

ADDENDUM REPORT

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No 8.

Reference No: HGY/2016/0558	Ward: White Hart Lane
Address: St John's Church and Hall, Acacia Avenue, London, N17 8LR	
Proposal: Remodelling and extension to existing church. Demolition and replacement of existing hall on church site with new community facility / nursery. Proposed 22 new build residential units to church site and 10 new build residential units to Acacia Avenue site with a mix of 1, 2, 3, and 4 bedroom accommodation over 2 - 4 storeys.	

1.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES (AMENDED DRAWINGS following Listing)

- 1.1 The following were consulted:
- 163 Neighbouring properties
 - 3 site notices were erected close to the site
 - Press Notice
- 1.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:
- No of individual responses:
- Objecting: 4
- Supporting: 0
- Others: 0
- 1.5 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are summarised as follows. All responses are in relation to Site B (Acacia Avenue).
- Proposal too large and too close in relation to gardens between 350 White Hart Lane and Cambridge Road
 - Loss of privacy/overlooking/overshadowing
 - Out of place character
- 5.4 The objections outlined above all relate to 'Site B', the Acacia Road site. This section of the proposal has not changed from that presented to The Planning Committee in June 2017 and considered in para 6.5.3 of the Planning Sub-Committee report. As such, there are no additional material considerations to consider.

2.0 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- 1.1. Since the Planning Committees resolution to grant planning permission in June 2017, the affordable housing provision has been altered to reflect the direction of Housing Policy:

6 no. London Affordable Rent units / 21 hab rooms

- 1 x 1 bed
- 2 x 2 bed
- 2 x 3 bed
- 1 x 4 bed

Total 6 units

11 no. (intermediate) London Living Rent / 30 hab rooms (such rents to be aligned with the London Living Rent benchmarks published by the Mayor of London)

- 2 x studio
- 4 x 1 bed
- 5 x 3 bed

Total 11 units

- 15 no. Private / 43 hab rooms
- 7 x 1 bed
- 4 x 2 bed
- 3 x 3 bed
- 1 x 4 bed

Total 15 units

Overall Total: 32

- 1.2. The Affordable rented element of the proposed affordable housing will be London Affordable Rent. This is one of the new affordable products that is being promoted by the Mayor of London. The rents of these units are broadly equivalent to social rents and sit at around 55% of market for one beds and lower than 55% for larger units.
- 1.3. The intermediate element of the proposed affordable housing will be London Living Rent. London Living Rent is one of the new affordable products that are being promoted by the Mayor of London. London Living Rent homes are for middle-income households who now rent and want to build up savings to buy a home. This can be either through shared ownership or outright purchase. Landlords are expected to encourage their tenants into home ownership within ten years.

- 1.4. The homes will be offered on tenancies of a minimum of three years. Tenants will be supported to save and given the option to buy their home on a shared ownership basis during their tenancy. They will also be given extra priority for other shared ownership homes across London.
- 1.5. Across London as a whole, the average monthly rent for a two-bedroom London Living Rent home is around two-thirds of the median market rent. To be eligible for a London Living Rent home, you must:
- be renting in London
 - have a maximum household income of £60,000
 - be unable to currently buy a home (including through shared ownership) in your local area
- 1.6 This represents a split that is approximately 60% intermediate and 40% affordable rented housing. Given that the applicant is proposing affordable products which are at the most affordable end of the spectrum of affordable products and given the levels of shared ownership property delivered in the east of the borough this increase in rental provision is in accordance with The figures have been agreed with Haringey's Intermediate Housing Statement (2018). An additional affordable unit has also been provided since the previous Committee resolution, increasing the overall affordable housing provision to 53%.

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 9

Reference No: HGY/2017/3071	Ward: Highgate
Address: 65 & 67 North Road, London, N6 4BQ	
Proposal: The demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a part single, part three storey building to provide 8 self-contained flats	

Public Notification

7 Additional objections following re-consultation on the 21st of May

- Impact on traffic and parking
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Out of character with the conservation area
- Detracts from the listed buildings
- Pedestrian safety
- Loss of privacy

OFFICER RESPONSE:

These issues have been highlighted previously and have been addressed in the Committee Report.

Seven emails were received from third parties requesting an extension to the latest consultation, dated 21st May (seeking 21 days instead of 14), however there is no statutory requirement to do so and there has been no material change in the proposal itself since the earlier re-consultation on the 25th of January 2018.

Appendix: Responses Summary (North Road)

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
No.	EXTERNAL		
1.	London Fire Brigade:	<p>1. We note the non-standard approach to appliance access and the extended hose-laying distance proposed. As no exact dimensions have been provided, this response is based on the information available from the referral form.</p> <p>2. We are of the opinion that 100m to an inlet point of a dry rising fire main is not a suitable arrangement. This would require at least 10 lengths of hose to be laid out and charged with water before crews could use the dry riser. This is normally achieved with 2 lengths over 18m. The distance to carry equipment to the base of the stairs also exceeds the distance permitted by guidance.</p> <p>3. The requirement to provide appliance access appears to have been demonstrated via the appliance tracking plan but we would have concerns regarding the management and availability of this access route. It would be our usual expectation that the access road is hatched and parking controlled in order to ensure that the route is available at all material times and access to any provided fire mains should be within 18m.</p> <p>4. In light of the items discussed above, an automatic water suppression system may provide a measure of mitigation. Any proposed systems should fully comply with either BS</p>	<p>As highlighted in section 6.65 of the Committee report, details in relation to access and swept paths has been provided.</p> <p>The details show that it would be possible that a fire tender can access the front of the site and that it would be possible for a fire tender to access North Road and turn in order to exit in a forward gear.</p> <p>In addition, the provision of dry risers to the front of each flatted entrance would allow for vehicle access to a pump appliance within 45m of all points within each dwelling. A domestic sprinkler system is also as part of the development.</p> <p>These issues raised are highlighted in section</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>9251:2014, '<i>Fire sprinkler systems for domestic and residential occupancies. Code of practice.</i>' or BS8458-1:2015, '<i>Fixed fire protection systems. Residential and domestic watermist systems. Code of practice for design and installation.</i>'. The guidance provided in BS9991:2015 indicates that where a fire suppression system is provided then the distance between the appliance and any point within the house or flat may be up to 75m (instead of 45m), for the case where there is a floor more than 4.5 m above ground level.</p> <p>5. It would also be our usual expectation that a water hydrant be provided within 90m of any dry fire main inlets.</p>	6.66 – 6.67
	RESIDENT GROUPS		
2.	Highgate CAAC	<p>Loss of green space</p> <p>Impact on the conservation area</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring listed buildings</p> <p>Impact on Metropolitan Open Land</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring amenity from use of terraces</p> <p>Impact on access from delivery vans</p> <p>Intensification of vehicles</p> <p>Inadequate Fire Brigade access</p>	<p>Highlighted in sections 6.11 – 6.16</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.30 – 6.37</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.38 – 6.40</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.13 – 6.15</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.53 – 6.55</p> <p>Highlighted in section 6.59 & 6.67</p> <p>Highlighted in section 6.59 & 6.67</p> <p>These issues raised are highlighted in section 6.66 – 6.67</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
3.	The Highgate Society	<p>Non-compliance with the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the site</p> <p>Lack of soft landscaping</p> <p>Loss of garden land</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring listed buildings</p> <p>Concerns regarding access</p> <p>Parking and congestion</p> <p>Impact of refuse collection</p> <p>No disabled parking space</p> <p>Right of way issues</p> <p>No daylighting study provided</p> <p>Inadequate Fire Brigade access</p>	<p>Demonstration of compliance with the HNP highlighted in sections 6.5, 6.11, 6.12, 6.35 & 6.72</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.7 – 6.8</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.74 – 6.76</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.11 – 6.16</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.38 – 6.40</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.60 – 6.68</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.61 – 6.65</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.70 – 6.71</p> <p>Amended drawings have shown a Disabled parking space as highlighted in section 6.65.</p> <p>Not a material consideration as highlighted in section 5.7</p> <p>Highlighted in sections 6.56</p> <p>Highlighted in section 6.65 – 6.66</p> <p>Not a material consideration as highlighted in section 5.7</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		No consultation prior to submission of application	
4.	The Twentieth Century Society	Impact on conservation area Impact on neighbouring listed buildings	Highlighted in sections 6.30 – 6.37 Highlighted in sections 6.38 – 6.40
4.	LOCAL RESIDENTS		.
	Principle of the development	Overdevelopment of the site No affordable housing provision Backland development Loss of green space	Highlighted in sections 6.7 – 6.8 Highlighted in sections 6.9 - 6.10 Highlighted in sections 6.11 – 6.16 Highlighted in sections 6.11 – 6.16
	Quality of accommodation	Concerns regarding housing mix / tenure Poor standard of accommodation	Highlighted in sections 6.45 – 6.50
	Design / impact on the conservation area and listed buildings	Impact on neighbouring heritage assets Impact on the conservation area Out of character for the typology of housing within the area Excessive volume of the proposed building	Highlighted in sections 6.30 – 6.40 Highlighted in sections 6.30 – 6.37 Highlighted in section 6.19 Highlighted in sections 6.21 – 6.29
	Impact on neighboring	Overlooking and loss of privacy Noise and disturbance from increase in movements to and	Highlighted in sections 6.54 – 6.56

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	amenity	from the site Loss of light Overbearing impact Light spillage from the development Impact on air quality	Highlighted in sections 6.56 Highlighted in sections 6.55 Highlighted in section 6.58 Highlighted in section 6.58
	Traffic, Parking, Access and Sustainable Transport	Insufficient parking spaces Proposal does not comply with fire regulations Insufficient circulation space Impacts upon road and pedestrian safety Issues regarding refuse collection	Highlighted in sections 6.61 – 6.65 These issues raised are highlighted in section 6.66 – 6.67 Highlighted in section 6.65 Highlighted in sections 6.68 – 6.69 Highlighted in section 6.70 – 6.71
	Trees and ecology	Ecological impact of the development Impact on trees Impact upon Metropolitan Open Land	Highlighted in section 6.77 – 6.78 Highlighted in section 6.72 – 6.76 Highlighted in sections 6.13 – 6.15