Appendix 3 – Consultation Responses – Internal and External Consultees

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
Design Officer	Summary  These proposals are an exceptionally high quality design that will provide a significant quantum of much needed new housing, mostly affordable, to an exceptionally high quality standard in amenity, convenience, and security, in a lushly landscaped setting, with plentiful communal gardens and playspace. Furthermore, their design is an intelligent, well considered, in materials and detailing, elegantly proportioned contemporary reinterpretation of the prevailing Edwardian context. The proposed height represents a gentle increase over some of the immediate surroundings, but is handled carefully and is of such a scale, bulk and design to be not out of character with the wider neighbourhood. Overall, it would represent an appropriate response to need and to the site, a beautiful addition to a pleasant and highly desirable community.	Comments have been taken into account. Materials to be controlled by condition.
	Principal of Development, and Masterplanning and Street Layout	
	1. The site forms part of Site Allocation SA51 from the Site Allocations DPD (adopted July 2017) and the proposals are broadly in accordance with those. The part of the site allocation outside of the current application contains eight terraced houses built at the same time as the existing former old peoples' home to be demolished to enable this development. The applicants fulfil the site allocation requirement to include a masterplan that indicates how these houses could be replaced as a continuation of the current proposals.	
	2. The presence of a large, shallow buried water main running across the site just north of the houses made it impossible to have a single block across the whole of the Muswell Hill Road frontage. The existing houses will still be accessed off a path to their north, but this will connect to a new, traffic calmed, pedestrian friendly roadway connecting north to Woodside Avenue, addressed by residential windows and front doors to Building B. The two houses of Building C will also face this street, whilst continuing the line of those existing houses. The path will be more generous in width and vegetation and populated with a "play-on-the-way" landscape.	

## Height, Bulk & Massing

- 3. The site sits between the heritage assets of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area, who's southern boundary is on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue immediately to the north of the site, and Highgate Wood, who's boundary is the southern side of the narrow footpath immediately to the south of the site. Highgate Wood is a designated Historic Park; it and the public footpath are designated Metropolitan Open Lane, a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) of Metropolitan Importance, an Ecological Corridor and an Area of Archaeological Importance. The Parkland Walk, which starts at the north-eastern corner of the site and continues via a bridge under Muswell Hill Road on to the north-east from the site, is also a SINC of Metropolitan Importance, as well as being a designated Local Nature Reserve and Green Chain. However, the site itself is not constrained by designations, except by virtue of proximity.
- 4. The wider built context is predominantly of low rise, two storey, terraced or semi-detached, residential housing, although taller three, four and occasionally five storey mansion block and shopping parade buildings predominate in and around the town centre of Muswell Hill and on and around the main arterial street of Archway Road, both a short distance away from this site, to the north and south respectively. Immediately west of the site, St James' Primary School is a 1960s building of one and two storeys. However, buildings along Muswell Hill Road are generally taller and bulkier than their two storey hinterland; immediately to the south of the site is a grandly scaled four storey shopping parade, with tall storey heights and a high parapet, whilst a lower-height late twentieth century flatted development opposite also comprises four storeys. The houses on Muswell Hill Road immediately to the north of the site, including the one on the opposite corner of Woodside Avenue which has been converted to a hotel, as well as those south of the shopping parade and flats opposite, are grandly scaled 2 ½ to 3 storeys, with prominent inhabited gables and dormers, semibasements and often rear elevations and extensions that squeeze in an additional storey in the same height; they are more accurately described as 2 ½ to 3 storey.
- 5. Woodside Square is a very recent development opposite the site on Woodside Avenue, immediately to the north west, although unlike this site is actually in the Conservation Area. It is the conversion of a former hospital, with its former Admin. Building (Statutorily Listed), and two grand, Victorian, former houses (Locally Listed). The new buildings, and extensions to the locally listed former houses, comprise a mixture of flatted blocks and terraced or semi-detached town houses of generally four storeys. Nevertheless, the immediate context to this site provided by Woodside Square is of its deep landscaped

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	frontage between the road and the listed / locally listed buildings, which is publicly accessible. The character of Woodside Avenue as it continues west of the site is generally much more institutional large scaled buildings in open settings; a major break from what is otherwise prevailing. The school is set behind playgrounds and tennis courts, the monumental pumping station beyond it behind a wide open landscaped frontage, a health facility and further school beyond Woodside Square also behind wide landscaping and allotments beyond that.	
	6. Therefore the context of the site is that it is a break from the norm of the prevailing low-rise, suburban, residential neighbourhood; a junction of the intermittently grander, higher buildings along Muswell Hill, connecting Archway Road to Muswell Hill town centre, with the landscaped space / strip of Highgate Wood / Parkland Walk, open, institutional Woodside Avenue, and <i>least</i> influentially the low-rise suburban hinterland. Therefore, in urban design terms, this site is considered appropriate for an exceptional development, that references but builds up from the prevailing height, whilst also exploiting the drop in the land of the site due to being on a former railway cutting.	
	7. Therefore the main height of the building that holds the significant street corner of Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue is of four storeys (not counting the lower ground floor in the depth of the railway cutting and the top floor in the roof space). This is the same number of storeys as the (taller in height) retail parade immediately to the south and the (lower in height) flats opposite, and only about a storey in height more than the 2½ - 3 storey houses on Muswell Hill to the north. The lower ground floor would be completely invisible from Muswell Hill Road, with windows and a door only onto the Parkland walk towards and at the bottom of its ramp down to the bridge under the road; in fact the rise of the bridge would put the ground floor windows lower to the level of the street. The top floor would only appear as a roof from the street side, pitched at a fairly shallow pitch to the west and turning to the north onto the Woodside Avenue side, indicating the corner. The top floor inhabited roof would be in a light weight, "roof like" material, and with just a small number of very low profile in-cut dormers, the sort that do not project at all from but are set into the roof plane.	
	8. To Woodside Avenue the same 4 storey height would prevail to Building A, with no lower ground floor windows at all and just a few in-cut dormers, and then height would drop with Building B at 3 storeys plus roof pitched to the north and west sides. The development would	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	form a visual punctuation from views further west down Woodside Ave., terminating the street and indicating its corner to the more important street of Muswell Hill Road. Only the south and west elevations looking into the mostly internal courtyard side of Block A would read as of 6 storeys onto the lower courtyard, a storey below ground level, with a wall to the new street on the west side and stepped terraced landscaping to the path on the south side. Block B would read as 4 storeys on its east and south sides from the new street within the development, as would the 2 new houses in Block C, "bookending" the retained existing terrace.	
	9. These taller sides would only be visible from within the development, or glimpsed very indistinctly from within the densely wooded Highgate Wood only when there are no leaves on the trees, and even then, barely due to the density of branches, climbers and undergrowth within this natural woodland. It is also notable that both wings of Building A, as well as all of Buildings B and C, are each of shallow building depth; only one flat deep. Therefore, although the proposed height steps up a floor or two from existing neighbours, their form, bulk and massing lighten their appearance and reduce their apparent height, especially where visible from surrounding streets.	
	10. Notwithstanding that the height can be justified as a modest step up, of generally about a single storey on its immediate neighbours, it is worth re-stating that the site sits somewhat detached from and exceptional to its context, and always has done. It's also worth remembering that 4-5 storey "mansion blocks" as a form of development are very typical of Muswell Hill as a whole, with several original Edwardian examples of buildings of this scale, often of bulkier, more monumental appearance, along Fortis Green, Fortis Green Road and Colney Hatch Road, as well as on Muswell Hill Road closer to Archway.	
	Form, Composition and Materiality	
	11. Original development in the surrounding area is generally from the Edwardian and inter-war period, with some older Victorian architecture, more common on Archway, and in variety of styles including Neo-Classical, "Moderne" (inter-war modernist with an emphasis on streamlining and elements of neo-classical composition), Arts & Crafts and more hybridised styles, but with several common or dominant features (not all present in all of the above noted styles, indeed sometimes opposed or subverted in some), but including predominant use of red brick, projecting bay windows, vertical proportions and strongly expressed pitched	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	roofs. Elsewhere in the vicinity other contemporary developments, such as Woodside Square by Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects, and Pinnacle Muswell Hill by PH+ Architects, have shown that contemporary reinterpretations of Edwardian and Inter-War architecture can successfully integrate high quality modern developments into this sensitive area of London.	
	12. These proposals seek to reference and echo characteristic local features in their contemporary reinterpretation of the mix of these local styles whilst designing a development that expresses the reality of its egalitarian, tenure-blind, sustainable, highest quality, contemporary, housing brief. In particular brick is proposed as the main external finish, to be variegated, predominantly red, to match this overwhelmingly dominantly used local material. Some of the brickwork will be in bands of soldier coursing to emphasise and mark entrances and details around windows. Zinc cladding is proposed to roofs, to harmonise with the brickwork whilst providing a lighter roof. These will be offset with banding in pre-cast concrete (also known as reconstituted stone), in either natural (buff/grey) or pink/brown colour, the former, found on the main street facing facades, particularly the ground floor plinth and to balcony floors, referencing the frequently found stone, concrete, white painted timber and white rendered elements in many nearby original buildings, the latter generally used for the decorative roof level parapet and around entrances.	
	13. Each material is appropriate to supporting the proposed building form. Zinc can accommodate the complex angles required for a roof that contains a steeper pitch to the street side, shallower to allow full height windows to the top floor on the courtyard side, and to turn the non-90° street corners, with faceted corners. Pre-cast concrete can form the angled bays, which reference the commonly found neighbouring bay windows but here provide balconies to flats facing Muswell Hill Road, and access galleries to flats on the Woodside Avenue side, where flats face south onto the courtyard to benefit from the sun more. The former, with solid sides, give balconies that have privacy to residents and hide clutter despite facing a busy street, the latter, with solid balustrades throughout, mean the potentially alienating strong horizontals and permanent lighting of communal access galleries is hidden. Together these allow a decorative metal balustrade to be used for balcony guarding to both private south facing amenity space and west communal access galleries to the courtyard side, adding a richness of decorative detail that ties the scheme together, provides good sunlight and views to balconies whilst still hiding clutter and protecting privacy.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	14. The proposals are composed with thought, to express their base, middle and top, in proportions appropriate to the height of the different facades; the ground floor of the two street facing facades of Building A using a pre-cast concrete plinth, with three "middle" floors over then the roof; to the garden side, the two lower floors are maisonettes, a band of pale pre-cast concrete marks the start of the middle 3 floors of expressed projecting balconies / galleries with the top floor in vertical zinc cladding as used for the roof on the street side. Building B scales down the same grading, with the garden wall replacing the ground floor plinth. Building C is expressed differently as a pair of vertically proportioned three storey houses, broken up by alternating ground floor entrance porch and 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor recessed roof terrace in pre-cast concrete.	
	15. With "crafting details" of stepped glazed brick and concrete details around entrances, also marked with ornamental steel gate / screens, and with decorative brick detailing under windows to achieve pleasing vertical proportioning, this proposal can justifiably be described as an exceptionally well designed, thoughtfully composed, elegantly proportioned, complimentarily materialled and detailed development that will add a new landmark to this area of Muswell Hill, appropriate to its out-of-character location and junction of two important streets and three important walking routes, two important natural landscape features and three different urban character areas.	
	Residential Quality, Daylight, Sunlight and Privacy	
	16. This proposal is exceptional in going well above and beyond, whilst complying with the Nationally Described Space Standards, to provide exceptionally high quality, well day and sunlit, privacy protected, dual and triple aspect, tenure blind homes in a generously landscaped setting.	
	17. There are no single aspect flats or maisonettes in the whole proposed development. All dwellings meet or exceed the private external amenity space in the London Plan, with private gardens, balconies or roof terraces. Maisonettes on the ground and lower ground floor of Building A have private gardens onto the communal landscaped courtyard. All flats have balconies off their living rooms, and many also have second balconies off a bedroom. Some upper floor flats and maisonettes have larger roof terraces. At the same time all homes, and the existing retained terrace of houses, will benefit from the exceptionally thoughtfully	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	designed communal landscaped courtyard. Ground floor habitable rooms to street facing facades are protected for privacy, noise etc with deep terraces and landscaped buffers.	
	18. The applicants provided Daylight and Sunlight Reports on levels within their development and the effect of their proposals on relevant neighbouring buildings, prepared in full 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), known as "The BRE Guide".	
	19. Their assessment finds great levels of daylight and sunlight achieved throughout the proposed development, with 79% of all habitable rooms will achieve their recommended daylight, the exceptions being mostly some of the combined living-dining-kitchens falling short of the recommended levels for kitchens, but achieving the recommended levels for living and dining rooms, which is considered a very acceptable result. For sunlight, most of the relevant living rooms, those facing within 90° of due south, achieve the recommended levels, but some fall short due to having overhanging balconies above. All the external amenity spaces achieve the recommended levels except one west facing courtyard, which would nevertheless receive good summer sun.	
	20. For existing neighbours, all external amenity spaces and relevant habitable rooms would continue to receive recommended sunlight levels, and for daylight it is the same for almost all neighbouring dwellings. The only exceptions are the north facing windows to the existing houses within the allocation site; nos. 112-116 Woodside Avenue. However, they would retain Vertical Sky Components of at least 24% (the recommended level being 27%); this is a more than acceptable result given this is an allocated site in a reasonably high density part of London, and the houses concerned are dual aspect with their primary living rooms on the opposite south side, unaffected by the proposals.	
	21. The BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations; as in London, the Mayor of London's Housing SPG acknowledges. In particular, the 27% VSC recommended guideline is based on a low density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable. Paragraph 2.3.29 of the GLA Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	restricted in densely developed parts of the city. Therefore, full or near full compliance with the BRE Guide is not to be expected. In this case, the levels of day and sunlight achieved are excellent, exceptional near or full compliance with the Guide recommendations are achieved.	
	A consideration of the effects of wind microclimate or other environmental effects would not be relevant to the design assessment on this low to medium rise development.	
Conservation Officer	There are no conservation- based objections to the proposed scheme.  Its substantial scale and 4 to 6 storey height, although unprecedented on this site and within this heritage context, are largely outweighed by the high design quality of the proposed buildings and related landscape design. The impact of this prominently located development that will sit just outside the southern boundary of Muswell Hill Conservation Area here characterised by 2 to 3 storey buildings will lead to a low level of less than substantial harm to the contributing setting of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area which bears medium significance as well as to the contributing setting of the surrounding locally listed heritage assets along Woodside Avenue and Muswell Hill Road. This low level of harm should be assessed in the light of the need for this development and the public benefits it will deliver according to test set out in paragraph 196 of the NPPF in relation to the contributing setting of the Conservation Area and according to the guidance set out in paragraph 197 of the NPPF in relation to the balanced judgment required for such a low level of harm to the medium/low significance of the locally listed assets. It is felt that the scheme is thoroughly justified and will deliver substantial public benefits that will largely outweigh the modest impact of the new buildings on the setting and significance of the surrounding heritage assets and the prosed scheme is fully supported from conservation grounds.	Comments have been taken into account.
Transportation Officer	Application proposal It is proposed to demolish the existing buildings at the site and provide 41 new residential dwellings within 3 blocks.  The breakdown of residential units is as follows;  • 14 No. 1 bedroom units	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions and other

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
,	19 No. 2 bedroom units	requirements will
	8 No. 3 bedroom units.	be secured.
	5 fully accessible units are included.	
	There will remain a highway access to the site, being relocated to the immediate east of the existing access, off Woodside Road. This will enable service vehicles apart from refuse collection trucks and larger rigid trucks and cars to access the site.	
	4 parking spaces are to be provided, all to blue badge bay dimensions and all will be electric vehicle charging bays.	
	75 long stay cycle parking spaces and 2 visitor spaces will be provided with cycle stores on the lower ground floor of Building A, the ground floor of Building B, and individual stores for the dwelling houses in Block C.	
	Some Highway changes are included that will enable refuse and recycling collections to be made, including the implementation of double yellow lines adjacent to the development access on Woodside Lane.	
	This development proposal has been through pre application processes, and over time has reduced from an aspiration for 65 residential units down to the 41 proposed in this application.	
	Location and access This site is located on the corner of Woodside Avenue and Muswell Hill Road, on the south west corner of the junction. It is opposite Cranley Gardens, and the Parkland Walk formal Right of Way is opposite the site on the eastern side of Muswell Hill Road. Highgate Woods is directly to the south and west side of the site. The Capital Ring passes through Highgate Woods to the south of the site.	
	The site is included within Haringey's Local Plan as Strategic Site SA51, considered for housing for up to 35 units.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	The site has a PTAL value of 3, considered 'moderate' access to public transport services. 4 different bus services are accessible from the site, in between 2 and 6 minutes' walk from it. There are no rail services or stations within the PTAL/WEBCAT walk distance criteria of 12 minutes walk/960 metres, however Highgate Underground station is only just outside this walk distance (16 minutes). During the period in which this development proposal has been progressed, the PTAL value according to WEBCAT has increased from PTAL 2 to PTAL 3.	
	The extract from WEBCAT showing PTAL value is shown below;	



Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	Looking at the output sheets generated by the WEBCAT site it appears that this increase in PTAL value is resultant from slight increases in bus service frequency that are planned by TfL, for the 134, 43, 234 and 102 services.	
	The site is not within any of the Borough's formal CPZ's, the closest formal CPZ is the St. Luke's CPZ just to the north of the site.	
	Access arrangements in detail The application includes provision of a new highway access and additional pedestrian accesses. There will be pedestrian accesses to units in the development from Woodside Avenue, Muswell Hill Road and Cranwood Lane.	
	A new foot access to Highgate Wood is to be provided, with a connection to the eastern side of the site from Woodside Avenue north/south to Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk. This will also enable foot access to the lower ground floor units siding Muswell Hill Road.	
	The new highway access will be located to the immediate east of the existing highway access. A new regime of waiting and loading restrictions will be implemented, including double yellow lines with accompanying 'ticks' to keep the area clear for refuse and recycling collections. Overall, there will be a loss of kerbside parking equal to three cars to accommodate this.	
	A section 278 Agreement or alternate Highways Act Agreement will be required to cover the changes proposed to the highway and the applicant will need to meet all of the Council's costs.	
	It is noted that the site is very well placed for connecting to the Parkland Walk, Highgate Woods and the Capital Ring.	
	Transportation impacts In terms of person trips, with 41 units and very low car parking, there will be no adverse impacts or implications for the public transport or highway networks. As proposed most servicing trips will be able to be accommodated within the site, and the highway changes proposed can facilitate refuse collection vehicles and larger 10m rigids making deliveries or collections.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	As a low parking development only with blue badge parking for the accessible units, it is expected there will be some minor external parking demands arising from the development. Along with the displacement of vehicles owned or used by occupiers of the existing units that are remaining and the loss of on street spaces in Woodside Avenue, there will likely be an uplift in parking stresses in the locality and this is discussed later in this response.	
	Car parking provision and considerations The Draft London Plan details a maximum provision for C3 residential dwellings in sites with PTAL 2/3 to be 0.75 to 1 space per residential unit.	
	The appropriate provision for each site should be guided by the PTAL, likely car ownership, and how the provision of measures that will encourage the uptake of sustainable transport modes, such as high quality cycle parking, car club provision, high quality walking and cycling connections, and a Travel Plan will reduce car ownership and usage at the development.	
	TfL have also now set up their multi-modal segmentation tool designed to categorise Londoners based on the travel choices they make and the motivations behind them. London has been mapped to include 9 different categories within the demographic, all of which have predictable characteristics with respect to their transport and travel choices and habits.	
	The TA has considered the future demographic of the occupiers of this development, and suggests the following categories apply (definitions in italics from TfL's TCOL document);	
	'Affordable Transitions' – people with new jobs and families with low car ownership, with high bus, walking and cycling levels. Highest level of change in travel behaviour	
	Family Challenge' – Low income families. Car ownership and active modes are average with high bus use, with a high level of change	
	The above relate to the social housing occupiers which is the bulk of the development.	
	The remaining dwellings will be for private sale and the likely TCoL classifications are:	

Stakeholder	Comments	Response
(LBH)		
	<ul> <li>'Urban Mobility' - characteristically young working adults without children and reasonable incomes. They have low car use and relatively high cycle mode share. Similarly, their propensity to travel behaviour change is well above average.</li> </ul>	
	The TA concludes that the general tendency of occupiers in this development will be towards the use of active and sustainable transport modes, however there will of course be some residents particularly within the family sized units that may well use a car for their employment or family requirements. The occupiers of the private sale dwellings will be aware of the lack of parking prior to their purchase and it is expected parking demands from these units will be negligible.	
	The provision of 4 spaces equates to effectively 10% provision. Whilst this is a lower provision than the maximum included in the London Plan, there are a number of sustainable transport initiatives included in the development that should collectively contribute to lowering potential car ownership/usage and parking demands.	
	These include the provision of long stay and short stay cycle parking to meet London Plan requirements, provision of a car club facility, and a Travel Plan for the development.	
	It is also noted that despite the moderate access to public transport facilities, there are a number of local services, shops and facilities that are within a reasonable walk distance of the site for life's essentials. There are three schools in the area, and it is a 150m/2 minute walk to a supermarket/food shop, 80m/1 minute to green space, 500m/6 minutes' walk to a pharmacy, and 800m/10 minutes' walk to a GP. Muswell Hill Town Centre is a 5 to 6 minute walk away.	
	The 4 parking spaces included within the development will be laid out for blue badge usage, and will be provided with electric vehicle charging facilities too. The parallel bays will be 2.4m wide x 6.6m long and the two other bays at the southern end of Cranwood Lane are laid out with the correct arrangement that enables manoeuvring space between them for the mobility impaired.	
	These spaces will be able to be allocated to the fully accessible units within the development using a leasing arrangement. Should there not be full take up from the accessible units, it will be possible for occupiers of the family sized units to use them however should additional demands arise from the accessible units this will take priority.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	Provision of 4 blue badge spaces does not fully meet the London Plan requirement of one space per accessible unit, it is short by one unit. This is disappointing; however, it is unlikely that all 5 units will require a car parking space.	
	At present it is detailed that there is 'unofficial/informal' parking taking place within the site, and that there is parking taking place associated with the 6 existing units within the site that are to be retained. The applicant's Transport Assessment details 2011 census figures for car ownership in the locality of this site (0.64 vehicles per household, derived from Lower Layer Super Output Area for this part of the Ward), it is considered robust to assume that 4 cars may be displaced as there will be no parking provision retained for these existing 6 units. In reality this figure may be lower.  There is no CPZ in place in the immediate locality of the site, and given the site's PTAL value of 3, so it is not possible for the development to be formally designated as a car free/permit free development. A parking consultation was undertaken to the north of the site during 2020, overall there was support for formal restrictions/CPZ in this area (the Town Centre) but falling support for	
	Parking Stress survey Parking stress surveys were carried out for the normal overnight period and also the AM and PM periods. The stresses calculated and demands recorded were based on a 5.5m car length, the Lambeth Methodology is based on 5.0m car lengths however to account for driver behaviour and other factors the Council also requested consideration of 6m car lengths as a sensitivity test. It is considered the most appropriate car length to consider is the 5.5m length and that has been used for the stress and capacity calculations.	
	The parking conditions in terms of stresses/levels of parking recorded and available spaces were similar for all periods surveyed, with slightly higher parking stresses recorded during the daytime AM/PM periods, most likely associated with the school drop off and pick up periods.	
	The overnight surveys recorded a Parking Stress of 88%, with 34 spaces out of 294 in the survey area available. This is considered a high parking stress, albeit 34 spaces remained available	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	within the 200m walk distance of the site. The stresses were slightly higher during the AM/PM periods with 31/25 spaces available.	
	Parking Impacts As commented earlier this is a low parking development. The 2011 census recorded average car ownership per household within this part of the Muswell Hill Ward at 0.64 vehicles across all dwelling sizes. This information was recorded just over ten years ago, and there has been a London wide reduction in car ownership since then, with changing attitudes towards the environment and the use of sustainable transport, walking and cycling. Transport Policies of the GLA, TfL and Boroughs all promote the uptake of active and sustainable travel with the accompanying implementation of new walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure London wide.	
	This development, despite the moderate PTAL value, is considered to be well placed for local shops and services, and for local bus services, and other facilities such as green space. There will be a number of sustainable transport initiatives and it is expected that beyond those residents that have an absolute requirement for a vehicle for their trade, profession or livelihood, the additional parking demands created outside of the site will be negligible.	
	Added to the external demands that may be generated from the existing properties at the site, and the loss of 3 spaces on Woodside Avenue, it is considered that there will still be 20 plus parking spaces remaining available within the survey area.	
	Cycle parking 75 long stay cycle parking spaces and 2 visitor spaces will be provided with cycle stores on the lower ground floor of Building A, the ground floor of Building B, and individual stores for the dwelling houses in Block C.	
	This meets the numerical requirements of the London Plan for long and short stay cycle parking spaces. However, the only cycle parking for visitors appears to be adjacent to bock A. whilst the London Plan standards have been met, ideally there would be additional visitor cycle parking closer to the other residential units within the site, and this should be explored and provided if practical.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	The stores are shown indicatively on application drawings, what will be required prior to commencement of any site work will be full dimensional details of the proposed long stay and short stay cycle parking arrangements. This will need to include the systems intending to be used, and dimensioned drawings showing how the installation requirements are met in terms of spacing, headroom and manoeuvring space. These should be provided for review and approved prior to commencement of any construction works for the development. This can be covered by condition.	
	Deliveries and servicing The TA details that there will be around 22 delivery and servicing visits to the development per day. With the internal access (Cranwood Lane) and internal loading bay, it should be possible for all visiting service vehicles to park and dwell within the site, except for larger 10m rigids that deliver white goods/furniture and the like, these will need to park on Woodside Avenue as per refuse/recycling collection vehicles. The number/frequency of these vehicles visiting is not expected to be problematical with respect to temporarily blocking Cranwood Lane.	
	It is noted on the swept path plots submitted within the TA that the manoeuvres being made for a 4.6 tonne van appear to show the van tracking over kerbs and close to the buildings at the turning area. The applicant will need to revisit this to ensure visiting 3.5t and 4.6t vehicles can enter and leave in a forward gear, dwell within the site and manoeuvre safely within the available space. This can be addressed via the Delivery and Servicing Plan condition.	
	With respect to refuse and recycling collections, details have been discussed with the Borough's Waste team and it is understood they are amenable to the proposed arrangements which include kerbside collections from Woodside Avenue or from Cranwood Lane with vehicles reversing in.	
	Emergency services access The TA details that Ambulance access will be complete and that the development will have sprinklers, with dry risers provided at block B and Block A. A fire appliance can access 20m into the site to access dry risers in Block B and the vehicle will reverse out.	
	The emergency services will need to confirm their support of the proposals.	

Sustainable transportation considerations There have been references within this response to the provision of sustainable and active travel components of the development, that will ensure it aligns with current transport policies that encourage modal shifts away from the use of the private car towards active and sustainable modes. These include London Plan compliant, high quality cycle parking, car club provision, and the availability of shops and services and the town centre within reasonable waking distances.  With regards to car club provision, the applicant has provided details of the recommendation from Zipcar for this development, taking into account the potential demands from it and local patronage and provision of hire cars. Their recommendation is for the applicant to fund three year's	
membership for each residential unit but at this moment it is not considered an additional vehicle is required in the locality.  The travel Plan (statement) will be a basic travel plan that will seek to encourage further uptake of sustainable and active modes.  Construction Phase Some brief details of routing and other aspects of the build out of the development have been referenced in the TA. A fully detailed CLP will be required, for submission and approval prior to commencement of the works.	
In order to develop this document, the applicant will need to engage with the Highway Authority and Network Managers at Haringey, to ensure the arrangements for accessing and servicing the build are safe and acceptable to the Highways and Network Managers.	
This application seeks to provide a new residential redevelopment of the existing site to provide 41 new units, predominantly for social housing. It accords with the aspirations for the site as included in Haringey's Local Plan (Strategic Site SA51).	
	membership for each residential unit but at this moment it is not considered an additional vehicle is required in the locality.  The travel Plan (statement) will be a basic travel plan that will seek to encourage further uptake of sustainable and active modes.  Construction Phase Some brief details of routing and other aspects of the build out of the development have been referenced in the TA. A fully detailed CLP will be required, for submission and approval prior to commencement of the works.  In order to develop this document, the applicant will need to engage with the Highway Authority and Network Managers at Haringey, to ensure the arrangements for accessing and servicing the build are safe and acceptable to the Highways and Network Managers.  Conclusion  This application seeks to provide a new residential redevelopment of the existing site to provide 41 new units, predominantly for social housing. It accords with the aspirations for the site as

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	not been met (1 space per accessible unit) however it is expected that the 0.8 spaces per unit provision should meet actual requirements.	
	There will likely be some additional parking demands materialise outside of the site, however these are not expected to be excessive and there will remain some parking capacity on local streets. Considering the demographic of the future occupiers, and the site's accessibility to local shops, services and facilities, and the provision of cycle parking to meet the requirements of the London Plan, a car club facility and travel plan, it is expected that there will be uptake of active and sustainable modes by occupiers.	
	Almost all delivery and service demands will be able to be met within the site, the waste team are amenable to the proposed arrangements, and any larger delivery or service vehicles should be able to park and dwell roadside by the site.	
	Subject to the following conditions and S106 Obligations, Transportation are supportive of the application.	
	<ul> <li>Conditions</li> <li>Cycle parking details</li> <li>Delivery and servicing Plan</li> <li>Construction Logistics Plan</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>S106 Obligations</li> <li>Car club provision</li> <li>S278 Agreement with Highways</li> </ul>	
Climate Change Officer	Carbon Management Response 27/10/2021  In preparing this consultation response, we have reviewed:  • Energy and Sustainability Statement prepared by Etude (dated September 2021, Rev D)  • Embodied Carbon Assessment prepared by Etude (dated September 2021, Rev B)	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions and

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
(2011)	Relevant supporting documents.	other requirements will
	1. Summary The development achieves a reduction of 90% carbon dioxide emissions on site and very high fabric efficiencies, which is supported. Some minor clarifications must be provided with regard to the energy strategy and overheating. Appropriate planning conditions have been recommended to secure the environmental benefits of this scheme.	be secured.
	2. Energy – Overall Policy SP4 of the Local Plan Strategic Policies, requires all new development to be zero carbon (i.e. a 100% improvement beyond Part L (2013)). The London Plan (2021) further confirms this in Policy SI2.	
	The overall predicted reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions for the development shows an improvement of approximately 90% in carbon emissions with SAP10 carbon factors, from the Baseline development model (which is Part L 2013 compliant). This represents an annual saving of approximately 45 tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> from a baseline of 50.2 tCO <sub>2</sub> /year.	
	London Plan Policy SI2 requires major development proposals to calculate and minimise unregulated carbon emissions, not covered by Building Regulations.	
	This application has been modelled in the Planning House Planning Package (PHPP) software to give a more realistic prediction of the operational energy use on site. The scheme has also been designed to Passivhaus standards, which could be achieved in Blocks A2 and A1 (with careful thermal bridge detailing), which is strongly supported. The applicant is encouraged to achieve the accreditation when building out the development.	
	<b>Energy – Lean</b> The applicant has proposed a saving of 14 tCO <sub>2</sub> in carbon emissions (28%; 21% with SAP2012 carbon factors) through improved energy efficiency standards in key elements of the build. This goes far beyond the minimum 10% reduction set in London Plan Policy SI2, so this is strongly supported.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response	
,	The following u-values, g-values and air tigh		
	Floor u-value	0.10 W/m <sup>2</sup> K (exposed GF) 0.14-0.15 W/m <sup>2</sup> K (lower GF)	
	External wall u-value	0.13-0.14 W/m²K	
	Roof u-value	0.10 W/m <sup>2</sup> K (mansard, flat) 0.20 W/m <sup>2</sup> K (terrace)	
	Door u-value	<0.80 W/m <sup>2</sup> K	
	Window area-weighted u-value	<0.80 W/m <sup>2</sup> K	
	G-value	>0.50	
	Air permeability rate	0.6 m <sup>3</sup> /hm <sup>2</sup> @ 50Pa	
	Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (efficiency; Specific Fan Power)	88% efficiency	
	Thermal bridging	Manual calculations for all thermal bridges	
	Thermal mass	Medium	
	Building form	1.90 - 3.13	
	Window proportion	7-30%	
	Space heating requirement	17 kWh/m²/y Block A1 13 kWh/m²/y Block A2 20 kWh/m²/y Block B 19 kWh/m²/y Block C	
	Energy Use Intensity	35 kWh/m²/year	
	Net Zero Operational Carbon?	47% of energy demand can be met on site.	
		ow. n measures. The site is not within reasonable distark rk (DEN). A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plan	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response				
	The applicant has included a con A1, A2 and B. Individual heat pur Block C. It will result in a 19.6 to measures.	mps with hot water stora	age tanks will provide heatii	ng/hot water to		
	The communal air-to-water ASHI heating to the dwellings in Blocks will be supplied at c. 55°C flow/ 3 unit. The bank of ASHPs will be I thermal envelope to minimise he	The hot water at interface				
	Energy – Green As part of the Be Green carbon r reduction of 20% from on-site rer					
		Solar photovoltaic (PV) panels deliver the Be Green requirement. A total of 11.4 tCO <sub>2</sub> (23%) reduction of emissions are proposed under Be Green measures.				
	The solar array peak output would be 67 kWp, which is estimated to produce around 17 kWh/m²/year of renewable electricity per year. The concertina flat layout and pitched roof arrays of 186x 360W panels would be mounted at a 10° angle, facing east and west. The solar array on Block C results on 121% of energy demand being met on site annually.					
	3. Carbon Offset Contribut A carbon shortfall of 5.3 tCO <sub>2</sub> /yea at £95/tCO <sub>2</sub> over 30 years.	eed to be offset				
	Residential					
	(SAP10 emission factors)	tCO <sub>2</sub>	%			
	Baseline emissions	50.2				
	Be Lean savings	14	28%			
	Be Clean savings	19.6	39%			

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments				Response
	Be Green savings	11.4	23%		
	Cumulative savings	45	90%		
	Carbon shortfall to offset (tCO <sub>2</sub> )	5.3			
	Carbon offset contribution (+ 10% management fee)	£95 x 30 year £16,615.50	s x 5.3 tCO <sub>2</sub> /year x 10% =		
	4. Overheating London Plan Policy SI4 requires developments to minimise adverse impacts on the urban heat island, reduce the potential for overheating and reduce reliance on air conditioning systems. Through careful design, layout, orientation, materials and incorporation of green infrastructure, designs must reduce overheating in line with the Cooling Hierarchy.  In accordance with the Energy Assessment Guidance, the applicant has undertaken a dynamic thermal modelling assessment in line with CIBSE TM59 with TM49 weather files, and the cooling hierarchy has been followed in the design. Results are listed in the table below.  All rooms pass the overheating requirements for 2020s DSY1. In order to pass this, the following measures will be delivered built based on:  Natural ventilation, with openable areas of 82% (incl) frame during day; 20% bedrooms on balcony rooves; 6% on night latch  Glazing g-value of 0.50  MVHR with summer bypass (0.55ach)  Pipework heat losses of 27W within flats, 16W through HIU casing  No active cooling  Additional design scenarios:  1. + brise soleil to southern façade (included in design)  2. + internal blinds (included in design)				

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments		Response
		% of habitable rooms pass TM59 (based on baseline + Brise soleil	
		and internal blinds)	
	DSY1 2020s	56/56	
	DSY2 2020s	24/56 (100% pass 1.5kW cooling coil)	
	DSY3 2020s	27/56 (100% pass 1.5kW cooling coil)	
	DSY1 2050s	56/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	DSY2 2050s	56/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	DSY3 2050s	48/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	DSY1 2080s	51/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	DSY2 2080s	45/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	DSY3 2080s	42/56 with 1.5kW cooling coil	
	Total number of	spaces modelled 56 habitable rooms	
	Overheating Action - Confirm w residents).	ho will own the overheating risk when the building is occupied (not the	
	sustainable desig sets out the propo health and wellbe	ustainability ne Development Management Document requires developments to demonstrate n, layout and construction techniques. The Sustainability section in the report osed measures to improve the sustainability of the scheme, including transport, ring, materials and waste, water consumption, flood risk and drainage, atteresilience, energy and CO2 emissions and landscape design.	
	•	<b>Biodiversity</b> achieves an Urban Greening Factor of 0.45, which complies with the interim f 0.4 for residential developments in London Plan Policy G5.	
	6. Whole Lif	e Carbon	
		es developments referable to the Mayor of London to submit a Whole Life Carbo demonstrate actions undertaken to reduce life-cycle emissions. The applicant	n

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response			
	hads submitted an Em commitment to reducir  The total calculated er				
		Estimated whole-life carbon emissions Blocks A-B	Estimated whole-life carbon emissions Block C	Meets benchmark (RIBA 2030 and LETI benchmark)	
	Modules A1-A5 Highest embodied carbon	564 kgCO <sub>2</sub> e/m <sup>2</sup> Services 32%	753 kgCO <sub>2</sub> e/m <sup>2</sup> Services 24%	No -500 kg/CO <sub>2</sub> /m <sup>2</sup> N/A	
	A number of areas werdesign process: simplistable thicknesses; redufacades and landscaping.  7. Conclusion Overall, it is considere sustainability point of vertices.	for			
		nitment to uploading energy contribution (and associated		6,615.50 (indicative), incl.	а
	Planning Conditions				
		by approved shall be cons nt by Etude (dated Septem			

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	improvement on carbon emissions over 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with SAP10 emission factors, very high fabric efficiencies (min. 28% reduction), air source heat pumps (ASHPs) and minimum 67kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) energy generation.	
	The development must be built in accordance with the approved overheating measures, and maintained for the lifetime of the development:  - Openable windows by 90 degrees;  - External horizontal shading above southern window openings;  - Fixed internal blinds with reflective backing;  - Window g-values of 0.50 or better;  - MVHR with summer bypass  - Hot water pipes insulated to high standards.	
	<ul> <li>No active cooling</li> <li>(a) Prior to above ground construction, details of the proposed energy strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must include: <ul> <li>Location, specification and efficiency of the proposed ASHPs (Coefficient of Performance, Seasonal Coefficient of Performance, and the Seasonal Performance Factor), with plans showing the ASHP pipework and noise and visual mitigation measures;</li> <li>Specification and efficiency of the proposed Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (MVHR), with plans showing the rigid MVHR ducting and location of the unit;</li> <li>Details of the PV including: a roof plan; the number, angle, orientation, type, and efficiency level of the PVs; how overheating of the panels will be minimised; their peak output (kWp) and the final carbon reduction at the Be Green stage of the energy hierarchy;</li> <li>Details of internal blinds to all habitable rooms: fixing mechanism, specification of the blinds, shading coefficient, etc;</li> <li>Air tightness delivery strategy;</li> <li>A metering strategy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved prior to first operation and shall be maintained and retained for the lifetime of the development.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	(b) Within six months of first occupation, evidence that the solar PV and ASHPs installations have been installed correctly and that an air tightness of circa 0.6 m³/hm² @ 50Pa has been achieved hall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include photographs of the solar array, a six-month energy generation statement, air tightness tests, and a Microgeneration Certification Scheme certificate.	
	(c) Within six months of first occupation, evidence shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that the development has been registered on the GLA's Be Seen energy monitoring platform.	
	(d) Within one year of first occupation, evidence shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how the development has performed against the approved Energy Strategy and to demonstrate how occupants have been taken through training on how to use their homes and the technology correctly and in the most energy efficient way and that issues have been dealt with. This should include energy use data for the first year and a brief statement of occupant involvement to evidence this training and engagement.	
	Reason: To ensure the development reduces its impact on climate change by reducing carbon emissions on site in compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, and in line with London Plan (2021) Policy SI2, and Local Plan Policy SP4 and DM22.	
	Biodiversity  (a) Prior to the commencement of development, details of ecological enhancement measures and ecological protection measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. This shall detail the biodiversity net gain, plans showing the proposed location of ecological enhancement measures, a sensitive lighting scheme, justification for the location and type of enhancement measures by a qualified ecologist, and how the development will support and protect local wildlife and natural habitats.	
	(b) Prior to the occupation of development, photographic evidence and a post-development ecological field survey and impact assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate the delivery of the ecological enhancement and protection	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	measures is in accordance with the approved measures and in accordance with CIEEM standards.	
	Development shall accord with the details as approved and retained for the lifetime of the development.	
	Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and the mitigation and adaptation of climate change. In accordance with Policies G1, G5, G6, SI1 and SI2 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP4, SP5, SP11 and SP13 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017).	
Nature Conservation Officer	Our ref: HGY/2021/2727 Location: Cranwood, Woodside Avenue N10 3JA Proposal: Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to provide 41 new homes Nature Conservation Response 11/01/2022	Comments have been taken into account. Appriopriate conditions will be
	Documents	secured.
	A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for the Proposed Development (Cranwood Ecology PEA Oct 2021.pdf), comprising a desk study search for baseline information on designated sites, habitats and protected species, and a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) (Cranwood Bat Survey Sept 2019.pdf) within the Site has been prepared to current good practice guidance covering relevant legislation and policy.	
	Other considerations  Demolition of building – mitigation measures to minimise this impact  Construction - A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be produced.  Building height – Commuting and foraging bats  Protected species - (Foraging/Commuting High) Vegetation clearance and changes to the lighting regime have potential to impact this species group.  Other BAP species: Hedgehog (moderate) Shrub vegetation on site and in the adjacent Highgate Woods Mitigation measures to minimise this impact.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	Birds - (High) The tree and shrub vegetation on site have potential to support nesting birds.  Mitigation measures to minimise this impact  Trees – Value habitat for nesting birds  Lighting - Lighting: a sensitive lighting strategy. Mitigation measures to minimise this impact  Landscaping – mitigation measures to minimise this impact	
	<ul> <li>Conclusion</li> <li>It is recognised that the Proposed Development may negatively affect the nature conservation value through construction, vegetation clearance.</li> <li>To establish as to whether the application has provided sufficient evidence to mitigate the proposed building height against the potential negative effects of ecological corridors.</li> <li>Details of the appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions should be produced within the Construction Ecological Management Plan. Incorporating the mitigation and enhancements options from Bat survey report.</li> <li>To ensure the safeguarding of the proposed net gain. Include the creation of a Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan.</li> </ul>	
Tree Officer	To facilitate this new development, it is proposed to remove 20 individual trees and 3 groups of small trees and shrubs. These are a mixture of species and age classes. Some have been formally planted and some are self-seeded. The reasons for their removal is that the existing building footprint is to be expanded, there are also significant level changes planned within the site. In addition to the relocation of the existing access road and new access path to the Parkland Walk.  The trees have been categorized In accordance with BS 5837, 8 of the trees specified for removal are 'B' trees and 14 are 'C' trees. There are no trees of high quality and value proposed for	Comments have been taken into account. Appropriate conditions will be secured.
	removal as part of this scheme.  To mitigate for the loss of the trees above, the new landscape plan proposes the planting of 47 new trees, 30 of which are native species. These include 4 semi-mature specimens (Oak and Lime), 12 advanced heavy standards (Hornbeam, Rowan and Wild Service tree), 22 heavy standards (Birch, Cherry, Hazel and Rowan) and 9 multi-stemmed trees.	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	The new trees will help mitigate the loss of existing canopy cover, increase biodiversity, improve the local environment and enhance the quality of life for existing and future residents. To help to increase local canopy cover further as part of this scheme, I would recommend the planting of additional new trees within the public highway in the adjacent roads (Woodside Avenue, Muswell Hill Road and Cranley Gardens).  The area where it is proposed to plant G1 below is on a slope down to the entrance to Parkland	
	Walk. They appear to be individual tree pits. Can you please seek confirmation if there was any consideration for these trees to be planted in an open strip of soil with underplanting of small perennials. This could then act like a rain garden. I am aware that there has been issues with flooding in and around the subway previously. This could also apply to the area proposed to plant G2 below.	
	There must be a future maintenance plan for this site to include a 5 year irrigation programme for all the new trees.	
Building Control Officer	This department has no objection to this application.	Comments noted.
Pollution	Having considered all the relevant supportive information especially the Design and Access Statement with reference 3649 Revision E dated September 2021, Asbestos Demolition Survey with reference J050727 dated 1st September 2014, Energy & Sustainability Statement Revision D dated September 2021, Air Quality Assessment with reference 66201917-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-J-0001 prepared by MLM Consulting Engineers Limited dated 3rd June 2021 taken note of sections 11 (Operational Phase Modelled Results), 12 (Air Quality Neutral Assessment), 13 (Mitigation) and 14 (Conclusions) as well as the Ground Investigation Report Revision 01 with reference STS5215 – G01 prepared by Soiltechnics Ltd dated May 2021 taken note of sections 1 (Chemical & Gaseous Contamination), 3.3.2 (Asbestos Survey), 3.10.2 (Detailed UXO Risk Assessment), 8 (Chemical Contamination), 8.9 (Further Investigation & Remedial Action), 8.10 (Risk Assessment Summary &	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions will be secured.

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	Recommendation) and 9 (Gaseous Contamination), please be advise that we have no objection to the proposed development in respect to air quality and land contamination but the following planning conditions and informative are recommend should planning permission be granted.	
	Contrary to the applicant submission in section 8.9 (Further Investigation & Remedial Action), a minimum of 600mm capping will be require for the private garden (front and back) and 450mm for communal garden rather than the proposed 600mm in potentially productive, private residential gardens and 300mm within front gardens/areas of soft landscaping as proposed in the report.	
	1. Land Contamination	
	Before development commences other than for investigative work: a. Using the information already submitted on the Ground Investigation Report Revision 01 with reference STS5215 – G01 prepared by Soiltechnics Ltd dated May 2021, additional intrusive site investigation shall be conducted where applicable using the information already obtained from the above Ground Investigation Report. The site 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 any additional remediation requirements where necessary. b. The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority which shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site. c. Where remediation of contamination on the site is required, completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and; d. 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.	
	Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.	
	2. Unexpected Contamination	
	If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
(==::)	be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.	
	Reasons: To ensure that the development is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	
	3. NRMM	
	a. 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 IIIB 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. b. 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 emission limits for all equipment. This documentation should be made available to local authority officers as required until development completion.	
	Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ	
	4. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans	
	a. Demolition works shall not commence within the development until a Demolition Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority whilst b. Development shall not commence (other than demolition) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The following applies to both Parts a and b above: a) The DEMP/CEMP shall include a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and Air Quality and Dust Management Plan	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	(AQDMP). b) The DEMP/CEMP shall provide details of how demolition/construction works are to be undertaken respectively and shall include: i. A construction method statement which identifies the stages and details how works will be undertaken; ii. Details of working hours, which unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority shall be limited to 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays; iii. Details of plant and machinery to be used during demolition/construction works; iv. Details of an Unexploded Ordnance Survey; v. Details of the waste management strategy; vi. Details of community engagement arrangements; vii. Details of any acoustic hoarding; viii. A temporary drainage strategy and performance specification to control surface water runoff and Pollution Prevention Plan (in accordance with Environment Agency guidance); ix. Details of external lighting; and, x. Details of any other standard environmental management and control measures to be implemented. 3 c) The CLP will be in accordance with Transport for London's Construction Logistics Plan Guidance (July 2017) and shall provide details on: i. Monitoring and joint working arrangements, where appropriate; ii. Site access and car parking arrangements; iii. Delivery booking systems; iv. Agreed routes to/from the Plot; v. Timing of deliveries to and removals from the Plot (to avoid peak times, as agreed with Highways Authority, 07.00 to 9.00 and 16.00 to 18.00, where possible); and vi. Travel plans for staff/personnel involved in demolition/construction works to detail the measures to encourage sustainable travel to the Plot during the demolition/construction phase; and vii. Joint arrangements with neighbouring developers for staff parking, Lorry Parking and consolidation of facilities such as concrete batching. d) The AQDMP will be in accordance with the Greater London Authority SPG Dust and Emissions Control (2014) and shall include: i. Mitigation measures to manage and minimise demolition/construction dust emissions during wor	

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
(LDII)	Reason: To safeguard residential amenity, reduce congestion and mitigate obstruction to the flow of traffic, protect air quality and the amenity of the locality."  Informative:  1. Prior to demolition or any construction work of the existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. With the asbestos survey done, 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.  2. Prior to demolition or any construction work of the existing buildings, detailed UXO Risk Assessment will need to be undertaken by the applicant.  3. Comment from Thames Water will also need to be sought by the applicant in relation to the installation of barrier pipes before any such installation.  I hope the above clarify our position on the application? Otherwise, feel free to revert back to us should you have any further query in respect of the application quoting M3 reference number WK/514654.	
Waste Management	The refuse strategy supporting this application is clear, has referenced council guidance and acknowledged pre app advice. The size of the refuse store for buildings A is suitable with the right bin type, number and capacity for each waste stream to provide for residents within these buildings. Collections can be made from Woodside Avenue within accepted drag distances and the addition of a drop kerb needed here is factored in.  Collections from refuse store B are more problematic. While again the bin store size and the type, number and split of bins is suitable the potential drag distances are excessive (food waste bin could potentially be reduced from a 360l to a 240l wheeled bin here). In addition, reversing to the refuse store so drag distances are reduced to within 10m is equally something that we try to design out with preference being for vehicles to enter pre and leave post collection in a forward gear. That said, there is a precedent here due to the collecting of bins from existing properties. As such the collection of bins from both refuse store B and the individual bins from the properties comprising building C can be agreed. Confirmation would be needed however that any	Comments have been taken into account. Bin collections are similar to existing arrangements. Works to the highway are to be confirmed. Collection methodologies will be secured by condition.

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	amendments being made to the carriageway would not impact negatively on collection vehicle access. The dimensions of the vehicle that collects from small blocks/estates/high rise is attached.  I would also advise that both refuse stores A and B are secured with access given to residents only by preferably fob/digilock. This will help to reduce issues such as misuse of bins, fly tipping/other ASB. I am sure this has been considered and will be factored into the build.	
Lead Local Flood Authority	Initial Comments:  Having reviewed the "Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy" reference number Cranwood \ 1223-02 dated 6th April 20201 submitted by "Civic Engineer", we have the following comment to make:  1. The total site area is said to be 0.33ha in this report but it was stated 0.39ha in the application form. Can you please ask the applicant to clarify.  2. The number of dwellings is quoted as 41in this report where the correspondence with Thames Water (Ref DS6081544) is said to be 42 dwellings. Can you please ask the applicant to clarify the correct number and amend the repot accordingly.  4. We noted that the calculations have been provided using FSR rainfall method. Can we please request you to utilises more up to date FEH rainfall datasheets. Use of FSR datasets would only ordinarily be permitted for instances where the critical volumetric storm is less than 60minutes in duration. Section 4.3.2. of the SUDS Manual (CIRIA C697) refers to Development Runoff. Within this Section, it is acknowledged that additional datasets have been added to Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) and rainfall depths obtained using FEH show significant differences from those obtained from Flood Studies Report (FSR) in some parts of the country. Within Haringey, the rainfall depths are often greater using more up to date FEH datasets than those using FSR, therefore for various storm events, greater run-off is produced, and additional attenuation is likely to be required. FEH rainfall data is more up to date than FSR (England and Wales) therefore calculations should use this FEH data to determine the volume of surface water attenuation required on site.	Comments have been taken into account.

Stakeholder (LBH)	Comments	Response
	In view of above, please request the applicant to address our above comments and resubmit their "Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy" for our review.	
	Additional Comments:	
	Having reviewed the re-submitted "Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy" reference number Cranwood \ 1223-02 dated 18th January 2022 submitted by "Civic Engineers", we are content that if the scheme is to built and maintain as per the details provided within the document above, we have no further comments to make.	

Stakeholder (External)		Response
Transport for London	TfL Spatial Planning Reference: HRGY/21/60  Borough Reference: HGY/2021/2727  Location: Cranwood 100 Woodside Avenue  Proposal: Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to provide 41 new homes (Use Class C3) within 3 buildings ranging from 3 to 6 storeys in height, with associated vehicular access from Woodside Avenue, wheelchair parking, landscaping, refuse/recycling and cycle storage facilities. New stepped access to Parkland Walk	Comments have been taken into account. Appropriate conditions will be secured.
	from Woodside Avenue.  Many thanks for consulting TfL on the above application. TfL offer the following comments:	

The site is located on Woodside Avenue and has frontage onto the B550 Muswell Hill Road, both borough roads. The site has a public transport access level (PTAL) of 2, on a scale of 1-6b where 6b is considered excellent. Two bus routes are accessible within 100m of the site.

The application is supported by a full Healthy Streets Transport Assessment (TA) in accordance with TfL guidance, which is welcomed. The routes identified in the Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment are acceptable. TfL would strongly support the Council securing financial contributions from this application and/or using borough CIL to fund identified improvements on borough roads.

# Cycle parking

75 long stay and 3 short stay cycle parking spaces are proposed in line with London Plan policy T5 (Cycling) minimum standards. Whilst this is welcomed, from the drawings submitted TfL is concerned that the cycle parking proposed does not comply with TfL's London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) guidance. As set out in section 8.2.1 of the LCDS, where cycle parking is inside a building, it should have step-free access, wide doorways and spacious corridors. Accessing the parking area should involve passing through no more than two sets of doors, with a recommended minimum external door width of 2 metres.

Similarly, whilst the commitment to provide 5% larger/adapted cycle spaces is welcomed the submitted plans show all remaining cycle parking will be provided as two-tier racks. In line with LCDS section 8.2.6 (Two-tier stands), two tier stands are not suitable for all types of users and should therefore be provided in conjunction with other types of stand. In addition, for the two tier racks a minimum aisle width of 2500mm beyond the lowered should be provided to allow cycles to be turned and loaded. TfL is concerned that the current size of the cycle stores will not allow for the London Plan required amount of cycle parking to be provided in line with LCDS requirements. TfL therefore requests the applicant provides labelled scale drawings of the cycle store to demonstrate LCDS compliance. TfL requests this is provided and resolved prior to the application being determined by the Council.

Car parking

The site is car free except for four disabled parking bays, which is welcomed in line with London Plan policy T6 (Car parking). TfL supports car club membership being provided for all new residents within the borough rather than providing general parking. All residents should be excluded from being eligible from apply for local on street controlled parking zones and TfL would support either a new CPZ be introduced in the area or if the existing St Luke's CPZ is extended to the streets surrounding the development.

TfL requests all disabled parking proposed is provided with active electrical vehicle charging point provision from the outset. This should be secured via condition.

#### Buses

Table 13 of the Healthy Streets TA (attached) estimates 59 total daily trips by bus. However, the mode share for Underground trips is 25%, despite Highgate station being over a 15-minute walk from the site. TfL is therefore concerned that bus trips are underestimated, and Underground journeys may include bus journeys to Highgate station. The Healthy Streets TA has not factored in any linked trips.

If all Underground trips were allocated to the bus network, there would be an additional 10 outbound trips in the AM peak hour and 4 trips arriving in the PM peak hour. Despite this underestimation, TfL is satisfied that this development will not generate enough demand to warrant seeking funding for capacity enhancements on the 43 or 134, and therefore complies with London Plan policies T3 (Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding) and T4 (Assessing and mitigating transport impacts).

### Servicing

A framework Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) is included within the Healthy Streets TA. 22 daily servicing trips are anticipated with a loading bay and turning facility proposed on the internal access road ensuring vehicles can access and egress onto the Woodside Avenue, which is welcomed in principle. Despite this, TfL is concerned that the location of the turning facility does not allow enough space for residents of block C to access their building. TfL requests the applicant clarifies this and demonstrates adequate space has been provided for pedestrians in these blocks.

	A full DSP should be secured via condition.  Construction	
	The site has frontage onto Muswell Hill Road, where 2 bus routes run. TfL requests the applicant's construction methodology is provided prior to the application being determined by the council. The construction logistics for the site should avoid impacting on these routes. If bus routes have to diverted at any point during construction, there may be a service charge.	
	A full Construction Logistics Plan should be secured via condition and discharged in consultation with TfL prior to construction commencing.	
	Overall, TfL requests the above is clarified prior to supporting this application.	
Thames Water	Waste Comments  The proposed development is located within 15 metres of a strategic sewer. Thames Water requests the following condition to be added to any planning permission. "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 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 significantly impact / cause failure of local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email:	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions and informatives will be secured.

developer.services@thameswater.co.uk Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Management of surface water from new developments should follow Policy SI 13 Sustainable drainage of the London Plan 2021. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

#### Water Comments

The proposed development is located within 15m of a strategic water main. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. 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 will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water 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 water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk

The proposed development is located within 5m of a strategic water main. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 5m, of strategic water mains. Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works. Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground strategic water main, utility infrastructure. The works has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-largesite/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk.

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Thames Water recommends 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. If you are planning on using mains water for construction purposes, it's important you let Thames Water know before you start using it, to avoid potential fines for improper usage. More information and how to apply can be found online at thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater. There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-yourdevelopment/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes **Supplementary Comments** This site is affected by wayleaves and easements within the boundary of or close to your site. Thames Water will seek assurances that these will not be affected by the proposed development. The applicant should undertake appropriate searches to confirm this. To discuss the proposed development in more detail, the applicant should contact Developer Services - https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers HSE is the statutory consultee for planning applications that involve or may involve a **Health and Safety** Comments have relevant building. **Executive** been taken into account. Relevant building is defined as: · contains two or more dwellings or educational accommodation and • meets the height condition of 18m or more in height, or 7 or more storeys "Dwellings" includes flats, and "educational accommodation" means residential accommodation for the use of students boarding at a boarding school or in later stages of education (for definitions see article 9A(9) of the Town and Country Planning

London Fire Brigade	Development Management (England) Procedure Order 2015 as amended by article 4 of the 2021 Order  However, from the information you have provided for this planning application it does not appear to fall under the remit of planning gateway one because the tallest building in the development is 16.75m (6 storeys).  Please also note for future reference a fire statement should be provided by the developer as part of their planning application for relevant buildings. Further guidance on Fire safety and high-rise residential buildings (from 1 August 2021) is available here. Please do not reply directly to the sender of this email but use the mailbox planninggatewayone@hse.gov.uk and our reference number (pgo-0604); this will ensure your query is promptly dealt with.  Once again thank you for your email, if you require further advice, please do not hesitate to contact the planning gateway one team.  Initial comments:  The Commissioner is satisfied with the proposals for fire fighting access. Subject to confirmation that block C has adequate turning facilities  Additional comments:  The fire fighting access would be considered acceptable	Comments have been taken into account.
Historic England (GLAAS)	Recommend Archaeological Condition(s)  Thank you for your consultation received on 23 September 2021.  The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) provides archaeological advice to boroughs in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and GLAAS Charter.	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended condition will be secured.

NPPF section 16 and the London Plan (2021 Policy HC1) make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration. NPPF paragraph 194 says applicants should provide an archaeological assessment if their development could affect a heritage asset of archaeological interest.

The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest.

If you grant planning consent, paragraph 205 of the NPPF says that applicants should record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms. Applicants should also improve knowledge of assets and make this public

I am grateful for the archaeological desk-based assessment submitted by the applicants prepared by Wessex Archaeology.

The application site lies immediately adjacent to the Tier 1 Archaeological Priority Area in the borough defined by current knowledge of the extent of the late iron age and early Roman kilns part excavated in the north of Highgate Wood fifty years ago and also by the undated, possibly prehistoric earthworks close by them. This location, at the watershed between the Lea and Brent valleys, appears to have attracted past human activity over a long period.

The north of the application has likely had its archaeological potential recued by the cutting of the former Alexandra Park railway branch line, now infilled. This impact does not extend into the south of the site however and buried archaeological remains comprising deeply cut features lower than the surface of the natural clay geology, such as pits and ditches, may be expected here.

I have looked at this proposal and at the Greater London Historic Environment Record. I advise that the development could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is needed to determine appropriate mitigation. However, although the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination, in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that I consider a two stage archaeological condition could provide an acceptable safeguard. This would

comprise firstly, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation.

NPPF paragraphs 190 and 197 and London Plan Policy HC1 emphasise the positive contributions heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and places. Where appropriate, applicants should therefore also expect to identify enhancement opportunities.

I therefore recommend attaching a condition as follows:

No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

- A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.
- C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set

out in the stage 2 WSI.

Informative:

Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological interest on this site. Approval of the WSI before works begin on site provides clarity on what investigations are required, and their timing in relation to the development programme. If the applicant does not agree to this precommencement condition please let us know their reasons and any alternatives suggested. Without this pre-commencement condition being imposed the application should be refused as it would not comply with NPPF paragraph 205.

I envisage that the archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

#### **Evaluation**

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

# Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer

We have met with the project Architects to discuss Crime Prevention and Secured by Design at both feasibility and pre-application stage and have discussed our concerns and recommendations around the design and layout of the development. The Architects have made mention in the Design and Access Statement referencing design out crime or crime prevention and have stated that they will be working in close collaboration with DOCOs to ensure that the development is designed to reduce crime at detailed design stage. At this point it can be difficult to design out fully any issues identified. At best crime can only be mitigated against, as it does not fully reduce the opportunity of offences.

Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions and informatives will be secured.

Whilst in principle we have no objections to the site, we have recommended the attaching of suitably worded conditions and an informative. The comments made can be easily be mitigated early if the Architects/Developers ensure the ongoing dialogue with our department continues throughout the design and build process. This can be achieved by the below Secured by Design conditions being applied (Section 2). If the Conditions are applied, we request the completion of the relevant SBD application forms at the earliest opportunity.

The project has the potential to achieve a Secured by Design Accreditation if advice given is adhered to.

## <u>Section 2 - Secured by Design Conditions and Informative:</u>

In light of the information provided, we request the following Conditions and Informative:

# **Conditions:**

Prior to the commencement of above ground works of each building or part of a building, details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve 'Secured by Design' Accreditation. Accreditation must be achievable according to current and relevant Secured by Design guide lines at the time of above grade works of each building or phase of said development.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

	1	
	Prior to the first occupation of each building, or part of a building or its use, <b>'Secured by Design'</b> certification shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or its use and thereafter all features are to be retained.	
	Informative:	
	The applicant must seek the continual advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) to achieve accreditation. The services of MPS DOCOs are available <b>Free of Charge</b> and can be contacted via docomailbox.ne@met.police.uk or 0208 217 3813	
City of London	<ul> <li>The City of London Corporation has no comments to make on the principle of development, land use, scale or matters of design. However, as raised previously, the site abuts the northern boundary of Highgate Wood and the City of London Corporation would seek to ensure that the effects of construction and operation of the development would have no material impact on the existing ecology or environmental quality of the Wood itself. There are a number of issues that arise as a result:</li> <li>Boundary Treatment- as previously stated, the City's preference would be for the southern boundary of the development to have limited environmental impact; with the preference being for a close-boarded fence or similar, with minimal footings required to ensure that any impact on existing flora or root systems is minimised. A suitably worded condition requiring approval of the details of boundary treatment at the southern edge of the site could address this concern and we would request that the City Corporation are consulted when an application is made to determine this condition.</li> </ul>	Comments have been taken into account. The recommended conditions and informatives will be secured.
	<ul> <li>External illumination – the preservation of the habitat of existing bat colonies in Highgate Wood is a key concern to the City Corporation. The scheme will likely alter the levels of illumination on the northern edge of the Wood; however, to limit the effects of this on the existing bat population, the City Corporation would request that a Condition is added which prevents the siting or use of externally</li> </ul>	

mounted illumination on buildings or within gardens of the two dwellings proposed in the southwest corner of the site.

- Construction Management The City of London Corporation has not had sight of
  the Construction Management Plan and this would be expected to be required
  through S.106 or Condition. The City Corporation would request that provisions
  are made explicit within the wording of a condition to ensure that the City
  Corporation Ecologist is consulted during the preparation of the CMP and
  measures are put in place which states how the contractor will ensure that there
  will be no adverse impact on the ecology or environment of Highgate Wood during
  the construction phase.
- Ongoing Maintenance there are a number of large trees in Highgate Wood in close proximity to the south western boundary of the development site. Statutory protections are in place for these trees by virtue of the Highgate and Kilburn Open Spaces Act of 1886 and we would suggest that any informative is placed on any decision if granted which advises the developer to ensure that future residents are mindful of this legislation and engage with the City of London Corporation before undertaking any works to trees located in the Wood, the branches of which may oversail their property.

# Appendix 4 - Summary of Representations

LOCAL	Summary of objection	Response
REPRESENTATIONS:	Material planning considerations	
244 INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES 229 IN OBJECTION	Overdevelopment of the site	The site has been identified for new residential development as part of Site Allocation SA51 and is currently underutilised. The development would be only marginally greater in height than other
15 IN SUPPORT		buildings in the area and proposed residential amenity is of a very good quality. There are no significant negative impacts from the proposal. As such, the development would not constitute overdevelopment of the site.
	Underdevelopment of the site allocation	It has not been possible to incorporate the whole of the Site Allocation SA51 area into the development land parcel. An indicative masterplan has been provided with the application that demonstrates the site allocation objectives can still be achieved through the proposed development and through the potential redevelopment of the remaining land in the future.
	Excessive size, scale and massing	The development would not be significantly greater in height than other properties nearby and would optimise the development of the application land parcel as required by London Plan Policy D3.

	As per comments above, the height is not
Excessive height	significantly greater than other properties in the vicinity.
Exocosive neight	violinty.
Inappropriate design	The contemporary design is a response to the site circumstances including topography and the proposed housing tenure and mix, as well as the high level of sustainability. Local character and materiality has been integrated into the design. The design is supported by the Quality Review Panel and the Council's Design Officer and has been thoroughly assessed and rationalised through the pre-application process.
Out of keeping with local character	Local character and materiality has been taken into account and features integrated into the development design. The design is supported by the Quality Review Panel and the Council's Design Officer and has been thoroughly assessed and rationalised through the pre-application process.
Negative impact on nearby conservation area	The Conservation Officer supports the development and has stated that there would be only a low level of less than substantial harm to the conservation area, which is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme overall in this instance.
a Ingresonal averahadovina	There are no public amenity spaces or residential garden areas within 20 metres to the north, east
Increased overshadowing	<u> </u>

Increased overlooking     Loss of privacy	or west of the development. Therefore, no overshadowing of such spaces would occur.  Separation distances to neighbouring properties are at least 20 metres to the north and east and 15 metres to the south. The nearest proposed
	units on the southern side of the development face east-west and thus direct overlooking would be minimised towards the south. These distances and the orientation of the building prevents an excessive degree of overlooking.
Overlooking to school	Overlooking towards the school has been designed out through increased windows cill heights and solid boundary treatments on the western side of Block B and the provision of integrated kitchen worktops and other furniture which means occupiers of those units cannot stand immediately adjacent to their windows on the western side of their properties.
Excessive noise	The proposed residential development, given the urban nature of the locale and its siting adjacent to a main road, would not increase noise levels significantly enough to result in disturbance to existing properties in the area.
Excessive pollution	The site is not anticipated to generate a significant number of vehicle movements on local

		roads. As such, any pollution from the development would be minimal.
•	Lack of parking	The site provides parking for disabled occupiers and any additional parking demand could be readily accommodated on surrounding streets.
•	Lack of infrastructure for electric vehicles	All new parking spaces would cater for electric vehicles.
•	Increased traffic congestion Loss of highway safety	The site is not anticipated to generate a significant number of vehicle movements on local roads. The installation of double yellow lines would make the new vehicle access safer than the existing by improving sightlines.
•	Increased flooding Lack of drainage	The site is not in a flood risk zone and surface water run-off would be filtered and attenuated through the installation of a series of sustainable urban drainage systems.
•	Loss of trees and negative impact on retained trees	Many more trees would be planted than removed. None of the trees on site are formally protected. Retained trees would be protected during construction.
•	Lack of urban greening	The proposed provision of urban greening exceeds the level required by London Plan Policy G5.
•	Lack of appropriate play equipment	

Lack of access to nearby woodland	The proposed provision of play areas and equipment meets the requirements of London Plan Policy S4. This will be secured by condition.
<ul> <li>Negative impact on adjacent woodland and green chain link</li> </ul>	The adjacent wood has a dedicated access onto Muswell Hill Road. Connectivity between this access and the surrounding streets would be improved through the provision of steps to Parkland Walk from Woodside Avenue and other improvements including the provision of a new handrail to the existing ramp.
Negative impact on biodiversity and ecology	The only Block C – two houses - would back onto Highgate Wood. Blocks A and B would be well separated from it. The City of London own and manage Highgate Wood and have raised no objections to the proposed development subject to conditions.
<ul> <li>Increased number of pedestrians</li> </ul>	The development would provide a net gain in biodiversity and would ensure that ecology is protected and improved through a range of measures. Council's Nature Conservation Officer has raised no objections to this, subject to conditions.
Increased demand for local services	A greater number of pedestrians in the local area would increase natural surveillance and help to support local businesses and is not anticipated to create any significant negative impacts.

Negative impacts from construction works     Resident comments have not been fully considered	Local services including schools and medical facilities are anticipated to be sufficient for the increase in people expected to reside within this new development.  Construction works are temporary and will be controlled by condition. Any contractors will be expected to accord with the requirements of the Considerate Constructors Scheme and this will be secured by condition.  The applicant's Statement of Common Ground set out that he views of residents have been
	considered through an ongoing process of engagement during the pre-application period, in addition to the formal consultation process undertaken as part of this full planning application.
Non-planning considerations	
Loss of a private view	The loss of a private view is a private matter and is not a material planning consideration that is taken into account as part of the planning process.
Impact on property values	The impact of new development on existing property values is a private matter and is not a material planning consideration that is taken into account as part of the planning process.

Procedural matters	This application process has followed standard planning procedure and has not deviated from the normal planning practices in any way.
Files not visible online	Council Officers have checked the online web page for this application and document files are available to view and download.