Appendix 1: Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
Conservation Officer	The Heritage Statement draws out the significance of the existing buildings and I agree with the conclusions. Although the buildings are not listed or locally listed, neither in a conservation area, they do have some significance as non-designated assets. However, I agree with the conclusion that the significance is confined to local heritage value through its association with the historic use of the hospital. The architectural interest is limited as much of the fabric has been altered internally. As such, I am of the opinion that the demolition of the buildings would cause limited harm. Additionally, to address the concerns raised by the Quality Review Panel with respect to options of retention of these buildings, the applicants have addressed this, including part retention and conversion of the building. It has been demonstrated that the conversion of the buildings would be difficult due to the poor structural condition of the buildings and due to their form which do not easily relent themselves to be converted to modern residential units. This will result in a poorer form of development which cannot be justified given the limited heritage value of the buildings. The redevelopment of the site on the other hand would create a more wholesome form of development that would be high in design quality and would enhance the area, providing much needed affordable housing. This would be considered as public benefit that would outweigh the limited harm caused due to the demolition of the non-designated assets. In assessing this proposal, the statutory tests do not apply as the assets are not under the statutory protection. However, NPPF paragraph 135 would apply which states that 'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.' I have given regard to the NPPF paragraph 135 and I consider that the total demolition of the non-designated buildings would cause some harm. However, I feel that the retention of the buildings in part or full will result in a much poorer form of development that could not be justified against the limited heritage value of the buildings. As such on balance, the demolition of the buildings is acceptable as the less than substantial harm is outweighed by the high quality design and the public benefits of the development. Overall, it is considered that whilst the existing buildings on site does have some merit, it is limited to their local heritage value. As such their demolition would cause less than substantial harm. This less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the public benefits from the scheme and would be acceptable.	
Design Officer	1. The site is in the far north-west of Haringey, close to the borders of the borough of Barnet, north-west of the centre of Muswell Hill, about 1.4km from The Broadway, in an open, lower density area where the ground falls to the valley of the Strawberry Vale Brook about 350m north of the site. The valley is increasingly dominated by open space and undeveloped land, but this is no rural idyll, as the bottom of the valley is dominated by the extensive, noisy traffic corridor of the North Circular Road, the A406, here built to near motorway standards and named Pinkham Way. 2. The street that the site faces, Coppetts Road, connects the centre of Muswell Hill to the North Circular, but only at a restricted T-junction onto a sliproad that forms part of the grade-separated junction with the more important B550 Colney Hatch Lane, parallel to Coppetts Road some 400m	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	to its east. Coppetts Road is the main street in the area as well as forming the east boundary, the frontage, of the site. In the vicinity of the site it is characterised by large scale developments set well back from the street behind wooded, landscaped frontages, with a discontinuous pavement, although as it continues southwards up the gentle slope towards Muswell Hill it becomes more built up, urban and fine grained, becoming fronted by semi-detached or terraced houses closer to the street, especially when south of Page's Lane it changes name to Tetherdown. 3. Nearby open spaces include Coppetts Wood itself, some 450m north of the site, Coldfall Wood some 400m south-west, both surviving areas of ancient woodland under council ownership, the adjoining Muswell Hill Recreation Ground immediate north of Coldfall Wood and some 100m west of the site, the vast Islington and Camden Cemetery west of that park, Halliwick Recreation Ground just 50m south-east of the site on the other side of Coppetts Road, the extensive playing fields of Coppetts Wood Primary School 75m east of the site and the extensive Halliwick Park Allotments starting just over 30m north of the site. 4. The site itself is on a smaller finger of built-up land between open spaces, running along Coppetts Road, broadening out into the built-up extent of Muswell Hill, on the ridge of the hill to the south, narrowing to a point where it meets the North Circular. Although the centre of Muswell Hill was developed at the end of the nineteenth century as consistent of grand, decorative, red-brick, 2/3 storey houses, surrounded by more crescent-form streets of early twentieth century semi-detached and short terraced houses, this site immediate surroundings were mostly developed as institutional buildings in grounds, industrial buildings and post war estates, with landscaping and an "arms-length" relationship to the street. Many of these have been recently redeveloped at higher density 3 and 4 storey housing; e.g. Gilson Place on a former industrial site just 80m north and Osier Crescent on the rest of the former Coppetts Wood Hospital site. 5. Coppetts Wood Hospital itself was originally built at the end of the	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	nineteenth century as an isolation hospital, before evolving into a general hospital, as a complex of disparate buildings in extensive grounds, as described in the applicants' Design & Access Statement. Much of the site was closed in 1990s and was redeveloped as Osier Crescent for housing; this site represents the last section of the hotel to be closed, and includes the original Admin. Building, three ward blocks and the Mortuary; their functions have now like the rest of the hospital earlier been moved to the Royal Free Hospital in Hampstead. 6. Osier Crescent, like the nearby Gilson Place, consists of a mixture of terraced townhouses and small mansion blocks of flats; although mostly built in the first few years of the 21st century, they are in a style popularised in the 1980s, of "post-modern" reinterpretations of classical and vernacular domestic forms; characterised by blocks sitting in landscape, served off curving crescent-streets as much as any 1960s estate, the blocks do nevertheless address the street to some degree and many, especially the "townhouses" have private back gardens, however their frontages appear car dominated. Heights are 3, 4 and 5 storeys, with pitched roofs containing dormers and roof lights, brick facades and traditional styled modern windows. 7. Other immediate neighbours include the Martins Walk estate immediately opposite; a 1950s or 60s council estate of 2 and 3 storey flatted blocks and short terraces "scattered" in grass landscaping. Between Martins Walk and the entrance to Coppetts Wood School to its north, the site of the former Bravanese Community Centre, demolished in 2013. Immediately north of the site facing Coppetts Road is Strawberry Terrace, a terrace of 2 storey 1980s houses, fronted by hardstanding for parking, culminating in a 3 storey flatted block immediately adjacent to the site. Beyond that and stretching behind to the site boundary is the Muswell Hill Church of Jesus Christ and the Latter Day Saints another low-rise building of '80s appearance with extensive grassed grounds and parking. Behind the church is the former Greenfields School, now the London School for	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Children with Cerebral Palsy, a 1960s 2 storey school building currently being extended, in wooded grounds. This school looks onto Muswell Hill Playing Fields to the north-west and are accessed off a lane off Coppetts Road to the north 8. The border between Haringey and Barnet boroughs runs along Coppetts Road in front of the site; the east side of the road is therefore in Barnet. At the northern end of Coppetts Road, the border turns south between Muswell Hill Rec / Coldfall Wood and the cemeteries, so that the Coppetts Road area forms a finger of Haringey into Barnet, with the area east between Coppetts Road and just east of Colney Hatch Lane forming a finger of Barnet into Haringey. 9. The site, along with the school and buildings/land to its north, form the Site Allocation SA55 "Coppetts Wood Hospital" in the Pre-Submission Draft Site Allocation (January 2016). The allocation reads: *"Consolidation of existing land uses to create potentially mixed use community and residential development."*, with the commentary: *"Consolidation of existing land uses to create potentially mixed use community and residential development."*. The only relevant Site Requirement is that the hospital function should *"demonstrate it is no longer required, or has been reprovided elsewhere, before any change of use may occur"; whilst the relevant Development Guidelines are; "The possibility to include the Church of Jesus of the Latter-day Saints building into this scheme should be considered."*; *"The amenity of the properties on Coppetts Rd should be respected by the new development."*; *"A piling statement will be required prior to any piling taking place."*; and *"Applicants must consult with Thames Water regarding both wastewater and water supply capacity upon the preparation of a planning application".* The DPD has been through Examination in Public and no relevant modifications are proposed to this arising from the EiP; the allocation can therefore be considered to have considerable planning policy weight. 10. Apart from the Site Allocation, there are no relevant local planning	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	designations on the site or immediately adjoining land. However a large amount of the nearby open space is designated Metropolitan Open Land under the London Plan, with the same protection as Green Belt. Coldfall Wood and Coppetts Wood are Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) of Borough Importance (Grade 1) and Muswell Hill Playing Fields is SINC Grade 2. Coldfall Wood and Muswell Hill Rec are also designated Local Nature Reserves. However the application site is not immediately adjacent to any of these designated open spaces so I would consider there is little need for the proposals to respond significantly to them. **Principal of Development** 11. The site is well located and suitable for residential development; it is a predominantly residential area and is immediately surrounded by housing in the Osier Crescent and Martins Walk estates, but also has nearby educational, religious, community and particularly sport and leisure facilities. However it is not particularly close to shopping or other town centre facilities. The nearest corner shop is 5oom away on the corner of Coppetts and Wilton Road; there are a few more shops and a local (Barnet Council) library some 700m away (by road; shorter but not walkable as the crow flies) on Colney Hatch Lane; and some 1.4km to the edge of Muswell Hill town centre, although this is a good town centre with a wide range of quality shops and facilities. 12. The site is also poorly connected to public transport, with a PTAL of 2. A bus route, but only one, the 234, does stop right outside the site every 10-13 minutes each way during the day, every 20 minutes in the evening, to the centre of Muswell Hill and on to East Finchley Station and Highgate Wood south, as well as north to Friern Barnet and High Barnet. More busses are available on Colney Hatch Lane (frequently) and (infrequently) the North Circular, but the nearest stations are New Southgate (Great Northern main line, infrequent) 2.5km north east and East Finchley (Northern tube line, frequent)2.6km south west, beyond most walking distance. The hilly terrain, busy roads and lack of segregated cycle routes	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	tend to reduce cycling in this area. 13. Therefore, although the expectations are for higher density development to seek to go some way towards meeting near overwhelming housing need, six to eight storey development typically appropriate elsewhere in the residential hinterlands of the borough would not be appropriate in the whole development here, and a development that stepped down to the height of the existing context would I feel, be in principle appropriate. **Existing buildings** 14. Amongst the existing buildings on the site, the Admin Building and Mortuary are recognised by the applicant as well as by officers, including myself, and more importantly, by the Council's Conservation Officer, as having some architectural quality and historic interest; both are amongst the earliest buildings built at the hospital, and are constructed in attractive decorative brickwork. The Admin Building in particular features a prominent and striking frontage to Coppetts Road, in two wings, each of a pair of decorated gabled bays, linked by an elaborately decorated portico-ed entrance; decorative features formed in rich, warm red brick and/or terracotta, as well as an attractive roof containing decorated timber dormers and brick chimneys. There are also attractive wrought iron railings to the Coppetts Road frontage. 15. The applicant has investigated possible retention and reuse in whole or parts of both the Admin Building and Mortuary but has demonstrated with comprehensive and robust evidence that the condition of both and the economics of possible conversion layouts preclude this. At my request they investigated the following extents of retention of the Admin Building; wholesale, with extensions up and behind, retention of just the frontage up to the roof ridge, retention of just the front (and possibly parts of the sides) facade(s), retention of just key parts such as the gabled bays and entrance portico, and reuse elsewhere of elements and decorative bricks. I felt that it would assist in anchoring the design of the proposals into its locality and	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	history, as well as providing the scheme with some distinctiveness, for as great an extent or as many elements of the good quality existing buildings to be retained or reused in the development as possible, regardless of whether or not that would be justified in heritage and conservation grounds. 16. This latter strategy is proposed, with the main entrance archway and portico, the most impressive element of the Admin Building, to be retained and re-erected at the entrance to a small park space within the development, known by the applicant as the "Pocket Green". The wrought iron railings will be refurbished and retained where Block F fronts Coppetts Road and Osier Crescent, with the gates repositioned as the other entrance to the Pocket Green. Finally the glazed tiles from the entrance lobby of the Admin Building will be reused in the entrance lobbies of Blocks C and D. 17. I had hoped the applicant would seek to salvage decorative brickwork / terracotta from elsewhere in the Admin Building for reuse in the relatively blank end flank wall of Block E (the townhouses facing Coppetts Road), as was discussed at the last pre-application meeting. However the applicant has not followed this through, regarding other design changes as having alleviated my concerns. I would still prefer to see this, but do not regard it on its own as a serious omission. 18. None of the buildings on the site are statutorily or locally listed nor is it in a Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer's comments should be referred to for a heritage and conservation analysis of the proposals. **Use, Form & Development Pattern** 19. The applicant considers the site falls into an "urban" character area from the point of view of the London Plan definition (Table 3.2). It is true that neighbouring housing includes mansion blocks and terraced housing of 3 and four storeys, suggesting urban character, but it also includes as much if not more 2 storey semi-detached housing, on small building footprint and of just two storeys; my view is that the character of the area is more of a	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	mix between “urban” and “suburban”. My view is that the proposal, of mansion blocks and terraced housing, of heights rising from two to six storeys, fits into this mixed character whilst, not unreasonably, reinforcing its urban rather than suburban characteristics. 20. The main move in planning the development has been to create a new east-west street across the site, and to organise access and line buildings along this and the Coppetts Road frontage. I consider this an exemplary strategy that will give the development clarity of layout, obvious visibility of house and block entrances and the best possible integration into context, including the possibility that the new east-west street could be connected to the very far end or Osier Crescent, where it loops back and terminates in a green space facing back towards Coppetts Road at the western boundary of this application site. 21. The fact that such a connection, for pedestrians, is not apparently currently possible is, I think, regrettable. I would not wish for a vehicular connection, but I would welcome a cyclable connection. I understand the applicant considers both the level change (the application site is about 1m above this part of Osier Crescent), legal obstacles and existing residents’ opposition have lead to this, to me obvious, improvement not being pursued, but I would hope that in the future, as the development “beds in”, it may become possible, and I am therefore satisfied that the form of development does not preclude such a connection being made in the future. 22. Neighbouring Osier Crescent is laid out with its main entrance off Coppetts Road, leading to a “mini-roundabout”, against the southern boundary of the application site, with the mini-roundabout providing a vehicular entrance north-west into the application site and the continuing Osier Crescent to the south-west. One of Osier Crescent’s mansion blocks faces its west side, addressing the mini-roundabout and Osier Crescent entrance, with a second identical block on its south side. I would estimate that it was intended development of this site would be accessed here, but the car dominated nature of Osier Crescent has not been a successful model and	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	its junction already suffers from vehicle congestion. 23. Therefore the connection created off the mini-roundabout on Osier Crescent is to be simply a pedestrian /cycle connection, into a small pocket park between the main block in the proposed development, Block F, and the linear blocks that line the east-west street, the "Pocket Green". In addition to its residents and public amenity functions, I am confident this will provide a useful local (non-vehicular) street function providing useful local connections between the proposed development and Osier Crescent, and via Osier Crescents own link, into the public park at Coldfall Wood / Muswell Hill Rec. 24. Gates mark the transition from Osier Crescent to the Pocket Green (the reused existing Admin Building entrance) and from the Pocket Green to the east-west street (the reused wrought iron boundary gate); this point of the street marks its transition from the site entrance, between Blocks E and F, to the more courtyard character central and western ends of the east-west streets, between blocks C and D and ultimately between Blocks A and B. North of this crossing, a final, 4th "street" element is a semi and then fully private parking court between the back of the townhouses (Block E) and the side of Block C; this is a semi and then quickly fully private service space; gated after the 1st 2 spaces, hiding away the largest area of surface parking and necessary access to the substation and mature trees on the boundary. More significantly, as alluded to above, from this crossing point the east-west street becomes more "courtyard-y" in character between Blocks C and D, before another transition where two street trees are proposed in front of the entrances to Blocks A and B, where it becomes a fully fledged "homezone" of shared surfaces, and then finally, in front of the mews style houses at the western end of the street, it becomes a grassed amenity space. 25. Building blocks line the proposed street network in a logical manner that recognises the street hierarchy. The largest mansion block, Block F, and the largest houses, the 3 ½ storey townhouses of Block E, address	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Coppetts Road; the townhouses having their own front door off a front garden off Coppetts Road whilst the mansion block has a grand entrance on the corner of Coppetts and the east-west street. The "medium sized" flatted blocks, Blocks C and D, face the courtyard street element of the east-west street, close to the "crossroads". The smallest flatted blocks, Blocks A and B, are entered from and address the point where the courtyard transitions to the homezone, framed by a pair of trees. And finally the two storey mews houses at the western end of the site face a grassed amenity space at the western end of the east-west street. **Height, Bulk & Massing** 26. Bocks A and B, the smaller flatted blocks and mews houses at the western end of the east-west street, is proposed to be at two and three storeys, Blocks C and D, the flatted blocks facing each other across the centre of the east-west street at 4 storeys, Block E, the townhouses facing Coppetts Road, 3 $^{1}/_{2}$ storeys and Block F, the mansion block facing Coppetts Road of 6 storeys; a 3 storeys with a set back 4th floor and a "mini-tower" of 6 storeys at its north-east corner. 27. The highest point of Block E (and of the development) reaches its maximum, at 6 storeys, as what I am describing as a "mini-tower" at the north-west corner of that block. It will be highly visible from the entrance to the site and as such will perform a useful function as a visual marker of the main entrance to the development and of this being the main (in numerical terms) building in the development. However as it is set back from the Coppetts Road facade it will have a reduced impact on longer views along Coppetts Road and will in all likely hood be invisible a short distance up or down the road. The applicants Design & Access Statement shows that it would not be seen from the south until close to the site (Pages 62-3). It is designed as a slender tower, with a ribbed effect to emphasise its verticality and a rootedness in the north east corner of the building where its six storeys drop to the pavement. It will therefore be legible, and assist in marking the entrance to the underground parking, at its base, and this	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	key corner of the site; the "crossroads" between the east-west street and pocket green / parking court. However six storeys is not an excessive height that could create detrimental environmental effects and its shadow will mostly fall over the onsite street network rather than any neighbouring dwellings or amenity spaces. 28. The remainder of Block F steps down considerably from the in any case not excessive height of the "mini-tower" to 3 storeys along the Coppetts Road frontage, with a significantly set back 4th floor that it likely to have an only minimal visual impact from the street. This matches the height of Block E, the proposed town houses also fronting Coppetts Road north of the east-west street. It also turns the corner into Osier Crescent in the same manner, before the set back 4th floor becomes the building height as it turns into the Pocket Green. This 4 floor height is matched in Block D across the Pocket Green; Block C that otherwise mirrors block D sets back its top floor from its east side only, where it fasces onto the parking court and across to the townhouses (Block E), which also has a set back 4th floor both front and back. Hence buildings around the development set up dialogues in height between those across separating streets and spaces. 29. Height also steps down to respond to neighbouring buildings. In particular the buildings either side of the east-west street step down from east to west, so that the mews style houses closest to the houses and block at the end of Osier Terrace are only of 2 storeys. Admittedly the fact that the ground level is higher than that of Osier Crescent on this (western) boundary means that it will not match the eaves level of the neighbouring 2 storey houses, but as a flat roofed rather than pitched design its highest points will be below theirs. It is regrettable that the applicants felt they were unable to grade the ground level of their site more to match neighbouring land; this is more pronounced at the northern end of Block E, the townhouses facing Coppetts Road, where the 1m or so drop, along with presumably higher floor to ceiling heights and the parapet design, means that a building of the same number of floors (three, not including the room	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	in the roof) to the neighbouring existing three storey flatted block, appears about a floor higher. 30. However, overall, I consider the height, bulk and massing of the proposals to be acceptable and well within the expected increase in development form its older neighbours, and not significantly at variance from the range of heights found within the most recent existing neighbours. **Approach to the front door(s), Accessibility & Legibility of the street layout** 31. The proposals create their own contribution to enhancing and extending the network of public streets and squares to enable access to the deep site. It is particularly to be welcomed how well integrated is this aspect of the proposals. As mentioned above the east-west street creates a clear public street into the site, with a strongly marked, obvious junction with Coppetts Road, the potential to connect to the far end of Osier Crescent and an actual, secondary "green path" link into the entrance to Osier Crescent. 32. What is more, all the residential properties directly face and open up off either the existing Coppetts Road or the proposed east-west street, with their house or communal front doors clearly visible and directly approached from the public realm of one of these two streets. The hierarchy of streets is reflected in the significance of blocks and their front doors, with the busiest and most important front door, that onto Block F, the largest flatted block containing 28 flats, in a large entrance door and lobby right on the wider pavement at the corner of the entrance to the site off Coppetts Road. 33. The largest, 3/4 storey townhouses of Block E similarly have entrances from Coppetts Road directly, with front doors off decent sized front gardens, and with the corner unit with a front door on the corner, adding to animation and overlooking of the corner. The medium sized flatted blocks, Blocks C and D, sit at the middle of the site with their communal front doors off the internal street closer to the crossing and the entrance to the site than the western end of the site. The smaller flatted blocks, Blocks A and	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	B, again have front doors off the internal street, as finally do the westernmost mews houses, although there the street is quietest and most garden like. 34. The only unaddressed element of the proposed street layout, that is the only element of the network of public spaces, public rights of way, without front doors opening onto them, is the "Pocket Green" and its corresponding short parking court north and south of the crossing of the east-west street. Both are public spaces of less significance than streets, with a measure of security or psychological indication of privacy by virtue of being gated, yet both are overlooked by upper floor windows from neighbouring flats, although generally without ground floor windows, unless they are screened, to avoid privacy loss to residents. 35. None of the paths for purely service access are publically accessible and more significantly no existing neighbouring private spaces are backed onto with new public space; the relationship of existing neighbouring private gardens is always that their new immediate neighbours will always only be private back gardens or locked private service space (such as the sub-station). **Dwelling Mix and Block(s) Layout, including Aspect** 36. The dwelling mix contains 22no. 1 bedroom flats, 39no. 2 bedroom flats, 8no, 3 bedroom flats, 3no. 3 bedroom houses (Mews houses), giving 11no. 3 bedroom units and 8no. 4 bedroom houses (3no. Mews houses, 5no. Townhouses). 37. Despite having a block laid out east to west, as well as the larger, deeper plan main blocks north to south along the Lawrence Road frontage and townhouses on the east side of the courtyard, the proposals for the site completely avoids north facing single aspect flats and generally avoids south facing or ground floor single aspect flats. There are single aspect west facing one bedroom flats in Block A, facing Lawrence Road, but this aspect is acceptable in single aspect units, they are all 1 bedroom and they	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	look out onto a busy street, from 1st to 4th floor only. 38. The partial exception on south facing is Block B, the "Courtyard Block", which consists solely of what would normally be described as single-aspect south facing one bedroom flats, including ground floor flats. These are designed with the location and aspect in mind to exploit the advantages and mitigate the concerns entailed. They *can* be described as effectively single aspect, but are laid out with a higher level kitchen window facing north onto the access deck, with the kitchen being open plan to the living room; this will ensure they all enjoy cross ventilation, mitigating the greatest concern with single aspect south facing flats (one exception being the end ground floor flat). The frontage is designed with layering so the living room and bedroom windows are separated from the pavement behind a landscape buffer and then the framed "exo-skeleton" containing staggered balconies and providing additional sun shading (particularly in summer when climbing plants are in leaf), as well as south facing outdoor amenity space off their living rooms, with better light due to the staggered plans, so that balconies the rooms balconies will provide shading to are bedrooms. This set of measures can be considered to allow the south facing flats to enjoy the great potential benefits of south facing aspect without suffering the harms. **Residential Design Standards & Internal Layout(s)** 39. All flat layouts meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and Mayors Housing SPG space and layout standards (?). 40. However, there are approximately 8no. single aspect north and south facing units; four north facing in Block D and four south facing in Block C. These are mitigated with larger windows and always having one window facing west on the projecting bay beside their balcony; they also each have a balcony that would have a west outlook. 41. There are also 6no. single aspect ground floor units facing a street or other unsociable space not otherwise reasonably screened. Two are the ground	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	floor versions of the flats mentioned in the paragraph above, in Blocks C and D, the other four are on the ground floor of Block F, the "mansion block", which has public frontage on all four sides. However in all cases there is reasonable amount of screening to their ground floors; around Block Fin particular, there are fairly deep gardens in front of the affected flats, and in the cases of Blocks C and D it can be argued that the street is less busy here. 42. Flats in the largest block, Block F, are laid out with normally 4 flats per floor (three on the 1st floor where one is omitted for the double height archway). All have simple layouts that meet minimum room sizes, and all have a private garden (at ground level) or balcony, including generous roof terraces to third floor flats. 43. The flats in the smaller blocks are laid out with up to four flats per floor, 15no. in total (Blocks C & D, and two flats per floor, six in total (Blocks A and B). have been described in detail above under "Dwelling Mix and Block(s) Layout, including Aspect", but it is also worth noting that in both here and at the rear of Block 1, layout and balcony location alternates floor by floor so that balconies are only ever above bedroom windows, meaning the balconies themselves and living room windows onto those balconies, get better daylight. 44. The two layouts of family houses can be characterised as "townhouses" in Block E (at the front of the site, facing Coppetts Road) and "mews houses" in Blocks A and B (at the very back of the site, its western boundary onto the end of Osier Crescent). The Townhouses are large four bedroom houses with separate living room, dining-kitchen and study (which could be used as a separate bedroom), as well as large front, east facing and private, back, west facing gardens. Their back gardens benefit from separate service access, which is also where their bin store is located. All rooms and total sizes are well in exec of London & National standards and recommendations. They are designed to be grand and luxurious, which meets a demand and helps improve development viability.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	45. The Mews House are more "homely" and modest, at two storey, three bedroom in Block B (south side of the east-west street) and three storey, four bedroom in Block A (on the north side). They nevertheless both feature separate living rooms and dining kitchens on the ground floor, opening onto their generous sized (by London standards) private rear gardens facing north or south but in both cases deep enough to get day long sunshine. They then have two bedrooms and a family bathroom on the 1st floor and the main bedroom, with en suite bathroom, and a small, front, west facing roof terrace. Again minimum room sizes are comfortably met, and they are provided with dedicated, secure, covered refuse and cycle storage besides their front doors. **Sunlight, Daylight, Overshadowing, Privacy & Overlooking** 46. The applicants have both provided Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing Reports on their proposed development and potentially affected neighbours, prepared in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment's publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice" (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011)[1], known as "The BRE Guide". 47. The applicants' report shows that *no* neighbouring windows to habitable rooms potentially affected by this proposed development would experience a *loss of sunlight* of a noticeable level as defined by the BRE Guide. 48. Their report further shows that only a very small number of neighbouring habitable rooms would receive a noticeable loss of daylight as defined by the BRE Guide and in each case the loss would or not reduce the amount of daylight to n unacceptable level. Specifically: • four windows to no. 207-229 Osier Crescent, a 4 storey flatted block immediately west of the application site, would experience reductions in	

[1] Building Research Establishment's publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice" (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011)

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Vertical Sky Component (VSC), one of two measures of daylight adequacy, to a greater degree than that the BRE Guide defines as acceptable. However, in all these cases the windows concerned are not the only or main windows lighting the rooms concerned, and the expectation of the BRE Guide is that where the room layout is known, only the "main" window need be assessed (or if there are two or more similar sized windows, the mean of all of the main windows taken). In each case the main window to the affected rooms are understood to be large south facing French doors onto balconies, that provide plentiful daylight and will be unaffected by this development. Furthermore, in all of these cases the rooms lit by these windows would not experience a reduction in area within the No Sky Line (NSL) the other of the two measures of daylight adequacy, to a greater degree than that the BRE Guide defines as acceptable. I am therefore satisfied that these rooms would not actually experience an unacceptable loss of daylight within the BRE Guide definitions. • Five rooms in flats in the Martins Walk estate east of the development would experience reductions in NSL greater than acceptable; two rooms in no. 92 Coppetts Road and one room in each of nos. 94, 98, 112 and 114 Coppetts Road. No properties in Martins Walk would experience a detrimental loss of VSC to any of their windows, but the standard in the BRE Guide is that loss to either VSC or NSL would be detrimental to neighbours daylight. However the NSL of the affected rooms would remain at quite high levels of 70% of the room area (60% to no. 114). These existing houses have a surprisingly good level of daylight by the standards typically found in London. Although no guidance is set in either the BRE Guide or planning policy for minimum absolute levels of NSL acceptable, The BRE Guide, which admits is based on a low density suburban housing model and not always suitable for being slavishly followed in more urban locations, suggests that any VSC of 27% or above would appear well daylit, and the GLA London Housing SPG recognises 20% VSC as "reasonably good" and	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	values in the mid teens as “deemed acceptable”. No window in these properties would fall below 19.7% (from 22.9%), and the vast majority would be in the low 30%s. I am therefore satisfied that the loss of daylight to these properties is minor and acceptable in this well daylit situation. 49. The applicants’ consultants did not asses the daylight and sunlight achieved in the proposed housing, but it is reasonable to assume it will be acceptable; there are no reasonable grounds for concern. They also did not asses the sunlight achieved on proposed amenity space within the development, nor the effect on sunlight achieved on nearby neighbouring amenity space. 50. The layout of the proposal carefully and comprehensively avoids detrimental overlooking of and therefore loss of privacy for neighbouring existing residential properties. The layout of the estate generally and Blocks B and D particularly places terraces parallel to and sufficiently distant from nos 295-315 (odd) Osier Crescent that distance alone prevents loss of privacy, given that at distances over 18m human faces cannot be recognised; at their nearest point the proposed would be 20.1m from the nearest part of Osier Crescent. The closer blocks at the western end of the site where they are only a couple of metres away from houses and a flatted block at the very far end of Osier Crescent, and at the northern boundary on the Coppetts Road frontage where no. 1-3 Strawberry Terrace is similarly close, are blank flank walls in the proposal and close to aligning with the existing blocks in plan. 51. Within the development, blocks face other blocks across public space, the internal east-west street and “Pocket Green”. We do not generally consider privacy such a great concern at upper floors across a public street. Nevertheless the distances across the east-west street are never less than 18.5m. Across the Pocket Green and parking court, i.e. between Blocks D and F, and C and E, the relationship is of side to back and is controlled by limiting the number of habitable room windows in the sides of	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Blocks D and B. Nevertheless there are some; importantly to provide overlooking and passive surveillance of the Pocket Green and Parking Court, but they are angled oriel windows so there is no direct line of sight from Block D to F or C to E. **<u>Elevational Treatment & Fenestration</u>** 52. The proposed elevational treatment and fenestration needs to give the development a distinctive identity whilst enabling it to fit comfortably into its context. However the immediate context is of a wide variety of building materials, architectural styles and patterns of development on their plots. 53. Crucially, the elevational treatment and fenestration needs to and in my view does reinforce the composition of the Coppetts Road frontage, as a bold block of a mansion-block style, proportioned appropriately for the street, with a strong three storey datum, and with the higher elements as either a set back floor to Block E (the Townhouses) and the south side of Block F (the mansion block), with the "mini-tower" (the north side of Block F) set back slightly further form the frontage. This three storey "street wall" has regularly spaced, strongly vertically proportioned fenestration arranged in paired bays, marking each townhouse and the five bays (and two recesses housing balconies) of the mansion block. 54. The elevational composition of the "mini-tower" is composed with a "base", "middle" and "top"; each of two storeys, separated with a lighter coloured band. The base is designed with less fenestration; the middle has windows connected with spandrel panels to appear as single large windows, the top is broken up into ribs with recesses or fenestration in between. Balconies also progressively increase in number and/or depth at each layer. The overall effect should be that it appears more light weight higher up. 55. The blocks behind, lining the east-west street, act as a pair of terraces, each with three distinct elements, of descending scale and height going from east to west, into the site (despite in "block" terms being defined for this development as two blocks each; Blocks C and A or Blocks D and B).	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	In each, the three elements step down from four, to three to two storeys (the three storey mews houses on the north side having dormer windows in the roof). These are simple, elegant elevations with careful composition of predominantly vertically proportioned windows. Initially, the rear elevations were rather utilitarian, but in response to my comments, these have been improved with subtle recesses. **Materials & Details** 56. The materials palette is predominantly brick, which is appropriate as a durable, robust material that weathers well, as well as being established by precedent from local context. A limited palette of just 2 different, interesting and variegated bricks provide sufficient variety; a predominantly red, highly variegated brick to the mansion block (Block F) and family houses (Block E), and light buff, still somewhat variegated brick to the blocks along the east-west street (Blocks A-D). I was initially concerned that the brick to Blocks A-D be concerned if the light buff brick was too yellow, but in the applicants' renderings it would appear to be proposed to be too much of an "off-grey", but detailed samples and precedents have convinced me this would be elegant and have sufficient "softness", "warmth" and variety to be successful. Both respond to local precedent without being a slavish match, as there is no dominant precedent and it is considered the rather bright, yellow bricks used in some recent developments (Osier Crescent and Gilson Place particularly) have not been as successful as hoped. Precise choice of brick will be subject to conditions. 57. Contrasting materials are used to bands to the mini–tower, balustrades to balconies, bays, entrances and of course window frames. I am confident these are all of appropriate quality and distinctiveness, and complimentary to the main dominant brickwork. It should also be noted that generally, although some balconies are projecting, others recessed, all balconies are all designed to have solid balustrades, giving privacy to residents and screening from the street.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	58. Conditions will be required to secure quality materials and that their detailing is robust, particularly of choice of brick, cladding, louvres, balustrades, rainwater goods and other materials, and detailing of parapets, window reveals and around recessed balconies, including their soffits. **Conclusions** As design officer I am satisfied that the necessary design quality has been achieved to permit the exceptional height and visibility in this sensitive location. I am also happy that the quality of residential accommodation will be high, and that the relationship of the proposed development to the street and context will be immensely positive and go a long way towards beginning to repair the urban grain of its location.	
Transportation	Transport Context The proposed development site is bordered to the south by Osier Crescent to the north by the Church of Latter Day Saints, to the west by Muswell Hill playing fields and to the east by Coppetts Road. The site currently shares an access with Osier Crescent via two mini roundabouts, one that links Osier Crescent with the site access and the other which links Osier Crescent with Coppetts Road. Coppetts Road is a 20mph Road with some traffic calming measure which has been implemented to restrict vehicular speeds, at the time of the site visit vehicles were observed travelling in excess of 20 mph. It was also observed that due to very little deflection at the mini-roundabout which links Osier Crescent which Coppetts Road vehicles were not slowing down. The site is located in an area with which has a low public transport accessibility level PTAL 1-2, however the site is located within walking distance of 4 bus routes: 1 bus route (234) located 188 metres from the site on Coppetts Road and 3 bus routes (134, 43, and 232) located some 547 metres form the site on Colney Hatch Road; these routes when combined offers some	Observations have been taken into account. The recommended legal agreement clauses, conditions and informatives will be included with any grant of planning permission.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	32 buses per hour for frequent connection to and from the site. The area surrounding the site is not located within a control parking zone and has been identified as an area suffering from high car parking pressures. In addition the 2011 census data identifies this ward (Fortis Green Ward) has have a car ownership levels with a car ownership of 0.90 cars per dwelling. The area surrounding the site also suffers from high car parking pressures as a result of parking demand generated by the nearby Muswell Hill playing fields; there are no proposals to consult on a control parking zone (CPZ) for the area surrounding the site. <u>Accident Analysis</u> The applicants transport consultant Milestone Transport Planning LTD has reviewed 5 years accident data for the area surrounding the site including: Coppetts Road, Osier Crescent and Trott Road. There were 6 accidents within a 200 metres radius of the site over the last 5 years period between 2010 and 2014. We have considered that the accident data submitted with the applicant is not the most recent accident and requested the most up recent accident data from Transport for London (May 2013 to May 2016). The most recent accident data concluded that there has been 4 recorded accidents in the last 3 years. All the accidents have been recorded as been slight accidents; none of the accidents involved pedestrian and were all vehicular/ vehicular accidents, with a range of factors contributing towards the accidents. One of the accidents was at the junction of Coppetts Road junction with Osier Crescent, where “vehicle one” (a coach/ Bus) braked sharply as the second vehicle turned right across the path of the first vehicle, causing a passenger travelling on the coach/bus to fall over. <u>Description of Development</u> The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building and redevelop the site to provide 80 residential units containing 69 flats comprising (22x1 bed,	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	39x 2 bed, 8x3 bed) and 11 family size house, construction of a new vehicular access to the development on Coppetts Road north of the existing roundabout at the junction of Coppetts Road with Osier Crescent. The applicant is also proposing to provide a total of 80 off street car parking spaces (75 car parking space including 8 wheel chair accessible car parking space, 3 visitor car parking spaces and 2 car club spaces). Of the c car parking spaces proposed 27 of the proposed 80 car parking spaces are at surface level the remainder of the car parking spaces, 53 car parking spaces including 4 wheel chair accessible car parking spaces will be provided in an underground car park. The applicant is proposing to provide 14 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces in each of the 5 residential blocks, the house will have cycle parking in the rear gardens. <u>Trip Generation</u> The applicant's Transport consultant Milestone has produced trip generation forecast as part of the Transport Assessment in support of the application, the sites selected for the Trip Generation forecast was generated using sites from the TRICS database based, using similar site characteristics (low public transport accessibility level). Based on the following sites from the TRICS database (Featherstone Road, Uxbridge Road, Judge Heath Lane, and Larshal Road) the proposed development of 80 residential units, would generate a total of 93 in/out persons trips during the AM peak hour and 70 in/out persons trips during the PM peak hour. Applying the 2011 census data for the super output area Lower Layer this development would generate 36% of its trips as a car drive/ passenger, with 48% of the trips generated by the site will be by public transport, 8% by pedestrians and 5% by cyclist. Based on the modal spit from the2011 census data, the proposed development would generate 32 in/out vehicular trips during the AM peak periods and 24 in/out vehicular trips during the PM peak periods. The impact of the additional traffic generated by the proposed development has been	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	modelled at the key junctions which includes: Coppetts Road/ new site access and Coppetts Road junction with Osier Crescent, we have reviewed the model outputs and have concluded that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would not impact on the operation of the transport and highways network. The construction of the new access will require amendments to the highways networks this will be secured byway of aS.278 agreement. <u>Pedestrian Access</u> The applicant is proposing to retain the existing pedestrian access from Osier Crescent, this will be a pedestrian and cycle access only, and the development will also provide pedestrian access via the new access point onto Coppetts Road, into a shared surface area which will have dedicated pedestrian areas, we have considered that give the limited number of car parking spaces that are at surface level, and the relative low vehicular movement during the peak trip generation period a shared surface is considered acceptable. <u>Parking Provision</u> The applicant's Transport consultant has conducted parking survey of the roads within a 200 metres walking distanced of the site, this included the following roads: Coppetts Road, Osier Crescent and Martins Walk, the results of the parking survey concluded that the areas surrounding the site are suffering from high car parking pressures. The applicant is proposing to provide a total of 80 car parking spaces for the 80 residential units, 3 of the car parking spaces will be allocated for visitors, 8 car parking spaces will be assigned to the accessible residential units, the applicant is also proposing to provide 2 car club spaces. The proposed car parking provision when the visitors and car club car parking provision are taken into consideration is 0.94 car parking spaces per unit, this	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	is largely in line with the 2011 census data which has conclude that the Fortis Green Ward has car parking provision of 0.90 car parking space per unit. The number of car parking spaces proposed is slightly high than that recommended by the Council's parking standard as per Saved UDP Policy M10. However we have considered that as the site is located in an area with a low public transport accessibility level, with moderate public transport connectivity, any under provision in car parking to support the development would result in displaced parking onto the local highways network. Considering that the area surrounding the site is suffering from high car parking pressures, any displaced parking would impact on residents on Osier Crescent and local highways safety as residents park on double yellow line which in turn will impact on visibility splays/forward visibility, potentially increasing vehicular/ vehicular and vehicular/ pedestrian collision. We have therefore considered that a higher car parking provision for this site is acceptable, we will require the applicant to provide a car parking management plan which includes details on the allocation and management of the proposed car parking spaces. The applicant will be required to provide electric charging points for the proposed car parking spaces, 20% of the proposed car parking spaces must have active provision with a further 20% passive provision for future conversion. <u>Access and Servicing Arrangements</u> Servicing of the proposed development will take place via the proposed vehicular crossover on Coppetts Road in the landscaped court yard the applicant has provided vehicle swept path analysis of refuse vehicle and other service vehicles which demonstrated that vehicles can entering and leaving the site in forward gear. The applicant will be required to provide service and deliver plan which includes details of deliver of parcels by way of a parcel drop boxes or concierge service. <u>Travel Plan</u>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	The applicant has provided a Draft Travel Plan as part of the application; the applicant will be required to provide a full Travel Plan no later than 3 months after the development has been occupied. The applicant's travel plan has a modal split target of 5% of trips by cycle, we will therefore require a revise draft Travel Plan which includes a cycle strategy to achieve the 5% target mode share. The developer will be required to pay a sum of £3,000 pounds for monitoring of the travel plan for 3 years post first occupation; this should be secured via the S.106 agreement. <u>Highways layout</u> The applicant has proposed a number of changes to the highways network in order to facilitate improved pedestrian access and safeguard pedestrian, as per Drawing No:2702-20-103, these include: Construction of a new bell mouth access and footway onto Coppetts Road, improvements to the raised crossing to the north of the site access and traffic calming measures. The above highways improvements have been reviewed by the Council's Highways infrastructure team as per Drawing: (CRE_PD_001_A) and estimated the cost of the works to be £40,000 (forty thousand pounds), the applicant will be required to enter into to S.278 agreement to fund the proposed improvements. <u>Construction Management</u> During construction period a significant amount of construction traffic will be generated by the development, the developer will be required to submit a Construction Management and Logistic Plan to minimise the impact of construction activity on the local highways network in particular impact on access to the nearby Coppetts wood Primary school. <u>Recommendation</u>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	On reviewing the above application and supporting documentation (Transport Assessments and draft Travel Plan) we have concluded that we would not object to the above application subject to the following S.106/ S.278 obligations and planning conditions: 1) A residential travel plan must be secured by way of the S.106 agreement. As part of the travel plan, the following measures must be included in order to maximise the use of public transport. a) The applicant submits a Travel Plan for each aspect of the Development and appoints a travel plan co-coordinator for the private and affordable housing aspect of the development and the travel coordinator must work in collaboration with the Facility Management Team to monitor the travel plan initiatives annually for no less that 3 years. b) Provision of welcome residential induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information, available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables to all new residents, travel pack to be approved by the Council's transportation planning team. Cycle parking to be provide in line with the London Plan (2015) c) The applicant provides a cycle strategy as part of the travel plan to support the proposed 5% cycle mode share proposed as part of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. We will also require details on how the cycle parking facility will be secured and means of access for residents (keys or electronic fobs) and how this will be monitored. d) Establishment or operation of a car club scheme, which includes at least 2 (two) cars. The developer must offer free membership to all residents of the development for at least the first 2 years, and £50 (fifty pounds) car club credit for each unit. Evidence of which must be submitted to the Transportation planning team. e) The developer is required to pay a sum of £3,000 (three thousand pounds) per travel plan for monitoring of the travel plans. f) A site management parking plan. The plan must include, details on the	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	allocation and management of on-site car parking spaces in order to maximise use of public transport. Electric Vehicle charging points (EVCPs) must be provided in accordance with the London Plan (2015) Reason: To promote travel by sustainable modes of transport to and from the site in line with the [line unfinished] 2) The applicant will be required to enter into a S.278 agreement for the implementation of: a new vehicular access point, new raised pedestrian crossing, traffic calming measures and footways resurfacing site side the cost of the works have been estimated at £40,000 (forty thousand Ponds). Reason: To mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the local highways network and to facilitate access to the development. Pre-commencement conditions; 1). The applicant/ Developer are required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months (three months) prior to construction work commencing on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work (inc. demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Coppetts Road, Osier Crescent and the roads surrounding the site is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods. Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation network. 3) The applicant is also required to submit a Delivery and Service Plan (DSP), details of which must include servicing of the commercial unite, and servicing of the residential units including facility to collect delivers for residents when	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	they are out concierge or parcel drop. Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation Informative The new development will require naming and numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges section on 020 8489 5573.	
Housing	**Affordable housing provision** The Applicant is proposing a development that will deliver new homes of which 51.2 % will be for affordable housing. This exceeds the borough wide target set in Haringey's 'Strategic Policies' which states that the Council will seek *'to maximise the provision of affordable housing by requiring all development capable of providing 10 or more residential units to provide affordable housing to meet an overall borough target of 40%* by habitable rooms. The scheme is compliant with the adopted London Plan strategic policy 3A.10 which seeks the maximum amount of affordable housing. **Dwelling mix and Tenure** The Council will seek 60% affordable rent and 40% intermediate housing with a recommended mix (Housing Strategy 2017 -22) for affordable rent housing of 11% 1beds 45% 2beds and 33% 3beds 11% 4bed; for private sale/rent and intermediate tenure mix of 30% 1 beds, 60% 2beds, 10% 3beds. This development offers in excess of the borough wide target of 40%. The tenure split between affordable rent and intermediate amounts to 49:51	Comments noted, although the affordable housing percentage is actually higher at 54% of the total number of units.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	percent by habitable rooms marginally in favour of the intermediate tenure. Policy for the west of the borough requires 60:40 split in favour of rent however as the overall yield of affordable housing units is greater than quantum required by policy the scheme proposal is acceptable on those term. The unit mix for the affordable housing amounts to 43 units, 51% by habitable rooms HR (equivalent to 125 HR) 13 x 1 bed, 24 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed and 3 x 4 bed. The council requires 10% if all new residential developments across all tenures to be fully wheelchair accessible to ensure housing choice for disabled residents. **Consultation** Pre-application consultation undertaken meeting with local residents and members. **CONCLUSION:** This scheme complies with the Councils Strategic Policies, SP2 ,DM10 (new supply), and DM13 (affordable housing) principally on the grounds that it will provide a good supply of new affordable housing in the west of the borough where there is a shortage of affordable housing available for rent and intermediate tenures. The Housing Commissioning, Investment and Sites team supports this scheme in terms of the proportion of affordable housing that is being proposed.	
Regeneration	From an economic development perspective, I do not have any adverse	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	comments to make.	
Arboricultural Officer	Tree cover at this site consists of a variety of species, the most important of which is a group of trees on the northern boundary consisting of mature Oak and Horse chestnuts. The trees are a significant amenity feature and as a group are of high biodiversity value. It is proposed to retain the majority of the trees categorized as A and B trees, which are of high or moderate quality and value. There are other trees on the site which are categorized as C and U trees and are specified for removal. The tree removals will not result in a detrimental impact on the site or the wider local area as new tree planting will mitigate this. The new landscaping proposal includes over 60 new trees. Planting a selection of new trees of various species, forms and sizes would improve the sustainability of the site and enhance biodiversity, while also increasing the quality of life for future residents. The Arboricultural method statement outlines how the trees to be retained will be protected in accordance with BS 5837: 2012. The tree protection plan shows the location of the protective fencing, which must be secured into the ground, shown as 'type 1' on the drawing. All new hard surfacing proposed within the root protection areas must be constructed using a 'No-Dig' method as specified in the method statement. In my opinion, re-development of the site would have minimal impact on the important trees on site, if protective measures are installed in accordance with the recommendations of the Arboricultural method statement. An application for a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) will be made for the important trees on site.	Observations have been taken into account. The recommended conditions will be included with any grant of planning permission.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	When drafting planning conditions, they must include reference to the following; A pre-commencement site meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (e.g. Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturist, Council Arboriculturist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees and discuss any construction works that may impact on the trees. Robust protective fencing / ground protection must be installed under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition and retained until the completion of construction activities. It must be designed and installed as recommended in the Arboricultural method statement. The tree protective measures must be inspected or approved by the Council Arboriculturist, prior to the commencement of demolition. The tree protective measures must be periodically checked the Consultant Arboriculturist and reports made available to the Council Arboriculturist. All construction works within root protection areas (RPA) or that may impact on them, must be carried out under the supervision of the Consultant Arboriculturist.	
Cleansing	I believe the plan is acceptable re waste collection, however, I have copied in Dave from Veolia who may wish to comment as he is the waste collection manager. <u>Additional comments from David Lynas, Veolia</u>	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Looking at the attached, it all seems correct for the collections requirements.	
Drainage Officer	The calculations regarding the rain water runoff and storage from the proposed development are acceptable and meet Haringey's requirement. We note the extensive CCTV survey that was carried out and the report states the current pipe work on the site is in poor condition mainly with root ingress and pipe structures showing signs of cracking. We require details on how this is going to be remedied to ensure the functionality of the system in the future. As part of the drainage proposal the consultant has included a pump system for the underground car park, pumps are not something we generally encourage unless there's justification that no other method can be used to remove water, we would like confirmation that this is the case with this site and if so, what will be put in place should the pump fail to operate and the area becomes overwhelmed. We need to see evidence that Thames Water has consented to the proposal of connecting to their existing network and there's sufficient capacity in the system to cope with the volumes. We note the maintenance of the SuDS will be undertaken by Catalyst Housing Group Ltd, confirmation is required that this will be for the lifetime of the development. We are pleased to see the variation of the SuDS techniques for the proposal and request details how these will operate in regards to how water will enter the system used i.e., the rainwater gardens, raised planters and where the water discharges to. We request a marked plan of the site showing the flow path and clarification on	Comments noted. Additional information was provided during the course of the assessment of this application that dealt with the Officer's original concerns.

<table>
<tr><th>Stakeholder</th><th>Question/Comment</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>how exceedance will be dealt with should the site become overwhelmed with water.

Overall the consultant/developer has put together an encouraging drainage proposal and has maximised the sites potential.

<u>Additional comments</u>

We have now reviewed the responses to our questions raised with the consultant regarding the drainage strategy for the Coppetts Wood site, the drainage strategy meets Haringey's criteria and is acceptable.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Carbon Management</td><td>Energy – Overall
The scheme delivers a 35.2% improvement beyond Building Regulations 2013. The policy requirement is 35% improvement beyond Building Regulations 2013.

Energy – Lean
The applicant has proposed an improvement of beyond Building Regulations by 3.3% through improved energy efficiency standards in key elements of the build. While this is not best practice it is policy compliant and a positive. This should be conditioned to be delivered on site:

Suggested Condition:
You must deliver the energy efficiency standards (the Lean) as set out in the Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016.

<table><tr><th>Building Element</th><th>Proposed specification for the development (u-values)</th></tr></table></td><td>Observations have been taken into account. The recommended conditions will be included with any grant of planning permission.</td></tr>
</table>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response

External walls	0.15 (flats) 0.14 (houses)
Roof	0.18 (flats) 0.13 (houses)
Ground floor	0.13
Windows	1.2
Air tightness	4 $m^3/hr/m^2$ for houses 5 $m^3/hr/m^2$ in the flats

The development shall then be constructed and deliver the U-values set out in this document. Achieving the agreed carbon reduction of 3.3% beyond BR 2013 with a carbon saving of 3.3 tonnes. Confirmation that these energy efficiency standards and carbon reduction targets have been achieved must be submitted to the local authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval. This report will show emissions figures at design stage to demonstrate building regulations compliance, and then report against the constructed building. The applicant must allow for site access if required to verify measures have been installed.

Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee.

Reason: To comply with London Plan Policy 5.2. and local plan policy SP:04

Energy – Clean
The scheme has stated that it has investigated area wide networks locally and has deemed that there are none. But there is no evidence of having investigated neighboring sites for local connection. The neighboring local school has the opportunity to link into this network and should be explored.

The scheme proposes individual boilers on the 11 houses. The applicant has

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	given justification for not connecting them to the central energy centre, which has been approved. A higher level of energy efficiency in these boilers should be conditioned. This is suggested below: **Suggested Condition** That all combination gas boilers that are to be installed in the 11 houses on the site are to have a minimum SEDBUK rating of 91%. The applicant will demonstrate compliance by supplying installation specification at least 3 months post construction. Once installed they shall be operated and maintained as such thereafter. **Reason:** To comply with London Plan Policy 5.2. and local plan policy SP:04 There will be a single energy centre operated by boilers which are located in the basement of building F. This energy centre will serve all flats on the development site. There are no details of how the single energy centre proposed on the site will interlink to all flatted units, and there are no details of how this single energy centre will be designed (through reserved space and basement wall plugs) to connect to a local network at a later date. Therefore based on these issues, at this stage the clean energy proposals are not policy compliant. We recommend that these are addressed through the following condition: **Suggested Condition:** You shall submit details of the site boiler facility and associated infrastructure, which will serve heat and hot water loads for all the flats on the site. This shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Authority at least 6 months prior to any works commencing on site. The details shall include: a) a review of the feasibility of connection to neighbouring sites (specifically the school to the north) b) location of the single energy centre which will contain all required plant; c) specification of equipment (including thermal storage, number of boilers and floor plan of the plant room); d) flue arrangement; e) operation/management strategy; f) the route and connections from the energy centre into all other blocks (from the basement of Block F into all units of blocks A, B, C, D and F; and g) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any neighbouring heating network (including the proposed connectivity location, punch points through structure and route of the link) The boiler facility and infrastructure shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved, installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter. **REASON**: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided and so that it is designed in a manner which allows for the future connection to a district system in line with London Plan policy 5.7 and local plan SP:04 and DM 22. **Energy – Green** That application has reviewed the installation of various renewable technologies. They have concluded that the most appropriate technology is solar PV panels which will generate 75.9kWp which is 34% of the sites regulated energy demand. These are installed on all flat roofs of the	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	development on top of living roofs. This is supported and should be conditioned: **Suggested condition** You will install the renewable energy technology (PV Solar Panels) as set out in the document Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016. This renewable technology will deliver a carbon saving of through the generation of 75.9kWp of electricity to the development site. Should the agreed target not be able to be achieved on site through energy measures as set out in the afore mentioned strategy, then any shortfall should be offset at the cost of £2,700 per tonne of carbon plus a 10% management fee. **Reason:** To comply with London Plan Policy 5.7. and local plan policy SP:04 **Sustainability Assessment** The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Assessment within their Energy Strategy. They have proposed that the scheme undertakes a Home Quality Mark and achieves a level 3 outcome. The Home Quality Mark The Home Quality Mark is similar to the BREEAM Assessment and the Code for Sustainable Homes, but it does not include targets on Energy. This approach is policy compliant and supported, it should be conditioned. **Suggested condition:** You must deliver the sustainability assessment as set out in the Energy Strategy, by CalfordSeaden, dated September 2016.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and shall achieve the rating of Home Quality mark level 3 for all units on the site, and shall be maintained as such thereafter. A post construction certificate shall then be issued by an independent certification body, confirming this standard has been achieved. This must be submitted to the local authority at least 6 months of completion on site for approval. In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the whole development, a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authorities approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions. **Reasons:** In the interest of addressing climate change and to secure sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2011) polices 5.1, 5.2,5.3 and 5.9 and policy SP:04 of the Local Plan. **Living Roof** A living roof is proposed on flatted blocks A,B,C, D, and F. While this is supported there are no details on its design or plant mix. More details should be given to the local planning authority. Therefore it suggested that the following condition is used: **Suggested Condition:** That prior to commencement on site details on the living roof shall submitted to the local authority for approval. This will include the following: • A roof(s) plan identifying where the living roofs will be located (Blocks A, B, C, D, and F);	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	• Confirmation that the substrates depth range of between 100mm and 150mm across all the roof(s); • Details on the diversity of substrate depths across the roof to provide contours of substrate. This could include substrate mounds in areas with the greatest structural support to provide a variation in habitat; • Details on the diversity of substrate types and sizes; • Details on bare areas of substrate to allow for self colonisation of local windblown seeds and invertebrates; • Details on the range of native species of wildflowers and herbs planted to benefit native wildlife. The living roof will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native); • Details of the location of log piles / flat stones for invertebrates; Confirmation that the living roof will not be used for amenity or sitting out space of any kind. Access will only be permitted for maintenance, repair or escape in an emergency. The living roof (s) shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved by the Council. And shall be maintained as such thereafter. **Reason:** To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and supports the water retention on site during rainfall. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13. **Living Wall** A planted wall is proposed along the ground-floor elevation of block F facing the Pocket Green. This wall extends vegetation vertically enhancing the façade of the building, creating a soft natural boundary to the Pocket Green garden. **Suggested Condition**	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	That prior to commencement on site details on the living wall on Block F facing the Pocket Green, shall submitted to the local authority for approval. This will include the following: • Plan (s) identifying where the living walls will be located and what surface area they will cover; • Details on the substrate depths across the walls; • Details on the diversity of substrate types and sizes; • Details on the range of native plant species to benefit native wildlife. The living wall will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native); • Details of the watering regime and commentary on how this will be sustainably watered in the future. The living wall (s) shall then be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved by the Council. And shall be maintained as such thereafter. **Reason:** To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and screening for the development. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13. **Biodiversity** A number of bird and bat boxes are proposed. These will be fitted into the mature trees and also the building construction. It is recommended that alongside the bat and bird boxes being fitted into trees, that at least half of these are integrated into the building along the north side of the development. The Council is not recommending these manufacturers, but highlighting that building integrated bat and bird boxes are available. Other manufacturer are available. (see - http://www.habibat.co.uk/ and http://www.ecosurv.co.uk/product/bird-box-range)	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Suggested condition You must deliver the Biodiversity features as set out in Coppetts Wood Biodiversity Strategy dated 16th September 2016, by Ireland Albrecht. This will include: - The incorporation of at least 15 bird boxes into the northern side of the development buildings and neighbouring trees - The incorporation of at least 8 bat boxes into the northern side of the development buildings and neighbouring trees The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance of the details so approved, and the developer shall provide evidence of these measures being installed to the local planning authority no more than 3 month after construction. Once installed these measures shall be maintained and if necessary replaced as such thereafter. In the event that these measures are not installed a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 4 months of completion on site. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the local authority's approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions. **Reason:** To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity. In accordance with regional policies 5.3, 5.9 and 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and local policy SP:05 and SP:13. **Overheating Risk** The thermal model submitted shows that the units are at risk from overheating,	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	specifically the units facing south and east. The simulations demonstrated that the kitchens-lounge rooms facing west are most likely to manifest temperatures above the thresholds. The application then recommends a list of passive measures that will have a positive impact in lowering the risk of overheating and improving the indoor thermal comfort during occupied hours. But do not confirm the measures that will be installed, to which standard and that with these measures that the units do now not overheat based on the model. - Installation of windows with lower solar factors. - Increasing of exposed thermal mass - Containing indoor heat gains (i.e. insulation district heating pipes) - Reducing windows area - Promoting cross ventilation realizing dual aspect flats **Suggested Condition** To demonstrate that there is minimal risk of overheating, the results of dynamic thermal modelling (under London's future temperature projections) for internal spaces will be given to the Council for approval. This should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority 6 months prior to any works commencing on site and any measures shall be operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. This model and report should include details of the design measures incorporated within the scheme (including details of the feasibility of using external solar shading and passive ventilation) to ensure adaptation to higher temperatures are addressed and the units do not overheat. Air Conditioning will not be supported unless exceptional justification is given. Once approved the development shall be constructed in accordance with the	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	details so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. **REASON:** London Plan Policy 5.9 and local policy SP:04 and in the interest of adapting to climate change and to secure sustainable development.	
Pollution (Air Quality & Contaminated Land)	**Air Quality** The London Plan, Policy 7.14 states that new development should: • minimise increased exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality (particularly within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) where development is likely to be used by large numbers of those particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, such as children or older people) such as by design solutions, buffer zones or steps to promote greater use of sustainable transport modes through travel plans • promote sustainable design and construction to reduce emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings; • be at least 'air quality neutral' and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality (such as areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)). • Ensure that where provision needs to be made to reduce emissions from a development, this is usually made onsite. The proposals for the development include 80 parking spaces for a total of 80 residential units, of these spaces two are Car Club and three visitor spaces.	Comments have been taken into account. Mitigation of the air quality impacts will be sought by condition and legal agreement. Conditions are also added in respect of land contamination.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	An Air Quality Assessment (SLR Reference: 402.05488.00004, September 2016) has been submitted. It is proposed that space heating and hot water will use a mixture of site wide heat network and individual boilers. The communal boiler will be located in the basement of block F and will serve blocks A, B, C and D. However no information on the size, type, or emissions of the combustion plant has been provided. Consequently the AQ assessment does not incorporate emissions from the boilers into the dispersion modelling assessment or air quality neutral assessment. Therefore the report is incomplete. Table AQ1-2 states modelled speeds for transport emissions used 32k/h and with a 20km/h corresponding 'slow-down' phase prior to roundabouts and junctions in accordance with guidance presented within LAQM.TG (16) however no account has been taken into account of the steep gradient of the road which also has a significant effect on emissions. In any case the AQ Neutral assessment calculates that the transport emissions of the proposed development are well in excess of the calculated benchmark figures for both NO_x and PM_{10} emissions. The NOx emissions of the proposed development are 586kg/annum compared to a benchmark figure of 124kg/annum. The PM10 emissions are 101kg/annum compared to the benchmark of 21kg/annum. Therefore the development is not only AQ neutral, but emissions are considerably in excess of AQ neutral standards set by the GLA Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Sustainable design and construction' are almost 4 times greater. However no specific additional mitigation has been proposed to reduce these transport emissions. The high rate of parking proposed (80 spaces will be provided) exceeds the councils parking standards which allows for 65 spaces. While the site has a	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	PTAL banding of 2 the transport assessment also states that the 'proposed development has very good access to alternative means of travel to the private car' yet despite this, parking is being provided at unsustainable levels. Therefore to make the development acceptable measures should include: • a reduction in parking spaces • only low emission vehicles deployed at proposed car club spaces; • electric vehicle charging points should be installed; • a requirement for of a service and delivery plan; • and the minimisation of emissions from combustion plant by selecting boilers and CHP with as low emissions as possible. **Contaminated Land** A Phase II Site Investigation Report (Reference: LP00863 dated 19 July 2016) has been submitted. This includes a summary of the Phase 1 Desk Study but does not include the previous studies or reports. An 'Environmental Risk Assessment' undertaken in 2007 (included in Appendix D) does not follow current methodology nor does it provide a list of the potential previous contaminative uses within the site or surrounding area. In addition at the time of the report's preparation a different use of the site was envisaged as the report makes reference to the end use of the site as a college with no gardens. The preliminary risk assessment identified the following possible sources of contamination (identified by third parties): • Diesel generator and storage tank potentially involving oil spills; • Electricity substation involving oil and polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs) spills; • Above-ground propane storage tank; • Below-ground boiler room; • Hydrocarbons contained within the blacktop hardstanding could provide a source for contamination.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	In addition Asbestos in the form of sheeting was identified during the site work and the made Ground could be contaminated by metals, PAH and asbestos. The Phase II Site Investigation Report concludes 'The granular Made Ground materials are contaminated with a range of metals and PAH compounds above acceptable limits for residential, public open space and allotment end uses. Furthermore, the existing topsoil has been shown to be contaminated with chrysotile and crocidolite asbestos fibres.' In addition an assessment of the ground gas regime considered it likely that the site sits within Characteristic Situation 2 and gas protection measures will be required or the Made ground removed. However no discussion or consideration of the hospital's past use as an infectious disease control hospital has been addressed. Therefore radioactive substances and bacteriological materials/spores have not been considered. Therefore a revision of the Phase I and Phase ll investigations taking into account potential radiological and microbiological contamination must be undertaken. **Recommended conditions** ❖ **<u>Combustion and Energy Plant:</u>** Prior to installation, details of the Ultra Low NOx boilers for space heating and domestic hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 20 mg/kWh @0% O2. *Reason: To protect local air quality* Prior to commencement of the development, details of the communal	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	boiler must be submitted to evidence that the unit to be installed. The communal boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40mg/kWh @0% O2. *<u>Reason</u>: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA SPG Sustainable Design and Construction.* ❖ **<u>Contaminated land: (CON1 & CON2)</u>** **<u>CON1:</u>** • Before development commences other than for investigative work: a) A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. b) If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:- ▪ a risk assessment to be undertaken, ▪ refinement of the Conceptual Model, and ▪ the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements. The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority. c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site. And **CON2** : • Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied. ❖ **Management and Control of Dust:** • No works shall be carried out on the site until a detailed Air Quality	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP), detailing the management of demolition and construction dust, has been submitted and approved by the LPA. The plan shall be in accordance with the GLA SPG Dust and Emissions Control and shall also include a Dust Risk Assessment. *Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan* • Prior to the commencement of any works the site or Contractor Company is to register with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the LPA. *Reason: To Comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan* • No works shall commence on the site until all plant and machinery to be used at the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Evidence is required to meet Stage IIIA of EU Directive 97/68/ EC for both NOx and PM. No works shall be carried out on site until all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant to be used on the site of net power between 37kW and 560 kW has been registered at http://nrmm.london/. Proof of registration must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works on site. *Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.* • An inventory of all NRMM must be kept on site during the course of the demolitions, site preparation and construction phases. All machinery should be regularly serviced and service logs kept on site for inspection. Records should be kept on site which details proof of	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	emission limits for all equipment. This documentation should be made available to local authority officers as required until development completion. *<u>Reason:</u> To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ.* **<u>As an informative</u>**: Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out. <u>Additional Comments</u> Prior to commencement of the development details of the communal boiler must be submitted including evidence to show that the chimney stack/flue will be at a sufficient height and discharge velocity etc to disperse the exhaust emissions. The communal boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40mg/kWh of dry NOx (at 0% O2). An Air Quality Neutral calculation for 'building emissions' shall be provided.	
Education Services	We anticipate this development will increase demand for primary school places though our latest 2016 School Place Planning report suggests that we have sufficient capacity of reception places in Planning Area 1 where the development is sited	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
Emergency Planning	No comments received.	Noted.
EXTERNAL		
Transport for London	Pinkham Way to the north forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL is the highway authority for the TLRN and any works temporary or permanent would need to be agreed with TfL. TfL is therefore concerned with any development which may impact on the safe and normal function of the highway network, including proposed works within TfL highway. Having reviewed the submitted documents, TfL have the following comments. • The site registers a Public transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1b on a scale of 1 to 6b which indicates a poor level of accessibility. • The applicant proposes to close the existing vehicular access on Osier crescent and replace it with a priority junction on Coppetts Road. TfL note the existing dropped kerb on Coppetts Road and request the applicant clarify that the new vehicular access will use that location. Furthermore there is a bus stop marked on Coppetts Road and the applicant should clarify that the new access will not interfere with the bus cage and kerb. • The applicant proposes 80 parking spaces comprising; 67 residential spaces, 8 Blue Badge spaces, 3 visitor spaces and 2 car club spaces. Residential parking will be provided at a ratio of 0.83 which TfL are content with. Parking will be located at surface level and in a new basement car park accessed via a ramp which TfL have no objection to. The London plan states that 20% of spaces will be fitted with active Electric Vehicle Charging Points (ECVP) with a further 20% passive provision. TfL request the applicant provide ECVPs in line with London Plan standards as well as identifying their location on plans. The council	Comments are noted. The existing access will be used and there will be no impact on the bus cage (15m separation). Full details of car parking are demonstrated on the attached plans. The majority of additional trips are expected to use bus services (including those on Colney Hatch Lane) but many will also use the rail/underground services which are an approximate 30 min walk/10 min cycle from the nearest stations. Conditions will be added as appropriate to any grant of planning permission.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	should secure full details of car parking by condition. • The Transport assessment proposes 140 cycle spaces overall which complies with London plan standards and is supported by TfL. TfL also assess storage and design of cycle facilities against the standards set out in the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS), cycle parking will be located in secure stores around each block, on the ground-floor and at basement level and every house in Block E will have a rear store for 2 cycles. TfL find the location of cycle parking secure but request the applicant identify the type of stands to be used. Cycle parking should take into account all users needs, therefore 5% of spaces should be suitable for enlarged cycles. Furthermore there should be a minimum door width of 1.2m to any cycle store room and 1m for any cycle lift. TfL request full details of cycle parking secured by condition, with reference to the London Plan and LCDS. • The applicant has provided a modal impact assessment forecasting 44 two way trips in the AM peak made on public transport. TfL expects these trips to use the bus services but require the applicant to clarify. • TfL have no objection to the proposed refuse and servicing arrangements. Based on the above request being met, TfL have no further comment. <u>Additional Comment (in response to applicant's comments that they would prefer to avoid submitting a plan demonstrating the location of the ECPVs.</u> No problem with any of these comments and in regards to the ECVPs have no objection to removing the location clause as long as the quantity is London Plan compliant	
Thames Water	<u>Waste Comments</u>	Observations have been taken into account and

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system. Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you email us a scaled ground floor plan of your property showing the proposed work and the complete sewer layout to developer.services@thameswater.co.uk to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required. Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling	recommended conditions/informatives will be included with any grant of planning permission.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement. 'We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: "A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via "www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality." Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses. <u>Water Comments</u> On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.	
London Borough of Barnet	Raises no objection.	Comments noted.
Metropolitan Police	I have looked through the documents on the website and make the following comments for your consideration. I struggled to open some of the documents online so there may well be items that I have missed. 1. GF vehicle access to basement parking needs a suitable gate with electronic controlled access/egress. 2. The detail on the lower panels to the west façade of Block F must be considered carefully as it could become a climbing opportunity if the slats are horizontal and the gaps too large. 3. Block C and D East and West facades appear to have almost no natural	Observations have been taken into account and amendments to the plans made where possible. The recommended condition will be included with any grant of planning permission.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	surveillance to ensure deterrent against criminal activity at this point. Can additional windows be added to the first floor and above please. 4. Please ensure that distances between GF walls and 1st floor balconies above are large enough to prevent climbing above by a competent climber. 5. Can front gates be fitted to the houses? At Block E (west). 6. There appear to be almost no natural surveillance Block E (south) elevation which is needed to ensure a deterrent against criminal activity at this point. Can additional windows be added to the first floor and above please. 7. There appears to be almost no natural surveillance Block E (north) elevation which is needed to ensure a deterrent against criminal activity at this point. Can additional windows be added to the first floor and above please. Having reviewed the application and available documentation we have taken into account Approved document Q and the design and layout there is no reason why, with continued consultation with a DOCO and the correct tested, accredited and third party certificated products that this development would not be able to achieve Secured by Design award. I would therefore seek to have a planning condition submitted where this development must achieve Secured by Design accreditation.	
London Fire Service	The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals for fire fighting appliance access, subject to ADB Vol 2 B5.	Comments noted.
Natural England	Natural England has no comments to make on this application.	Comments noted.
National Health Service	No comments received.	Noted.
LOCAL		

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
REPRESENTATIONS	**Alternative uses could be provided:** • Care home should be built on the site • Student housing could be an option for the site • Site should be a school/sports facility/doctors' surgery • Community facilities should be provided on an NHS site • A community growing area could be provided • Why is there no shop on the site? • Site Allocation is for 21 units only • The existing hospital use of the site should be retained **Clarification is sought on the type of affordable housing:** • Will new homes be affordable? • Will the affordable housing be available for 'right to buy' **Height, bulk and massing is excessive:** • Excessive scale • Overdevelopment of the site • Excessive density • Area is semi-rural • Local area is already overdeveloped • Local area is already overpopulated **Historic character is not protected** • Loss of historic character • Site has visual, historical, evidential and communal value • The site is a non-designated heritage asset • No attempt to preserve heritage which is held in local affection • Medical historian finds this site of great interest	The site has been identified for residential purposes as part of site allocation SA55. This matter is described in detail in the case officer report. 54% of new affordable housing is proposed with tenure split between affordable rent and shared ownership. Issues relating to proposed scale and massing are fully addressed within the report. Officers consider that the proposed development does accord with development plan policies. Although a non-designated heritage asset of limited value would be lost this would be outweighed by the

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	• Facade of admin building is a local landmark and should be retained • Metal railings are not retained **Poor detailed design:** • Development has commercial appearance • Development does not follow design of Osier Crescent properties • Design of the building is poor/inappropriate (industrial appearance) • Out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area • Design is bland, generic • Design is dull, ugly • Basement is out of character with area • Where is the clock – will it be used in this development, as with previous development approvals? **Poor layout of units:** • Family homes should have been built next to family homes • Insufficient accessibility for emergency access • Lack of amenity space • Insufficient play space is provided • No facilities are provided for teenagers **Negative impact on neighbouring amenity:** • Increased noise disturbance • Loss of outlook • Loss of day/sunlight • Loss of privacy • Increased crime • Increased pollution	new affordable housing for which there is high local demand. Some historic elements would be retained. The design is considered to be exceptional by the Council's Design Officer and would be a positive contemporary addition to local character. Family homes within the development are located adjacent to family homes on adjacent streets. Sufficient play space and amenity space is provided. Independent reports on noise, light and basement digging record no significant impact on existing residents. Distances to new units would be appropriate for

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	• Increased rubbish, noise and air pollution • Clarity is needed on whether policy still exists requiring each floor above ground floor to be set back 10m more than the usual 20m • 20m separation is not correct for some properties • New development would impact in views from local parks • Impact on foundations from basement excavation	an urbanised area. Appropriate waste collection facilities have been provided.
	Insufficient local public transport: • Existing public transport is insufficient (single bus is irregular and overcrowded; otherwise too far to walk esp at night) • Bus service is irregular • Bus service is inadequate • Bus route is slow/overcrowded and will not help to alleviate problems caused by proposed lack of parking	TfL note there are four bus routes within a short walk of the site, and consider the existing facilities adequate for this development.
	Excessive/Insufficient parking: • Loss of existing on-street parking • Insufficient off-street parking provided • Gilson Place is already suffering parking issues • Overspill parking is inevitable and dangerous • Existing Osier Crescent parking demonstrates that 1:1 parking is not realistic • Number of visitor parking spaces is insufficient • Car ownership in the area exceeds one per household, contrary to 2011 census data • Coppetts Road is not suitable for additional parking pressure	Parking provision is marginally in excess of the Council's maximum standard and is appropriate given proposed sustainable transport initiatives.
	Impact on traffic, highway and pedestrians:	Transportation and TfL

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	• Loss of road/pedestrian safety (especially close to school) • Exacerbates existing traffic congestion problems • Large number of traffic hazards in the area close to this site • Parking problems prevent the efficient delivery of urgent care • Location of pedestrian access makes Osier Crescent attractive for overspill parking • Emergency access to Osier Road dwellings will be compromised	raise no objections to the impact of the development on the public highway.
	Lack of local amenities/services: • Insufficient local amenities (i.e. doctors'/dentists', surgeries, schools, retail facilities) to support this number of new dwellings • All local schools are already oversubscribed • Local infrastructure is poor and will continue to worsen • Nearby schools should receive financial payments to help mitigate negative impacts • No community benefits	Education note existing school provision is sufficient for the development. Financial contributions from CIL go towards public infrastructure.
	Impact on the environment and biodiversity: • Negative impact to/loss of local wildlife (studies may be inaccurate) • Bird watching brief should be undertaken • Loss of birds/vegetation • Environmental damage	Soft landscaping, tree planting, green/brown roofs and bat/bird boxes would be installed to maximise biodiversity improvements.
	Impact on trees/landscaping: • Loss of trees and other foliage • Additional tree planting must be provided • Insufficient green space/landscaping	Good quality trees on site will be protected with 60 new trees planted, in addition to new planting.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Other considerations: • People were buried in the grounds; how will this be managed and is it hazardous? • Refuse collections on neighbouring developments have not worked • Waste management is already a problem in the area (overflowing bins, illegal dumping, lack of recycling infrastructure) **Non-Planning Related Comments:** • Loss of a private view • Social problems could arise from overdevelopment • Increase in anti-social behaviour • Impact from construction works (i.e. dust/noise, loss of highway and pedestrian safety) • Increased air pollution during construction works • Neighbouring school will need extensive protection during construction to avoid affecting the highly sensitive children • Advertisement for the public meeting was insufficient • Catalysts management of the existing site has been ineffective • Data in parking/traffic studies is unrealistic • Transport statement data is not fully representative, and in some places inaccurate • Impact on structure of road/tarmac	Sufficient waste provision is provided within the site and land contamination matters will be dealt with by condition. These matters are not material planning considerations and therefore have not been assessed as part of this application.
COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATIONS	<u>Cllr Martin Newton (Ward Cllr)</u> • Pleased to see high level of AH • Overlooking and loss of amenity need to be addressed • Concern over lack of local infrastructure; i.e. bus service, doctors,	CIL contributions will be put towards local infrastructure and LB Barnet has raised no objections to this

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	schools, shops • Parking is an 'issue' particularly when Muswell Hill Fields are used for football • Barnet and Haringey should work together and provide local plan for infrastructure in this area <u>Andrew Dismore (London Assembly Member – Barnet and Camden): Labour</u> • CWPS should received S106//CIL contributions • Inadequate parking provision with inevitable overspill parking • Existing building has historical value and architectural merit; is of great interest to community • Metal gates should be retained • Overdevelopment in a suburban setting • Excessive size and scale • Insufficient amenity space • Negative impact on local amenities	application. Parking is in excess of the Council's parking standard. Design, density and impact on residential amenity is discussed in detail in the case officer report. Metal gates are to be retained.