River Ching in this location, address flood mitigation and improve access and to the river corridor (as discussed in paragraphs 92 to 98). This is a significant benefit of the scheme, particularly given the public safety issues arising from the narrow and secluded alley to the south of the Popular Stand. As well as promoting access to, and the use of, the riverside space, the proposal would also introduce new housing directly overlooking this area and thereby promote its passive surveillance.

78 The landscape masterplan for the site is well considered and would create a series of distinct, but linked, spaces responding to the character of each part of the site. In particular the proposal would maintain a linear open space in the centre of the site, allowing views to the listed buildings at either end, and would celebrate the latter by focusing community amenity spaces such as allotments and play areas in front of each of the listed buildings. The proposals for the River Ching corridor would naturalise this through the site and introduce new habitat, which is welcomed. The extensive use of shared surface streets is appropriate to the residential character of the area, especially given the probable number of families with young children in the area.

Scale and massing and appearance

79 The scale and massing of the proposed buildings has been determined in response to the specific context of each part of the site and is on the whole well considered. Those buildings backing onto the two-storey houses on Rushcroft Road and Empress Avenue would be two to four-storeys with generous gardens between. These are well conceived as contemporary townhouses built in brick with metallic cladding to the upper levels.

80 The townhouses would face the linear apartment buildings in the centre of the site, which would be up to five-storeys. The scale and massing of these buildings has been carefully considered in relation to the listed buildings on the site. At their eastern end the buildings have been tapered to diminish their bulk and, in tandem, to mirror the concave form of the kennels. This would create a well-defined and proportioned amenity space that would manage the change in scale and would appropriately be centred on the kennels.

81 At the western end of the site the buildings would also be tapered, which together with their scale of five-storeys, would ensure that they would not interfere with the silhouette of the Tote when viewed in dynamic views from Chingford Road. These views, which take in the Tote and the car park frontage, are widely recognised and central to the appreciation of the special architectural and historical interest of the site. In these views the proposed buildings would appear as subservient background elements behind the Tote and car park and would, importantly, avoid interference with the distinctive silhouette of the upper part of the Tote, preserving the current backdrop of clear sky. This approach is supported.

82 The architecture of these buildings would reference the 1930's architecture of the listed buildings, with extensive use of clear and obscure glazing framed within banded expressed floor plates in white concrete. The design is well handled and would complement the setting of the listed

buildings. The local authority should ensure that the materials used are of the high quality demanded by this approach, through the use of conditions on any planning permission.

83 The buildings in the southeast corner of the site would range from five to eight storeys. The applicant has, in discussion with the local authority, proposed buildings of a greater scale in this location to mark the site in views from the east. The proposed buildings would step-up in scale from the southern end of the single-storey kennels and from the proposed two to four-storey buildings to the west. As discussed through the pre-planning application process, GLA officers consider that this part of the site is not an intuitive location for an increase in built scale in townscape terms, although there is some merit in providing overlooking of the riverside open space to the east. The Council should satisfy itself that the approach to building height in this location satisfactorily addresses local design policies.

Heritage assets

84 The application proposes the restoration and conversion of the listed Tote building and Kennels and is accompanied by a listed building application for determination by the local authority in parallel with this application.

85 The Kennels would be refurbished and used to provide storage and community space for the allotments. The Tote building would be restored and the car park brought back into use as such. The rear of the building would be stripped of various contemporary additions, notably those associated with the nightclub, and then augmented with an extension. This would enable the creation of four studios, for dance and fitness classes, and a communal cafe and reception area beneath the Tote itself. The extension would be treated in glass and steel and, whilst harmonious with the modernist form of the original building, would be visually distinct so as to enable a clear understanding of the different elements.

86 On the basis of the material submitted in connection with this application the proposed approach is appropriate and would both restore the heritage assets on the site and bring them back into beneficial economic use, thereby enhancing the prospects of their ongoing preservation. The proposal would also, through the considered positioning and design of the proposed buildings, preserve the setting of the listed buildings on the site. The overall approach to the heritage assets on the site is supported and consistent with the expectations of the London Plan.

Summary

87 In summary the proposal is consistent with the design policies of the London Plan, specifically policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, and 7.8.

Inclusive design

88 London Plan Policy 7.2 requires all future development to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion, and requires design and access statements submitted with planning applications to explain how the principles of inclusive design, including the specific needs of disabled people, have been integrated into the proposed development and how inclusion will be managed and maintained. London Plan Policy 3.8 expects 10% of all new housing to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users. Further guidance to this policy is provided in the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance '*Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment.*'

89 Whilst the design and access statement states that all units will be designed to Lifetime Homes standards and 10% will be designed to be adaptable for wheelchair units, this is not demonstrated with indicative flat layouts. The applicant has indicated where the wheelchair accessible units will be located, including a commitment that units located above ground floor being served by two lifts,

which is strongly supported. However, the applicant should submit flat layouts illustrating the design of these units to ensure that the standards will be met. The Mayor's Best Practice Guide on wheelchair accessible housing provides a useful checklist that can be used to demonstrate the adaptability of the new homes proposed.

90 The design of the landscaping and the public realm, including the entrances to buildings, is crucial to how inclusive the development will be to many people. The pedestrian routes to all of the buildings, and within the buildings and courtyards, should be designed to ensure full and easy access for all users. In addition, all public spaces and recreation/play facilities should be designed to ensure access for all. Whilst the applicant has provided written commitment that these standards will be met in the detailed design, further evidence is required to ensure that the commitments are delivered in the final scheme.

91 At this stage it is not therefore possible to determine whether the proposals accord with London Plan policies 3.8 and 7.2.

Blue Ribbon Network and flooding

Blue Ribbon Network

92 The River Ching currently runs in a culvert along the southern boundary of the site. The river enters the culvert in the south east corner of the site, and emerges from the culvert 160 metres to the west. As a major tributary to the River Lea, the River Ching forms part of the Blue Ribbon Network.

93 London Plan Policy 7.24 makes clear that *"The Blue Ribbon Network is a strategically important series of linked spaces."* Policy 7.28 of the London Plan seeks the restoration of the network and states that *"Development proposals should restore and enhance the Blue Ribbon Network by taking opportunities to open culverts and naturalise river channels..."*

94 The application deculverts the River Ching for its entire route on the southern boundary of the site. This is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.28. Built development has been pulled back from the river, and an improved pedestrian and cycle route has been introduced along its banks, together with a number of open spaces fronting the river, to increase the amenity value of this important asset. These measures will assist with flooding (discussed below), and will help improve the amenity value of the river, providing a much improved environment to the southern boundary of the site.

Flooding

95 Part of the application site is located within a Flood Zone 3a, as defined by the Environment Agency, indicating it suffers from a high probability of flooding. London Plan Policy 5.12 states that *"Development proposals must comply with the flood risk assessment and management requirements set out in PPS25 over the lifetime of the development..."*

96 Given that residential uses are proposed, an exceptions test is required under PPS25. London Plan Policy 5.12 states that *"Developments which are required to pass the PPS25 Exceptions Test will need to address resilient design and emergency planning by demonstrating that the development will remain safe and operational under flood condition; a strategy of either safe evacuation and/or safely remaining in the building is followed under flood conditions; key services including electricity, water etc will continue to be provided under flood conditions; and buildings are designed for quick recovery following a flood"*.

97 The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment in response to national, strategic and local policy requirements with regard to flood risk. This includes details regarding emergency planning in

the event of a flood. As part of the wider flood risk strategy, the applicant is proposing sustainable urban drainage measures, including permeable surfaces, swales, and green roofs. These measures are supported in accordance with London Plan policies 5.11 and 5.13.

98 Subject to the assessment of the proposal by the Council, and any comment provided by the Environment Agency, the proposal with regard to flooding is acceptable, and accords with strategic planning policy.

Climate change

99 The London Plan climate change policies as set out in chapter five collectively require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions (Policy 5.2).

Climate change mitigation

100 London Plan policies 5.2, 5.6 and 5.7 focus on mitigation of climate change and require a reduction in a development's carbon dioxide emissions through the use of passive design, energy efficiency and renewable energy measures. The London Plan requires developments to make the fullest contribution to tackling climate change by minimising carbon dioxide emissions, adopting sustainable design and construction measures and prioritising decentralised energy, including renewables.

Energy efficiency standards

101 A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameter will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations. Other features include low energy lighting.

102 The development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 54 tonnes per annum (7%) in regulated carbon dioxide emissions compared to a 2010 Building Regulations compliant scheme. Using the tables provided by the applicant in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of its submitted energy strategy, it appears that carbon savings of 30% beyond 2010 building regulations will be achieved with the use of energy efficiency alone for the residential element. Whilst strongly supported, these savings appear to be very high. Further clarification regarding the level of savings achieved through energy efficiency is therefore required.

District heating

103 There are no district heating networks within the vicinity of the proposed development.

104 A site wide heat network, served from a single energy centre, is proposed for the development. The network will provide heat to all of the apartments and buildings. This approach would allow the development to take heat from an external heat network should one be available in the future. The applicant should provide schematics showing an indicative route for the on-site heat network, showing all buildings connected to it.

105 A 235 sq.m energy centre is proposed in order to house the required heat generating plant. Drawings have been submitted showing the location of the energy centre.

Combined heat and power

106 The applicant is proposing to install a gas-fired combined heat and power plant. The applicant should provide further details regarding the capacity of the plant proposed, supported with the submission of heat load profiles.

107 A reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions of 261 tonnes per annum (36%) will be achieved through this second part of the energy hierarchy. As with the proposed energy efficiency savings, these savings appear to be high. In order to be able to verify the carbon savings, the applicant should confirm the assumptions used for the calculations, for instance the electrical efficiency of the CHP plant, and the proportion of the development heat load supplied by the CHP plant.

Cooling

108 The applicant should clarify what design features are being proposed to reduce the demand for cooling in the first instance. The applicant should clarify where a need for active cooling would exist and explain how these requirements would be provided.

Renewables

109 As part of the renewable proposals the applicant has concluded that either photovoltaic or a biomass boiler could be used to supply energy to the proposed development.

110 As stated by the applicant, the reported carbon savings achieved with the use of energy efficiency measures and combined heat and power plant are enough to fulfil the London Plan carbon reduction targets. However, further information is required to verify the carbon savings claimed under the energy efficiency and combined heat and power sections. If the carbon savings are subsequently amended, a more detailed evaluation regarding which renewable energy technology is the optimal solution will be required.

Overview of carbon savings

111 As currently reported, the estimated regulated carbon emissions of the development are 467 tonnes of carbon dioxide per year, after the cumulative effect of energy efficiency measures and CHP have been taken into account. This equates to a reduction of 315 tonnes per year in regulated emissions compared to a 2010 Building Regulations compliant development, equivalent to an overall saving of 40%.

Climate change adaptation

112 London Plan Policy 5.3 seeks to ensure future developments meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction. Specific policies relate to overheating (5.9), living roofs and walls (5.11), urban greening (5.10), sustainable drainage (5.13), water (5.14 and 5.15) and waste (5.17). Further guidance is provided in the London Plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG.

113 Whilst the applicant has submitted an energy and sustainability strategy, it focuses primarily on the proposed energy strategy, and does not adequately detail the sustainable design and construction standards and features which will be included within the development. It is not therefore possible to determine whether the proposal accords with London Plan policies 5.3, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, 5.13, 5.14, 5.15 and 5.17. The applicant should submit a more detailed strategy, demonstrating that all the of the Mayor's essential standards within the SPG, and the relevant London Plan Policy requirements, will be met as a minimum.

Transport for London

Car parking

114 The provision of 212 parking spaces to serve 301 dwellings, resulting in a ratio of 0.7 spaces per unit is, considered reasonable in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13 '*Parking*'. A further sixty spaces will be provided for the various non-residential units. In accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13, and Table 6.2, TfL welcomes the applicant's commitment that 20% of all spaces will include an electric charging point (active provision), with an additional 20% passive provision for future use. In addition, TfL welcomes the provision of two car club vehicles, and the commitment for a third bay to be reallocated from the visitor spaces, should demand arise.

Cycle parking

115 The commitment to provide cycle parking in accordance with TfL's cycle parking standards and London Plan Policy 6.9, '*cycling*' for all elements of the development is welcomed. The provision of Sheffield stands for visitors close to building entrances is also welcomed. Spaces should be provided in a secure, accessible and sheltered location. The provision of showering and changing facilities within the non residential buildings is supported in order to encourage employee cycle use.

Buses

116 TfL considers that overall, the approach to trip generation is reasonable and complies with TfL's Best Practice Guidance. However, the use of the 2001 census has its limitations, due to its age and as it provides data on travel to work. Consequently, the assessment appears to have underestimated bus usage. It is expected that a high proportion of underground and train passengers will use this mode to access either Blackhorse Road, or Walthamstow Central station from this site, rather than walk to Highams Park station. Furthermore, TfL does not agree with the assessment methodology that disperses bus trips evenly across the eight local bus services close to the site.

117 When taken with other planned/committed developments in the area, TfL expects that this development will cause a capacity problem on the bus network, particularly on the Blackhorse Lane corridor. In accordance with London Plan Policy 6.3 '*Addressing effects of development on transport capacity*,' and Policy 6.7 '*Better streets and surface transport*,' TfL has therefore requested a contribution towards mitigating the capacity problem on the network, which has not to date been committed to by the applicant. TfL reiterates that this development is likely to generate the need for an additional journey in the busiest directions in the peak hour. A contribution of £210,000 (£70,000 per annum for a typical period of three years) is therefore considered reasonable and necessary.

118 TfL welcomes the applicant's confirmation that with the alteration to the site frontage along Chingford Road, the existing accessible bus stop and shelter will be reused. The provision of signage to indicate routes through the site is also welcomed in order to assist with wayfinding and encourage walking in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.10 '*Walking*'.

119 In response to TfL's initial comments, the applicant is currently undertaking further work to address issues in relation to junction capacity modelling, in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.11 '*Smoothing traffic flow and reducing congestion*'. In order to mitigate the traffic impact of this development, and to enhance access to the site by bus, the operation of the nearby signal junctions during peak and off peak periods should be improved. TfL has there recommended the introduction of SCOOT (Split Cycle Offset Optimisation Technique) at the Walthamstow Avenue/Chingford Road junction and Crooked Billet Roundabout. SCOOT would provide a general benefit for development traffic and, specifically during the off-peak period, would assist with reducing delays to minor arms of the junctions. Whilst TfL welcomes the applicant's initial offer of £70,000 towards the installation of SCOOT at the Walthamstow Avenue junction, discussions are ongoing to determine whether this can

be increased overall to £150,000. A proportion of this contribution could then be pooled towards improvements to the Crooked Billet roundabout.

Travel planning

120 In order to manage travel demand, and in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.3, *“Assessing effects of development on transport capacity”*, TfL welcomes the submission of a site wide travel plan. In response to TfL’s request, the applicant has also agreed to provide a delivery and service plan and construction logistics plan. These commitments should be secured and monitored through the section 106 process.

Local planning authority’s position

121 It is understood that the Council will determine this application, together with the proposal at the adjacent site, and the application for the redevelopment of the former Walthamstow Greyhound Stadium, in Autumn 2011.

Legal considerations

122 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

123 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

124 London Plan policies on sport and leisure, housing, children’s play space, urban design, inclusive design, the Blue Ribbon Network, flooding, climate change and transport are relevant to this application. The application complies with some of these policies but not with others, for the following reasons:

- **Sport and leisure:** The loss of the greyhound stadium is acceptable in land use planning terms, subject to the Council securing the off-site leisure and sports contribution, and further detailed discussions regarding the provision of the additional on-site facilities. The provision of allotments and social infrastructure facilities is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.22 and 3.16 respectively.
- **Housing:** The applicant’s viability report will need to be subjected to independent review. It is not therefore possible to determine at this stage whether the proposal accords with London Plan Policy 3.12.

- **Children’s play space:** The application provides sufficient play and amenity space in line with London Plan Policy 3.6, and the initial design concepts for these spaces are strongly supported. However, further discussion is required regarding how this quality and design approach will be carried forward to the detailed design phase, to ensure full compliance with London Plan Policy 3.6 and the Mayor’s SPG: Providing for children and young people’s play and recreation.
- **Urban design:** The design rationale, and the approach to heritage assets, is broadly in accordance with London Plan policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.8.
- **Inclusive design:** Whilst the applicant has provided written commitments, it is not possible to determine at this stage whether the proposal accords fully with London Plan policies 3.8 and 7.2.
- **Blue Ribbon Network and flooding:** The application accords with London Plan policies 7.24, 7.28, 5.11, 5.12 and 5.13, with regard to the Blue Ribbon Network and flooding.
- **Climate change mitigation:** Whilst the energy strategy is broadly in accordance with strategic priorities with regard to climate change mitigation, it is not possible at this stage to determine whether the proposal accords with London Plan policies 5.2, 5.6 and 5.7.
- **Climate change adaptation:** The applicant has not provided a detailed sustainability statement. It is not therefore possible to determine whether the proposal accords with London Plan policies 5.3, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, 5.13, 5.14, 5.15 and 5.17.
- **Transport:** The proposal does not accord with London Plan policies 6.2, 6.3, and 6.11 with regard to bus capacity, managing travel demand, and smoothing traffic flow.

125 On balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan. The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan:

- **Sport and leisure:** The Council should secure the proposed financial contribution towards off-site leisure use within the legal agreement, in addition to the leisure facilities being proposed on-site. Further discussions regarding the design and layout of the additional on-site measures are required to ensure that these are appropriately incorporated into the application.
- **Housing:** Further discussions are required with regard to financial viability, including an independent assessment of the applicant’s viability report, to ensure that the development is providing the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing.
- **Children’s play space:** Whilst the approach to play provision is supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.6, further discussion is required with regard to securing the design concepts presented at this stage, through to the detailed design.
- **Inclusive design:** The applicant should submit indicative flat layouts demonstrating that the requirements of London Plan Policy 3.8 will be met. In addition, further information is required regarding how the principles of inclusive design have been adopted in the design of the public realm, including the proposed play spaces.
- **Climate change:** Whilst the broad approach to the proposed energy strategy is supported and in accordance with London Plan priorities, the carbon dioxide emission savings reported from both energy efficiency measures and the combined heat and power plant, need to be verified

and evidenced. In addition, further information is required regarding the cooling strategy. Should the carbon dioxide emission savings be amended following further review, a detailed renewable energy strategy will be required.

- **Climate change adaptation:** The applicant should submit a more detailed strategy, demonstrating that all the of the Mayor's essential standards within the SPG, and the relevant London Plan Policy requirements, will be met as a minimum.
- **Transport:** The applicant is required to provide a financial contribution towards bus capacity improvements, and towards improving the operation of the Walthamstow Avenue/Chingford Road junction and Crooked Billet Roundabout. The Council should secure the delivery of a travel plan, delivery and service plan, and construction logistics plan.

for further information, contact Planning Decisions Unit:

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager - Planning Decisions

020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

020 7983 4895 email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

Sarah Considine, Principal Strategic Planner, Case Officer

020 7983 5751 email sarah.considine@london.gov.uk
