

Appendix 2 Plans and Images

Site location plan



Site photographs – existing building



Existing pedestrian access, View Road.



Original building, Kekewich House as seen from front garden.



Unsympathetic extension to Kekewich House.



Unsympathetic extension to Kekewich House.



View across existing garden towards 3 View Road.



Existing front garden, View Road.



Rear of Kekewich House and linked extension building.



Rear of Kekewich House.



Proposed basement plan



Proposed ground floor plan



Proposed second floor plan



Proposed elevations with existing building outline



Elevation A-A - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Elevation B-B - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Elevation C-C - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Proposed North Hill Frontage



Proposed View Road frontage



Appendix 3 Quality Review Panel (QRP) Reports

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Video conference

Panel

David Ubaka (chair)

Louise Goodison

Tim Pitman

Andy Puncher

Ann Sawyer

Attendees

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Neil McClellan

London Borough of Haringey

Elisabetta Tonazzi

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Kiki Ageridou

Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Dean Hermitage

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

Deborah Denner

Frame Projects

Confidentiality

This is a pre-application review, and therefore confidential. As a public organisation Haringey Council is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

Report of Formal Review Meeting

18 May 2021

HQRP108_Former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home

1. Project name and site address

Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, Highgate, London N6 4DP

2. Presenting team.

Nick Johnson	DWA Architects
Lauren Di Pietro	DWA Architects
Jordan Alcock	DWA Architects
Mitesh Dhanak	Highgate Care Limited
Neeraj Dixit	ND Planning Limited
Nick Collins	KM Heritage

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

4. Planning authority briefing

The site was formerly owned (and operated as a care home) by the Mary Feilding Guild. It was recently acquired by Highgate Care Limited. The site sits within the Highgate Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures. On its North Hill frontage, the site is flanked on one side by a Grade II Listed Georgian terrace while on its View Road frontage it is adjoined by a Locally Listed villa at 3 View Road. The current care home complex includes a red brick building on the site's View Road frontage, the core of which is an Edwardian House with some Arts and Crafts features. This has been linked through a series of extensions and newer buildings to a four storey 1960 / 1970s block on the North Hill frontage. The original Edwardian building is considered a positive contributor to the Conservation Area.

The proposal is for the complete demolition of the existing 42-bed care home (Use Classes Order C2) and the redevelopment of the site to provide a new 72-bed care home with ancillary communal facilities, services and amenities. Officers strongly support the retention of a care home facility on the site, which would confer some public benefit. The National Planning Policy Framework highlights that local planning authorities should refuse consent for development, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm to - or total loss of - a designated heritage asset is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.



Officers would welcome the panel's views on the design quality of the scheme, including the scale and massing of the proposed building and the impact this may have on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the setting of adjoining listed buildings and on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for the former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home as they continue to evolve. The panel is pleased that the applicant's intention is to retain the use of this important site for residential care accommodation. However, it is not convinced by the current proposals and feels that further work is required at both a strategic and a detailed level. At a strategic level, further site analysis and a greater understanding of the nature and qualities of the local context is required. This should feed into the process of re-visiting the brief for development to create something joyful, prioritising high quality, liveable residential care accommodation that complements and enhances the local context and conservation area.

Consideration of embodied energy, alongside a 'fabric first' approach to sustainable design should inform early, strategic decisions about the nature, overall configuration, and detail of the scheme. The relationship of the building to the landscape will also be very important, as will the scale, quality and design of external landscaped amenity spaces. Further work to reduce the scale, massing and building footprint is required; while scope also remains to refine the scheme layout, and architectural expression of the proposals. As design work continues, it will be important for scheme drawings and images to show the proposals within contextual sections and elevations. Further technical work is also required, to include daylight / sunlight analysis, transport input, and arrangements for servicing, waste management, deliveries, parking / accessible parking, and cycle storage.

The panel understands that there has been a lot of publicity about the sale and potential redevelopment of the site. As the proposals continue to evolve, it will be very important to undertake a consultation / engagement process with local residents and conservation societies, to inform the design process. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- The material presented at review did not show the scheme set within the context of neighbouring buildings, and some of the cross-sections were very difficult to read; in this regard, it is very difficult for the panel to assess the scale and proportion of the proposals.
- From the information shown, the panel's initial response is that the scale and massing of the current proposals (on both View Road and North Hill) is too



large and out of proportion. This is particularly the case with the block on North Hill, which will appear considerably higher than shown in the drawings, due to the relative levels of public realm and carriageways adjacent. Using abstract constructs such as the Fibonacci sequence to justify an increase in height in this location is not acceptable.

- The proposed footprint of the building is particularly problematic, and requires revisiting. It has expanded from that of the original care home, bringing the building envelope closer to neighbouring dwellings, resulting in a reduction of usable external amenity space, and compromising access to daylight in residents' rooms, due to trees along the adjacent boundaries.
- The panel thinks that the proposals are being driven primarily by quantum of units within the proposed care home, which is resulting in a compromised quality of accommodation and external amenity, alongside a problematic relationship with the local context. While the existing building accommodates 42 beds in 2367m²; the proposals accommodate 72 beds plus a wellness centre in 6700m². It notes that the core responsibility of the panel is to evaluate the design quality of the proposals; the panel highlights that viability should not be an acceptable justification for a lack of design quality in a scheme such as this.

Relationship to local context

- The panel would encourage the design team to revisit the analysis of the site and context. It feels that a deeper rigour is required for such a complex redevelopment within this location; to inform strategic decisions, refine the brief and ensure that it is realistic and achievable.
- While the character of the two roads (View Road and North Hill) was described very well in the presentation, the panel feels that this is not yet reflected in the proposals, which seem suggestive of a 'greenfield' site, lacking in contextual elevations and sections. The panel would encourage a more responsive and sensitive approach to the project.
- The panel would like to see a greater understanding of the visual themes within the architecture of neighbouring buildings and the conservation area rather than a 'pick and mix' appropriation of selected architectural details. Thematic analysis will tease out issues of symmetry/asymmetry, calmness/dynamism, composition, and the visual role of different elements.
- A key characteristic of the conservation area is the relationship between the buildings and the gardens; the dwellings typically sit within very verdant garden landscapes. The buildings themselves also have a distinct style.



Landscape design

- The footprint of the building has increased considerably, such that the existing central garden space which is northwest facing, has significantly reduced in size and been pushed to the edge of the site. The other external spaces are also limited in size, located at the edges, and largely dominated by hard landscaping. In this regard, the panel feels that the proposed amenity space for the increased number of residents is inadequate.
- The panel is also unconvinced by the quality of these amenity spaces. For example, it questions whether a north-facing terrace, located at basement level, would be a pleasant place to sit.
- It would encourage the project team to explore research (University of Stirling and Liverpool John Moores University), concerning design for dementia. It notes that a key finding of dementia research is that landscape offers huge benefits, including significantly improved quality of life, enjoyment, and health outcomes.
- The panel highlights the importance of providing high quality landscaped spaces, including a large, open and sunny garden where all of the residents can gather for events and socialising.
- A greater understanding of the site, its landscape features and topography, should inform the redevelopment proposals. The panel notes that existing trees are missing from the drawings, and distances from buildings to boundaries and habitable windows are not clear. It thinks that the belt of existing trees along the site boundary will have a significant impact upon the levels of daylight within proposed accommodation.

Scheme layout and quality of accommodation

- While the site offers huge potential to accommodate a fantastic elderly care home, the panel is not convinced that the current proposals represent high quality, liveable care accommodation that responds to the site, the local context and the need for energy efficient, sustainable design.
- The panel would encourage the project team to revisit the brief for development to ensure that an integral part of the design approach is a deeper understanding of the requirements of the people that will live there.
- Dementia research suggests that the design of accommodation should feel homely and residential, which tends towards smaller clusters of units rather than a more linear – and institutional – configuration of rooms. Corridors should be generous and daylit, to support wayfinding and enhance quality of life. The panel considers that stepped, enclosed corridors that have blank ends are not appropriate in this type of setting.



- The proposals include many north-facing single aspect rooms and the panel feels that this is unacceptable, especially given the proximity of trees and boundary fences which could significantly restrict daylight penetration into rooms.
- The panel would like to know more about how the existing building is configured, how it sits within the site, how it relates to the external spaces, and how the individual rooms and circulation areas are organised. An understanding of this could help to inform strategic decisions about how the main body of accommodation should be configured within the site.
- Exploration of options for the site that would maximise opportunities for the residents' rooms to enjoy good views, daylight and sunlight would be welcomed. This may include exploration of a garden courtyard-led approach, or a cloistered building, with units off a daylight corridor.
- Cross-sections taken through the building and showing the relationship to outdoor amenity spaces should be provided.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of the ground floor layout, both internally and externally. This should include the integration of functional infrastructure, such as bin stores, cycle storage and deliveries, at an early stage.
- Clarity on the role and purpose of the North Hill building would also be welcomed. The panel notes that significant space in prominent locations is allocated as changing areas, which seems unnecessary.

Architectural expression

- The panel would encourage the design team to develop a calmer, more coherent approach to the architectural expression of the proposals that avoids cluttering the elevations with 'stuck-on' appropriated local details.
- Analysis of the overarching architectural themes in the locality – including lines, head heights, window lines, roof forms, corners, symmetry/asymmetry and three-dimensional relationships to external space – will help to inform an approach that inherently reflects the context and enables a softer architectural expression instead of the heavier, more bombastic elevational treatment proposed.
- At a detailed level, the panel highlights that the external architectural expression can also be used to reflect what is happening internally within the building; for example, expressing a staircase externally through the location and design of fenestration can help the building be more readable.



- It would encourage further work on the design and approach sequence of the main entrance on View Road. The primary focus of the current frontage appears to be the sweeping driveway leading to the entrance to the vehicle lift. The panel would like to see the visual focus of this elevation shift to that of the pedestrian approach to the main entrance.

Local community engagement

- The sale and potential redevelopment of the site has had a lot of publicity, both nationally and locally; there is significant interest in what the outcome will be.
- The footprint of the current proposals sits very close to the site boundaries and may impact upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings, which could lead to significant numbers of objections from neighbours and local conservation societies at application stage.
- The panel understands that there has been no consultation process; it considers that a comprehensive local engagement process is critical to the success of the scheme. It will be important to get the involvement of local residents and conservation societies at an early stage in the process, which could help to inform design development as the scheme continues to evolve. Taking on board comments from such a consultation process is likely to result in a very different scheme coming forward, to that currently proposed.

Low carbon design and environmental sustainability

- The panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability within the scheme. Following its Climate Emergency Declaration in 2019, Haringey Council adopted the Climate Change Action Plan in March 2021, which identifies a route map to enable the borough to become Net Zero Carbon by 2041. All new development coming forward should have regard for these requirements to avoid the need for retrofitting later. Proposals should demonstrate how they comply with these requirements.
- Consideration of the embodied energy within the existing buildings is an important starting point in sustainability terms. The panel would like to see detailed analysis of a development approach that seeks to retain all or part of the existing buildings, to identify opportunities. This should include exploration of the existing floor plan layout, and options to retain, adapt, extend, and build up.
- Consideration of operational energy requirements should start with a 'fabric first' approach – optimising the performance and design of the building envelope, components, and materials to achieve sustainable and energy-



CONFIDENTIAL

efficient design. Utilising renewable energy sources, natural light, cross ventilation, and nature will also form part of this work.

- A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as the scheme continues to evolve.
- At a detailed level, the locations of plant provision should be established very early stage. Careful integration through design can mitigate the impact on the roofscape.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposed important scheme as they continue to evolve.
- The panel also offers a focused chair's review on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability if required.
- Community engagement at an early stage to enable the local community to inform the design process would be supported.

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home

Wednesday 25 August 2021

Video conference

Panel

David Ubaka (chair)

Louise Goodison

Attendees

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Katerina Koukouthaki	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Laurence Ackrill	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Zainab Malik	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

Confidentiality

This is a pre-application review, and therefore confidential. As a public organisation Haringey Council is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

1. Project name and site address

Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, Highgate, London N6 4DP

2. Presenting team.

Nick Johnson	DWA Architects Limited
Jordan Alcock	DWA Architects Limited
Mitesh Dhanak	Highgate Care Limited
Neeraj Dixit	ND Planning Limited
Nick Collins	KM Heritage
Rebecca Morgan	Guarda Landscape
Nimco Ali	Hodkinson Consultancy Limited

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

4. Planning authority briefing

The site was formerly owned (and operated as a care home) by the Mary Feilding Guild. It was recently acquired by Highgate Care Limited. The site sits within the Highgate Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures. On its North Hill frontage, the site is flanked on one side by a Grade II Listed Georgian terrace while on its View Road frontage it is adjoined by a Locally Listed villa at 3 View Road. The current care home complex includes a red brick building on the site's View Road frontage, the core of which is an Edwardian House with some Arts and Crafts features. This has been linked through a series of extensions and newer buildings to a four storey 1960s / 1970s block on the North Hill frontage. The original Edwardian building is considered a positive contributor to the Conservation Area.

The proposal is for the complete demolition of the existing 42-bed care home (Use Classes Order C2) and the redevelopment of the site to provide a new 70-bed care home with support facilities, a well-being and physiotherapy centre and associated works. Officers strongly support the retention of a care home facility on the site, which would confer some public benefit. Officers would welcome the panel's views on the design quality of the scheme, including the scale and massing of the proposed building and the impact this may have on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the setting of adjoining listed buildings and on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.



5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for the former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home as they continue to evolve. The panel is pleased that the applicant's intention is to retain the use of this important site for residential care accommodation. It thanks the project team for the helpful presentation, and feels that the work done in response to the previous review has been very positive. It commends the tenacity of the project team, working with planning officers and consulting with the community.

The panel supports many of the strategic moves made during design development; however it feels that the massing and detail of the roofscape could be further improved, along with the architectural expression of the scheme. It would also encourage further consideration of the scheme layout, to improve the quality of the communal accommodation and circulation areas, while enhancing the relationship between key shared spaces and adjacent garden areas. As design work continues, sections taken through the building and the surrounding context will be important to ensure high quality accommodation.

The retention and re-purposing of the North Hill block should be considered, alongside a wider strategy for the re-use on site of any appropriate demolition material. Full consideration of embodied energy, alongside a 'fabric first' approach to sustainable design, should inform the continuing evolution of the proposals at a detailed level. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and roofscape

- The panel accepts the massing and development density of the proposals, but would encourage the project team to refine the massing of the roofscape to further reduce the visual bulk of the building.
- For example, the roof line of the two wings either side of the central block, fronting onto View Road, could be lowered by reducing the roof pitch, or by using a flat roof or mansard roof. This would make the side wings visually subordinated and would start to break up the bulk of this important façade, while also reflecting the approach to massing within existing adjacent buildings on View Road. Introducing a different tone of brickwork in these side wings could also help to distinguish them from the central block.
- In addition, the ridge-line of the pitched roofs across the scheme could potentially be lowered. Sections through the building would help to identify where higher pitches are needed to accommodate adequate head-room. A careful balance will be required to ensure that - within external views - the roofscape appears generous enough, while also reducing the visual bulk of the top of the building.



- The depth of the roof also presents some challenges with regard to the nature of the hip elements, which seem oversized. The panel would encourage a simpler approach to the pitched roofs within the scheme, using strong gable ends rather than large hips. For example, an opportunity exists to bring the ridge line of the linking building from the North Hill block and terminate it at the garden with a gable end facing west into the garden.
- The panel welcomes the adjustments to the building footprint, which has been pulled away from adjacent buildings to allow for a more generous gap than currently exists.
- The panel notes that the demolition and redevelopment of the North Hill building only achieves the same mass and footprint as the existing building. It would strongly encourage the project team to fully explore retaining, refurbishing / re-cladding and re-purposing the existing building, which the panel considers to be architecturally elegant and which does not seek to compete with the adjacent Georgian terrace.

Landscape design

- While the panel regrets the reduction of the garden space, it feels this is acceptable as the building footprint has also been pulled away from the boundary in some locations, providing a more generous distance to adjacent buildings.
- The panel welcomes the concept of the healing garden, with its aspiration to nurture the physical and mental well-being of residents. Careful consideration of the path, the orientation of the garden and the ramp access will be required to ensure that a strong visual and physical relationship is created between the internal accommodation and the garden.

Scheme layout and quality of accommodation

- The panel would like to see further refinements to the scheme layout, to create a better relationship (both visually and physically) between internal communal areas and the garden spaces externally. The terrace areas in the 'elbow' of the scheme also need further work.
- The panel is concerned by the intention to locate the restaurant in the basement. Instead, it would like to see it at ground floor level, ideally in the west-facing section of building overlooking the garden (where there are currently a number of individual rooms shown). The kitchen could remain at basement level.
- Some of the other uses currently located within the basement would also be much better suited to being located at ground level, including staff rooms and communal facilities like the shop, library, barbers and hair and beauty salon.



These uses could potentially help to activate the frontage of the North Hill block.

- The panel feels that the proportion of circulation space within the North Hill block is unbalanced and would like to see improvements to the efficiency of the floor plans.
- It would also support further refinement of the design of the circulation spaces and communal areas, to include increasing the generosity of - and daylight access to - corridors, circulation cores and stairwells.
- Sections taken through the accommodation will be critically important to understanding how the sloping roofs and dormers will affect the quality of accommodation within the roof spaces.
- Greater clarity would be welcomed on the arrangements for refuse storage and how this will work in practice for the different parts of the development.

Architectural expression

- The panel would support further refinements to the View Road elevations, including simplified recesses and a greater distinction in the side wings of the main building through use of different brickwork, as mentioned above.
- It would also encourage further consideration of the northern (flank) façade of the scheme. It thinks that a green wall would not be appropriate in this location, and notes that flank walls can be used to express things; examples can be seen within the arts and crafts buildings nearby.
- The panel feels in particular that it would be beneficial to get daylight into the stairwell that is bounded by the flank wall, and would encourage exploration of options, including fritted glass.
- Opportunities exist to introduce visual references or motifs within the architectural expression that relate to Mary Feilding, to give a sense of narrative and historical perspective to the scheme.
- While the panel feels that retention of the North Hill block should be explored as a first response to this part of the site, it would encourage a calmer and simpler approach to the architectural expression of the proposed North Hill block; it thinks that the stepping of the proposed building line is too complicated, and does not relate to the adjacent Georgian terrace. The panel also notes that the exterior looks like an office building, rather than reflecting the uses that are accommodated within.



CONFIDENTIAL

Low carbon design and environmental sustainability

- As at the previous review, the panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability within the scheme.
- It highlights that following its Climate Emergency Declaration in 2019, Haringey Council adopted the Climate Change Action Plan in March 2021, which identifies a route map to enable the borough to become Net Zero Carbon by 2041. All new development coming forward should have regard for these requirements to avoid the need for retrofitting later. Proposals should demonstrate how they comply with these requirements.
- The panel notes that consideration of the embodied energy within existing buildings is an important starting point in sustainability terms. It would like to see detailed analysis of a development approach that seeks to retain – as a minimum – the North Hill block, plus other parts of the existing building where appropriate. This should include exploration of the existing floor plan layout, along with options to retain, adapt and extend it. Options for re-using demolition materials should also be fully explored.
- Consideration of operational energy requirements should start with a ‘fabric first’ approach – optimising the performance and design of the building envelope, components, and materials to achieve sustainable and energy-efficient design; renewable energy sources, natural light, and cross ventilation will also form part of this work. Further details on the approach to u-values would be welcomed.
- A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as the scheme continues to evolve.
- As design work continues at a greater level of detail, the panel would encourage officers to challenge and interrogate the scheme further regarding the agenda for the climate emergency.

Next steps

- The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers. It would be happy to review the proposals at a further chair’s review if required.
- The panel also offers a focused chair’s review on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability.



Appendix 4 Planning Committee Pre-Application Briefing Notes

PRE/2020/0138 - MARY FEILDING GUILD CARE HOME, 103-107 NORTH HILL, N6

Proposal: Demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and redevelopment to provide a new nursing and convalescence home of 70 beds with support facilities, a well-being and physiotherapy centre and associated works.

Minutes:

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and redevelopment to provide a new nursing and convalescence home of 70 beds with support facilities, a wellbeing and physiotherapy centre and associated works.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- In response to a question about the distance between buildings, the applicant team drew attention to the site location plan which showed the footprints of the existing and proposed buildings. It was explained that there had been an attempt to move the boundaries away from neighbouring properties and sensitive areas and some other areas where the footprint had been extended.
- It was noted that the site previously accommodated a 42 bed residential care home and that the proposal would be a different business model for short term stays after hospital treatment. The Committee enquired how this would meet Policy DM15, which preserved specialist housing. The Head of Development Management noted that the previous and proposed uses concerned two different types of specialist housing and that this would need to be assessed and weighed to determine whether the proposal was acceptable.
- Attention was drawn to the comments of the Quality Review Panel (QRP). It was noted that the site was located near a row of Georgian town houses and it was queried whether the current utilitarian design had the right architectural quality for the area. Further design work? The applicant team noted that they had rigorously assessed the site and its context in

planning, architectural, and heritage terms over the last year. It was added that views had been collected from residents and local amenity groups and the applicant team considered that the current proposal had an appropriate design context for the area. It was also noted that officers and the QRP also considered the design to be appropriate but that the applicant would continue to engage on the progression of the design.

- Some concerns were expressed that the North Hill frontage was not visually attractive or complementary to the Georgian terrace. It was also enquired how demolition was justified. The Head of Development Management explained that the applicant would need to show that they could meet the requirements for specialist housing and that the replacement building would be equal to or better than the existing building in terms of enhancing the conservation area. The applicant team added that they had considered retaining and repurposing the building but that it was not practical or financially viable.
- It was noted that the QRP had criticised the location of the restaurant in the basement. The applicant team explained that the restaurant would now be located on the ground floor and would be overlooking the rear garden.
- It was confirmed that 10 rooms would be north facing which constituted a small number of the total rooms.
- The Committee noted that this application was quite different to a standard planning application and requested that the final report contained additional information about the specific considerations for this type of decision, including information about affordable provision and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions.
- It was noted that there were a number of landmarks near to the site, including Grade II Listed and locally listed buildings. The Committee requested that the images for the final application included these details so that they could be seen in context to the proposals.
- It was noted that the QRP had referred to the climate emergency. It was commented that this was a large site which could have a significant benefit or detriment and it was requested that as much detail as possible was provided in the application. The applicant team explained that they had appointed a sustainability and renewable energy consultant who had

already been in contact with the council's climate officer and agreed a scope of works and information requirements to support the application.

- In response to a question about the description of the development as 'special needs housing', the applicant team stated that this would be Class C2 residential use. It was explained that Policy DM15 was supportive of special needs accommodation and that the proposal would meet a special need for residential accommodation. It was added that, as part of the council's policy, there were sub-criteria which indicated the type of facilities that would be relevant and which would be applicable in this case; this included the level of supervision, management, and care/support.
- Cllr Peacock noted that the applicant team should use the phrase 'older person' rather than 'elderly'.
- It was clarified that each floor of the building would have a communal area. It was noted that all rooms would have en suite facilities. It was added that the previous rooms were approximately 10sqm and that the new rooms would all be in excess of 20sqm.
- It was enquired whether the windowless room shown on the plan would be for staff and whether they would be sleeping in this room. The applicant team noted that this was planned to be a state of the art facility and that the area mentioned would possibly be a rest area for staff; it was added that the internal configuration might still change and that the rest area might move upstairs.
- The applicant team noted that the estimated cost of staying at the facility would be £300 per night.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

Appendix 5 DM Forum Summary

- Query about the landscaping strategy
- Concerns with the financing of the scheme
- Query on future and current demand of care facilities in the area
- Mary Feilding Guild was a good facility
- Concerns the new facility is short term and unaffordable
- The development does not fit into the area
- Concerns with the loss of the care home
- Increased traffic, congestion and parking concerns
- Has bat friendly lighting been explored
- Query on trees/landscaping
- Concerns with the North Hill frontage
- Concerns this is not a care home facility
- Will the operator be London Living Wage accredited
- Section drawings and rear elevations should be provided
- To what extent will the View Road part of the building be independent of North Hill facilities
- Query on whether the proposal will be zero carbon and whether there will be PV's and where will they be located. Query also made on air source heat pumps
- Concerns on the location of roof plants
- Concerns with the design of the scheme. Further work is needed
- Query on PTAL rating
- What percentage increase is the footprint on the building
- Query on what benefit the development brings
- Concerns the development would be a convalescence centre and not a care home