

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2021/3481

Ward: Highgate

Address: 103-107 North Hill N6 4DP

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home (Class C2 - Residential Institution), together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre. The proposed care home includes up to 70 bedrooms, with ancillary hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, cafe, lounge, bar, well-being shop, general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.

Applicant: Mr Mitesh Dhanak Highgate Care Ltd

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Valerie Okeiyi

1.1 This application has been referred to the Planning Sub- committee for a decision as it is a major application that is also subject to a section 106 agreement.

1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The scheme optimises the potential of the site for a new modern care home
- The care home facility would provide 70 bedrooms along with traditional long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia palliative care), a well-being and physiotherapy centre and an area for residents to recuperate from surgery that will include specialist staff and tailored care;
- The impact of the development on residential amenity is acceptable;
- There would be no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding highway network or on car parking conditions in the area;
- The proposed development would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and not cause harm to it, it would be a high quality design of an appropriate scale to its context and would respect the visual amenity of the streetscape and locality generally;
- The proposed scheme will be more sustainable and energy efficient than the existing buildings;
- The proposed development would result in the loss of 7 low grade trees but would be replaced with 8 newly planted trees - ensuring there is no net loss off trees.

The 8 new trees will form part of a high quality and substantially sized landscaping scheme as part of the proposed development;

- The scheme would provide a number of section 106 obligations

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
- 2.3 That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 06/08/22 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- 2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Materials
4. Boundary treatment and access control
5. Landscaping
6. Lighting
7. Site levels
8. Secure by design accreditation
9. Secure by design certification
10. Land Contamination
11. Unexpected Contamination
12. NRMM
13. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
14. Combustion and Energy Plant

15. Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Facility
16. Construction ecological Management Plan
17. Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan
18. Tree Protection Plan
19. Arboricultural method Statements
20. Landscape Plan and aftercare programme
21. Energy strategy
22. Gas boilers
23. Overheating
24. Living roof
25. BREEAM Certification
26. Movement monitoring (Basement development)
27. Construction Management Plan (Basement development)
28. Cycle Parking
29. Construction Logistics Plan
30. Gym restriction
31. Outpatients facility
32. Satellite antenna
33. Kitchen Extract
34. Restriction to use class
35. Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
36. Fire safety
37. Plant noise

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Asbestos
- 8) Secure by design
- 9) Thames Water underground assets
- 10) Water pressure
- 11) Ramps

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

1. Section 278 Highway Agreement

- Reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access, and meet all of the Council's costs

2. Sustainable Transport Initiatives

- Monitoring of travel plan contribution of £2,000 per year for a period of 5 years
- £20,000 towards parking management measures
- £4,000 towards permit free with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ

3. Carbon Mitigation

- Be Seen commitment to uploading energy data
- Energy Plan and Sustainability Review
- Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £404,700 plus a 10% management fee

4. Employment Initiative – participation and financial contribution towards Local Training and Employment Plan

- Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator;
- Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies;
- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents;
- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees;
- Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff);
- Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs.

5. Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value of contributions (not including monitoring);
- £500 per non-financial contribution;
- Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000

2.5 In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

2.6 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) Section 278 Highway Agreement for reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access and meet all of the Council's costs. 3) A

contribution towards parking management measures. 4) A contribution towards permit free with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ. 5) Implementation of a travel plan and monitoring free would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies T1, Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32, DM48 and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policies TR3 and TR4.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team and to provide other employment initiatives would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI 2 of the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.6) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:

- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
- (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
- (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

CONTENTS

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8. RECOMMENDATION/PLANNING CONDITIONS & INFORMATIVES

APPENDICES:

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Appendix 1 | Consultation Responses – Internal and External Consultees and Neighbour Representations |
| Appendix 2 | Plans and Images |
| Appendix 3 | Quality Review Panel Reports |
| Appendix 4 | Planning Committee Pre application Briefing Notes |
| Appendix 5 | DM Forum Summary |

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

- 3.1.1. This is an application for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a three and four storey building fronting North Hill and View Road to operate as a care home (Use Class C2) providing 70 bedrooms. 43 of the bedrooms (61%) will provide traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia palliative care). The well-being and physiotherapy centre will utilise 27 bedrooms (39%) and will provide an area for residents to recuperate from surgery and include specialist staff and tailored care. This centre will cater for a mix of inpatient and outpatient/public use for these facilities.
- 3.1.2. The primary access to the care home will be from View Road leading to the convalescent, nursing and dementia care, vehicle drop off and access to the basement car park and physiotherapy centre. The North Hill frontage will provide pedestrian access to the well-being and physiotherapy centre.
- 3.1.3. 17 car parking spaces including 2 disabled spaces and cycle parking spaces are proposed at basement level. The physiotherapy centre in the basement will include; gym physiotherapy spaces, consulting rooms, hydro pool, sauna, cinema, barber, hair and beauty salon and wellness shop. Also at basement level are kitchens, laundry room, WC, changing rooms, maintenance store, reception, office, deliveries room, equipment store and plant rooms.
- 3.1.4 The ground floor will provide convalescent short stay guest accommodation, a reception space, communal hub, restaurant, café, office, nurse room and outdoor space. The first floor will be dedicated to older people's care and will comprise of bedrooms with en-suites, dayspace provided by way of a lounge, dining room and quiet room. An assisted bathroom (spa bathroom) is located centrally. The first floor also includes the staff room, treatment/medical room and nurse station. The second floor will be dedicated to dementia care and will comprise of bedrooms with en-suites as well as dayspace, an assisted bathroom and nursing station. This floor also includes a private terrace. The third floor is dedicated to the well-being centre only and provides convalescent stay accommodation and a communal terrace.
- 3.1.5 The proposal would include comprehensive landscaping around the development including to the frontages along View Road and North Hill. Some of the new landscaping features will include a 'healing garden', water features, new tree planting, green walls, paving, soft planting, semi-private terraces for the residents and accessible paths.
- 3.1.6 The development would be contemporary in style with the North Hill frontage faced in yellow brick and include a dark grey aluminium window system and parapet in a Portland coping stone. The View Road frontage would be faced in

red multi and contrasting dark red brick and include a dark grey slate pitched roof, dark grey aluminium window system and zinc clad dormers.

Amendments

3.1.7 The planning application has been amended since initial submission and includes the following changes:

- The North Hill elevation has been revised from red multi brick, buff brick and white render to a single yellow brick
- Set back distance plan updated to include a proposed extension at a neighbouring property
- Roof plant relocated from the flat roof to a secluded area within the pitched roof volume
- Transport addendum submitted

Site and Surroundings

3.1.8 The site is occupied by a part 2, part 4 storey building that has two frontages facing onto North Hill (north-east side) and View Road (south-west side). The site was formerly owned (and operated as a care home) by the Mary Feilding Guild. It was recently acquired by Highgate Care Limited. The site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures.

3.1.9 On its North Hill frontage, the site is flanked on one side by a Grade II Listed Georgian terrace known as 'Prospect Terrace' while on its View Road frontage it is adjoined by a Locally Listed villa at No. 3 View Road. The current care home complex includes a red brick building on the site's View Road frontage, the core of which is an Edwardian House with some Arts and Craft features. This has been linked through a series of extensions and newer buildings to a four storey 1960/1970s block on the North Hill frontage. The original Edwardian building is considered a positive contributor to the Conservation Area. There is a tree subject to a TPO south of the frontage facing North Hill. There are a number of trees and shrubs planting to the perimeter of the site and to the rear of the buildings is a large lawn.

3.1.7 The current main pedestrian entrance is from North Hill and the building is set back from a one-way road parallel to North Hill, which runs north-west to south east and at a lower level to the North Hill frontage and the one-way road. There is a single, large disabled persons parking space and two visitor parking spaces on this frontage. The View Road frontage provides a gated vehicular in/out access and a car parking area to the rear.

3.1.8 To the north of the site is a narrow strip of land owned by the Council, which falls outside the application site boundary. Beyond this are the rear gardens of the properties fronting Yeatman Road. Adjacent to the site to the south-east at the junction of North Hill and View Road is Weatherley Court, a small modern development of 4 storey houses. To the rear of Weatherley Court and adjacent to the site is 1a View Road, which appears to be a large house on a large plot. Directly opposite the North Hill frontage is the four-storey block of flats 'Highcroft', located at the corner of North Hill and Church Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a diverse range of different architectural styles.



Fig 1 – Aerial View

3.2 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The site has a significant planning history including several alterations and extensions to the buildings.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 Planning Committee Pre-Application Briefing

4.1.1 The proposal was presented to the Planning Committee at a Pre-Application Briefing on September 2021. The minutes are attached in Appendix 4.

4.2 Quality Review Panel

4.2.1 The scheme has been presented to Haringey's Quality Review Panel on two occasions.

4.2.2 Following the final Quality Review Panel meeting on 25 August 2021, Appendix 3, the Panel offered their 'warm support' for the scheme, with the summary from the report below;

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

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

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

4.3 Development Management Forum

4.3.1 The proposal was presented to a Development Management Forum in September 2021.

4.3.2 The notes from the Forum are set out in Appendix 5.

4.4 Application Consultation

4.4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:
(comments are in summary – full comments from consultees are included in appendix 1)

Design Officer

Comments provided are in support of the development

Conservation Officer

Comments provided are in support of the development

Transportation

No objections raised, subject to conditions, S106 and S278 legal clauses

Waste Management

No objections

Employment and Skills

No objections

Building Control

No objections to the basement development, subject to conditions
NHS Haringey

No objection

Arboricultural Officer

No objections raised, subject to conditions

Nature Conservation

No objections raised, subject to conditions

Pollution Lead Officer

No objection, subject to conditions

Surface and flood water

No objections

Carbon Management

No objections, subject to conditions and S106 legal clause

Public Health

No objection

Supported Accommodation

No objection

EXTERNAL

Thames Water

No objection

Designing out crime

No objections, subject to conditions

Environment Agency

No objection

London Fire Brigade

No objection

Historic England

No objection

GLAAS

No objection

Tree Trust for Haringey

No objection

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following were consulted:

203 Neighbouring properties
3 Residents Association
Public site notices were erected in the vicinity of the site

5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 44
Objecting: 41
Supporting: 0
Others: 3

5.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)
- Highgate Society

5.4 The following Councillor made representations:

- Councillor Robert Hare
- Councillor Paul Dennison
- Councillor Liz Morris

NB: Councillors Hare and Morris are no longer Ward Councillors but were at the time this planning application was submitted and their comments in their capacity of Ward Councillors have been included and addressed in this officer report.

5.5 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

Land Use and housing

- The new care home should not be used for any commercial interest
- Concerns with the financial viability of the development
- Concerns some of the proposed facilities will be for public use
- Loss of care home facility
- Concerns the proposed facility is more like a sports injury treatment and rehabilitation facility rather than a care home
- Some of the uses are inconsistent with the existing use class

- The internal and external environment is more like a hospital and inappropriate as a care home for residents
- The proposed facilities are unlikely to be used by residents, however the rents would be very high
- The applicant has failed to show the need for the various services

Impact on Heritage assets

- The height is not in keeping with the Conservation Area
- The scale is a concern given its close proximity to the listed building
- The preservation of the character of the conservation area needs to be properly assessed
- The development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- The development will harm the settings of the listed buildings
- The heritage assessment is incorrect
- Substantial harm to the Conservation Area

Size, Scale and Design

- The design is not in keeping with surrounding properties
- Overbearing in relation to neighbouring buildings
- Excessive height, bulk, massing and scale
- The development is significantly larger in scale than the existing buildings on site
- Overdevelopment of site
- The development should be significantly reduced in scale
- The Quality Review Panel comments have not been adequately addressed
- The Council's pre-application advice has not been adequately addressed
- The scheme should be redesigned
- Excessive footprint
- The development is contrary to Local Plan policies and the NPPF
- Poor quality design

Parking, Transport and Highways

- Increased traffic generated
- Pressure on parking
- Road safety concerns
- The North Hill entrance will not be suitable for daily out patients
- The main entrance for outpatients should be on View Road
- It is unlikely outpatients will use sustainable forms of transport to the site
- Concerns the access road would not be sufficient for this development
- The slip road is designed for residential access
- This narrow section of North Hill is the main route for children of Highgate Primary School
- The wellbeing and physiotherapy centre will be open to non-residents with implications for traffic and parking

- Cycle racks will not be an appropriate solution

Residential Amenity

- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Unacceptable overshadowing
- Loss of daylight and sunlight
- Impact on visual amenity
- Noise and disturbance
- Impact on amenity
- The setback plan showing the distance between buildings is incorrect
- The daylight/sunlight assessment has not been carried out properly
- Concerns the proposed mechanical plan will impact the amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Environment and Public Health

- Significant increase in pollution
- Increased emissions
- Noise pollution
- Impact on human health
- Impact upon local flora/fauna
- Major disruption to the local community
- Impact on the quality of life of local residents
- Potential security issues
- Impact on trees
- Damage to existing trees
- Loss of trees
- The bat survey should be redone
- Loss of garden space
- There is no mention of green roofs
- More details of the permeable paving are required

Basement development

- The potential impact of the basement development has not been adequately addressed
- Risk of ground movement
- Impact of basement development on the listed terrace
- Impact on ground and underground water courses
- The basement is excessive in scale
- Concerns of flooding
- Impact on local drainage services
- Subsidence
- Where will attenuation tanks be located
- Impact on hydrology

- Proper monitoring arrangements should take place by the Council
- Further data is required for phase 2 of the site investigation
- The ground and groundwater conditions should be fully and adequately addressed at the planning stage
- Incomplete basement assessment
- Building Control has not taken into account Alan Baxter's submission
- The Council's basement policy is poor

Archaeology

- An archaeology impact assessment is required as the site is located within the Highgate Archaeological Priority Area

Sustainability

- The air source heat pump and other handling plant should be dealt with in detail as part of this application
- Concerns with the potential impact of the plant
- The plant will be highly visible from the public realm
- Details of gas boiler flues, basement parking ventilation, kitchen extract and other plant are missing
- A zero carbon building should be achieved

Other

- The proposed compliance with Part M of the Building Regulations which provides information on access to and use of buildings needs to be stated

5.6 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- No site notice placed outside the development (Officer comments: A site notice was placed outside the development)
- Consultation period was not long enough (Officer Comments: Consultation period was extended at least twice, and further notification carried out on the amended plans)
- Developer's drawings are misleading (Officer comments: Drawings have been updated to address specific points)
- The consultation was not wide enough (Officers comments: The consultation was undertaken in accordance with The Council's Statement of Community Involvement)
- Consultation process not adequate (Officers comments: The consultation process was adequate consisting of a DM Forum where residents were invited and which was well attended before submission of the planning application; the scheme was presented to members in a public forum at pre-application stage. Once the application was submitted, the Council consulted residents twice by

letter, extended the consultation period at least twice. The application was able to be viewed on the council's website)

- Feedback from Statement of Community engagement is not correct (Officers comments: The Statement of Community involvement (SCI) is the applicant's reporting of the feedback as they understand it to be. Officers have assessed the SCI alongside the comments from objectors and then made a balanced assessment of how the feedback has been summarised in the document)
- Inaccurate and misleading CGIs and graphic (Officers comments: CGIs and graphics have been updated so to remove any inaccuracies or misunderstanding of the plans)
- The comparative drawings are misleading (Officers comments: as above)
- Inaccurate, missing and conflicting submission (Officers comments: As above. The Applicant submitted a number of further drawings when requested following consultation feedback)
- Existing plans should be submitted (Officers comments: existing plans and elevations have been submitted)

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development
2. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
3. Design and Appearance
4. Site layout/Quality of Accommodation
5. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
6. Parking and Highways
7. Basement Development
8. Trees
9. Sustainability and Biodiversity
10. Water Management
11. Air Quality and Land Contamination
12. Employment
13. Fire Safety
14. Conclusion

6.2 Principle of the development

Policy Framework

National Policy

6.2.1 The 2021 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes the overarching principles of the planning system, including the requirement of the system to "drive and support development" through the local development plan process. It

advocates policy that seeks exemptions to affordable housing provision where the site or proposed development provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for older people).

- 6.2.2 For the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Haringey's Development Plan includes the London Plan (2021), Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), the Development Management Policies DPD (2017), the Site Allocations DPD (2017) and the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017).
- 6.2.3 The planning decision with respect to this proposal must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Regional Policy - The London Plan

- 6.2.4 London Plan Policy H13 contains requirements for 'specialist older person housing' however this does not apply to accommodation which is considered 'care home accommodation'. London Plan Policy H12 contains requirements for 'supported and specialised accommodation' which includes reablement accommodation (intensive short-term) for people who are ready to be discharged from hospital but who require additional support to be able to return safely to live independently at home, or to move into appropriate long-term accommodation.
- 6.2.5 London Plan Policy D6 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services. It emphasises the need for good housing quality which meets relevant standards of accommodation.

Local Policy

- 6.2.6 The Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies DPD (hereafter referred to as Local Plan), 2017, sets out the long-term vision of the development of Haringey by 2026 and sets out the Council's spatial strategy for achieving that vision. This is not an allocated site and the use of the site remains as a care home.
- 6.2.7 The Development Management DPD (2017) (hereafter referred to as the DPD) is particularly relevant. Policy DM15 sets out the Council's policy on specialist housing.
- 6.2.8 The core objectives of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) are to help achieve the following vision; social and community needs, economic activity, traffic and transport, open spaces, and the public realm and heritage.

Land Use Principles

6.2.9 The proposed development would replace the existing care home (Use Class C2) with a new long term traditional care home with a smaller component operating as a well-being and physiotherapy centre. The replacement of the care home is assessed in land use policy terms as follows.

Replacement of the existing care home

6.2.10 Policy DM15 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017 (DM) states;

- A Proposals for development that would result in the loss of special needs housing will only be granted permission where it can be demonstrated that there is no longer an established local need for this type of accommodation or adequate replacement accommodation will be provided.
- B The Council will support proposals for new special needs housing where it can be shown that:
- a There is an established local need for the form of special needs housing sought having regard also to the aims and recommendations of Haringey's Housing Strategy and Older People Strategy.
 - b The standard of housing and facilities are suitable for the intended occupiers in terms of:
 - i. The provision of appropriate amenity space, parking and servicing;
 - ii. The level of independence; and
 - iii. Level of supervision, management and care/support;
 - c There is a good level of accessibility to public transport, shops, services and community facilities appropriate to the needs of the intended occupiers; and
 - d The impact of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenity of the local area or to local services.

6.2.11 The site has operated as a care home (Use Class C2) for at least 85 years. The former Mary Feilding Guild care home was registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) for a 43 single occupancy bedroom nursing home (Use Class C2). The proposed provision for traditional, long term senior care bedrooms would be 43 rooms, which is in line with the requirement of policy DM15 to provide adequate replacement accommodation.

6.2.12 Haringey's Housing Strategy 2017-22 states that the Council will move to more modern housing options for older people, ensuring services are needs-based and not age-based", provide suitable housing and neighbourhoods for older people, and develop more tailored services for individual older and vulnerable people.

6.2.13 In terms of the other requirements of DM15; meeting an established local need and providing a standard of housing and facilities suitable for the intended occupiers, the former Mary Feilding Guild care home was in private ownership and closed in May 2021. The applicant states that there was a significant under-utilisation of the site, with only 16 residents (an occupancy of only 37%) at the time of closure. The care home had been financially unsustainable for several years and was unable to attract new residents. They have indicated that the home could not continue to operate and function as it previously operated or adapt to provide modern care and nursing facilities in its previous form.

6.2.14 The applicant states that they had commissioned experts to assess the demand for care home provision in the local area. This concluded that there is good provision of traditional residential accommodation for older people in the area. In addition, it is also identified there is good provision of sheltered accommodation in the area. The experts however identified a strong demand for a nursing and convalescence home to assist older people to recuperate from operations and increase their health span.

6.2.15 The proposal therefore seeks permission for up to 70 bedrooms predominantly for traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia and palliative care). This will account for approximately 61% of the bedrooms. A well-being and physiotherapy centre will account for approximately 39% of the bedrooms provided for residents to recuperate from operations with specialist staff tailored care. Therefore, the proposal is considered to meet an established local need and subject to more detailed consideration of the quality of accommodation set out below it is considered to provide a standard of housing and facilities suitable for the intended occupiers.

Land Uses – Conclusion

6.2.16 The principle of traditional, long term senior care and well-being and physiotherapy centre is considered to meet an established local need and would provide adequate replacement accommodation. The proposed development is therefore supported by DM Policy DM15 subject to all other relevant considerations,

6.3 The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

6.3.1 London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

6.3.2 DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context. Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) states that development proposals, including alterations or extension to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate's conservation areas.

Statutory test

6.3.3 Section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 provide: "In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are "the planning Acts".

6.3.4 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise."

6.3.5 The case of the Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council sets out that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area or a Historic Park, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a

heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

- 6.3.6 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
- 6.3.7 With regards to the existing context the Conservation Officer notes that this generous development site sits within Highgate Conservation Area and spans across North Hill and View Road, two thoroughfares with a different yet complementary historic townscape and character.
- 6.3.8 On North Hill the existing care home building is flanked by a listed terrace, on View Road it is adjoined by a locally listed house. The townscape along North Hill is characterised by the varied and down-sloping topography of the bank, by the spacious road section, three to four storey buildings of various ages well set-back from the pavement behind their front gardens. The main elevation of the existing office building of the Mary Feilding Guild Care Home fronts North Hill and forms part of this townscape. The existing office building on North Hill is linked through a series of utilitarian extension buildings to the original 1920s care home building fronting View Road; despite various side and rear alterations this historic building is deemed to be a positive contributor to the character of the CA.
- 6.3.9 View Road is a quiet residential street where several listed and locally listed large houses are comfortably set in large sites complemented by leafy front gardens and generous, deep rear gardens and contribute to a more suburban character than the busy North Hill.
- 6.3.10 The Conservation Officer notes that the proposed redevelopment of the Mary Feilding Guild Care Home rests on a thorough assessment of the architectural proportions, quality, heritage significance and conditions of the existing buildings and their site, a careful analysis of the existing topography and gardens forming part of a well-rounded and comprehensive site analysis.
- 6.3.11 Both contextual analysis and the assessment of susceptibility to change and reuse of the original care home have demonstrated the need for and the benefits descending from the replacement and coherent redesign of both existing buildings, poorly proportioned and poorly accessible interiors, dull office building fronting North Hill and scarcely accessible gardens. The loss of the much-altered original 1920s care home which provides a modest contribution to the character of the area along View Road would have a negligible negative impact on the

character of the area and would lead to a low level of less than substantial harm that would be outweighed by the improved care home services and design quality that the proposed scheme provides.

6.3.12 The Conservation Officer notes that this contextual awareness and a solid experience in the design of specialist care homes have been the basis for a sound and successful design exploration aimed at maximising the site potential and providing an optimal level of accommodation with related amenities and a sensitive response to the historic townscape and urban context of the conservation area. The extensive pre-application discussion with council officers, review and local groups has informed a very specific design proposal that extends across the site replacing and optimising the footprint, plan form, masses and heights of the existing building, with a carefully proportioned new care home building that would benefit from a fully reconfigured and accessible soft and hard landscaped garden space that will pleasantly complement the architectural design of the new buildings. The whole project has been sensitively shaped, both externally and internally by the need to complement the historic townscape of the conservation area respectively on its North Hill and View Road frontages while expressing the genuinely contemporary character of the new care home.

6.3.13 The Conservation Officer notes that the proposed office building along North Hill retains the proportions of the existing one, which is bland and monolithic and offers a straightforward opportunity for improvement. The proposed design seizes this opportunity to enhance forms, functions, and setting of the listed terrace and introduces an interesting articulation of heights and masses and a facade design inspired by the adjacent Georgian terrace and softened by the elegantly multifaceted brickwork façade. The proposal has been carefully shaped and assessed in views across the conservation area along North Hill and by virtue of its sensitive design approach, it fully respects the architectural primacy and legibility of the listed terrace in its urban context and is supported from conservation grounds.



Proposed North Hill Frontage

6.3.14 The Conservation Officer notes that the care home building fronting View Road respects the height of neighbouring houses and has been designed as a contemporary reinterpretation of a suburban villa with symmetric façade, generous fenestration and an interesting roof articulation that draws inspiration from the traditional roofs, dormers, and prominent gables of the adjacent buildings. The subtly elaborated brick façade would be complemented by the soft landscaped garden hidden behind the retained boundary wall located on a raised street level along View Road where the proposed building will positively complement its varied context while retaining a number of established features of this part of the conservation area such as the enclosed nature of the View Road building, the suburban, residential, verdant character of View Road as well as featuring the established architectural forms and materials reinterpreted in a more contemporary key. The building fronting View Road is supported from the conservation perspective with encouragement to further refine the façade treatment, dormers, and porch.



Proposed View Road frontage

6.3.15 The proposed development has been rooted in deep understanding of the site potential and full awareness of the value of its heritage setting. It is a design proposal that creatively seizes the opportunities offered by this challenging and multifaceted heritage site through a conservation-led, context-responsive, well-articulated design concept that provides a specialist development response to this part of the conservation area, a well- founded design response.

6.3.16 The Conservation Officer therefore concludes that the proposed scheme is acceptable from a conservation perspective, as it will lead to a very low, less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and its assets while optimising the use of the site and its garden and while enhancing the townscape along North Hill. The Conservation Officer recommends conditions requiring further details of materials, landscape and boundary treatment to ensure that the character and appearance of the conservation area are effectively enhanced.

6.4 Design and Appearance

6.4.1 The NPPF 2021 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. The NPPF further states that proposed developments should be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character and history, and maintain a strong sense of place.

6.4.2 Policy DM1 of the DMDPD states that all new developments must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character of the local area.

Quality Review Panel (QRP) Comments:

- 6.4.3 The Quality Review Panel (QRP) has assessed the scheme in full at pre-application stage twice (on 18 May 2021 and 25 August 2021). The panel on the whole supported the scheme.
- 6.4.4 The full Quality Review Panel (QRP) report of the review on 18 May 2021 and 25 August 2021 is attached in Appendix 3. The final Quality Review Panel's summary of comments is provided below;

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

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

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

- 6.4.5 The detailed QRP comments from the most recent review together with the officer comments are set out in Table 1.

Table 1: QRP comments and officer response

Panel comments	Officer Response
Massing and roofscape	
The panel accepts the massing and development density of the proposals, but would encourage the project team to refine the massing of the roofscape	The project team has investigated the roof form with alterations made where necessary such as half hipped roofs to both wings of the building to the View

<p>to further reduce the visual bulk of the building</p> <p>The depth of the roof presents some challenges with regard to the nature of the hip elements, which seem oversized. The panel would encourage a simpler approach to the pitched roofs within the scheme, using strong gable ends rather than large hips</p> <p>The panel welcomes the adjustments to the building footprint, which has been pulled away from adjacent buildings to allow for a more generous gap than currently exists.</p> <p>The panel notes that the demolition and redevelopment of the North Hill building only achieves the same mass and footprint as the existing building. It would strongly encourage the project team to fully explore retaining, refurbishing / re-cladding and re-purposing the existing building, which the panel considers to be architecturally elegant and which does not seek to compete with the adjacent Georgian terrace</p>	<p>Road frontage and general reduction of pitch by 5 degrees.</p> <p>Officers consider that the roof articulation draws inspiration from the traditional roofs, dormers, and prominent gables of the adjacent buildings</p> <p>QRP support noted</p> <p>The applicants explored options of retaining the existing building, but it could not be adequately adapted to provide a modern care facility. Officers consider that the proposed building along North Hill retains the proportions of the existing one and offers a straightforward opportunity for improvement. Further revisions provided following negotiations have ensured that the building does not compete with the Listed Georgian Terrace and respects their setting.</p>
<p>Landscape design</p>	
<p>While the panel regrets the reduction of the garden space, it feels this is acceptable as the building footprint has also been pulled away from the boundary in some locations, providing a more generous distance to adjacent buildings.</p> <p>The panel welcomes the concept of the healing garden, with its aspiration to nurture the physical and mental well-being of residents. Careful consideration</p>	<p>QRP support noted</p> <p>To address this the project team has introduced level access to this garden space from the foyer/central hub and restaurant (which does not exist at</p>

<p>of the path, the orientation of the garden and the ramp access will be required to ensure that a strong visual and physical relationship is created between the internal accommodation and the garden.</p>	<p>present). Raised planters define generous smooth paths along circular routes through the garden to allow residents to move about independently or with the support of carers or visitors alongside. A series of pergolas help break up the space and lead to a wide variety of seating spaces</p>
<p>Scheme layout and quality of accommodation</p>	
<p>The panel would like to see further refinements to the scheme layout, to create a better relationship (both visually and physically) between internal communal areas and the garden spaces externally. The terrace areas in the ‘elbow’ of the scheme also need further work.</p> <p>The panel is concerned by the intention to locate the restaurant in the basement. Instead, it would like to see it at ground floor level, ideally in the west-facing section of building overlooking the garden (where there are currently a number of individual rooms shown). The kitchen could remain at basement level.</p> <p>Some of the other uses currently located within the basement would also be much better suited to being located at ground level, including staff rooms and communal facilities like the shop, library, barbers and hair and beauty salon. These uses could potentially help to activate the frontage of the North Hill block.</p> <p>The panel feels that the proportion of circulation space within the North Hill block is unbalanced and would like to see improvements to the efficiency of</p>	<p>The layout has been revised by relocating the restaurant to the ground floor facing the main garden area. Communal spaces and terraces to the upper floors have also been refined so that the main garden elevation will be animated by those main social, communal rooms and terraces</p> <p>The restaurant is re-located from the basement to the ground floor, so to open out on to the proposed healing garden. This allows the restaurant space to utilise both the views out onto the garden and direct access for outdoor seating etc. The revised location also allows for natural light to flood the space.</p> <p>The staff rooms have relocated from the basement to first floor level. Officers consider the shop, barbers and hair and beauty salon acceptable in the basement as they would be used for short visits.</p> <p>Circulation and layout of the treatment suites in the North Hill block have also been refined, including improving natural light to circulation, with servicing</p>

<p>the floor plans</p> <p>It would also support further refinement of the design of the circulation spaces and communal areas, to include increasing the generosity and daylight access to corridors, circulation cores and stairwells.</p> <p>Sections taken through the accommodation will be critically important to understanding how the sloping roofs and dormers will affect the quality of accommodation within the roof spaces.</p> <p>Greater clarity would be welcomed on the arrangements for refuse storage and how this will work in practice for the different parts of the development</p>	<p>and refuse storage better defined and disguised.</p> <p>The revised design includes window openings placed within stairwells & circulation spaces where possible to enable natural light into the spaces.</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Refuse storage is accessed internally at ground floor level and externally from View Road. The refuse collection will be made by a private contractor from within the site utilising the internal drop off bay accessed off View Road. The area is externally accessed and located adjacent the staff & deliveries entrance. A service lift is located adjacent for use by back of house staff.</p>
<p>Architectural expression</p>	
<p>The panel would support further refinements to the View Road elevations, including simplified recesses and a greater distinction in the side wings of the main building through use of different brickwork</p> <p>It would also encourage further consideration of the northern (flank) façade of the scheme.</p>	<p>Officers consider the building fronting View Road is supported from the conservation perspective with encouragement to further refine the façade treatment, dormers, and porch.</p> <p>The northern elevation has been simplified, replacing the proposed green wall with fenestration to circulation and brick recesses, and enriching detailing to both entrances, window surrounds, gables to View Road and walls to</p>

<p>The panel feels in particular that it would be beneficial to get daylight into the stairwell that is bounded by the flank wall, and would encourage exploration of options, including fritted glass.</p> <p>While the panel feels that retention of the North Hill block should be explored as a first response to this part of the site, it would encourage a calmer and simpler approach to the architectural expression of the proposed North Hill block; it thinks that the stepping of the proposed building line is too complicated, and does not relate to the adjacent Georgian terrace. The panel also notes that the exterior looks like an office building, rather than reflecting the uses that are accommodated within.</p>	<p>landscaping, especially in front of lightwells.</p> <p>Window openings are placed within stairwells & circulation spaces where possible to enable natural light into the spaces.</p> <p>Officers consider that the proposed building along North Hill retains the proportions of the existing one and offers a straightforward opportunity for improvement. The proposed design seizes this opportunity to enhance forms, functions, and setting of the listed terrace and introduces an interesting articulation of heights and masses and a facade design inspired by the adjacent Georgian terrace and softened by the elegantly multifaceted brickwork façade.</p>
<p>Low carbon design and environmental sustainability</p>	
<p>The panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability within the scheme.</p> <p>The panel notes that consideration of the embodied energy within existing buildings is an important starting point in sustainability terms. It would like to see detailed analysis of a development approach that seeks to retain – as a minimum – the North Hill block, plus other parts of the existing building where appropriate.</p>	<p>The development delivers a minimum 62% improvement on carbon emissions over 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with SAP10 emission factors, high fabric efficiencies, air source heat pumps (ASHPs) for 100% space heating and minimum 70% hot water demand, and a minimum 14 kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) array</p> <p>The whole life cycle carbon assessment has been submitted and provides analysis of the embodied energy within the building</p>

<p>Consideration of operational energy requirements should start with a ‘fabric first’ approach</p> <p>A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as the scheme continues to evolve.</p>	<p>As discussed under the Sustainability and biodiversity section of the report below, Officers support the scheme based on its carbon reductions. They have requested further information which can be dealt with by conditions. The shortfall of the care home will need to be offset to achieve a zero-carbon target, in line with Policy SP4 (1).</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6.4.6 The Design officer notes that the proposals would replace existing buildings of varied quality in consistent high-quality designs in contemporary reinterpretations of the local context Georgian and Arts & Crafts architecture, of a compatible and appropriate scale to the context, elegantly proportioned, in attractive, appropriate materials and detailing, set in lush, high quality landscaping. The use of high-quality materials is considered to be key to the success of the design standard. As such, a condition shall be imposed that requires details and samples of all key materials and further details of the design and detailing of junctions between the brick and glazed elements to be agreed, prior to commencement of works on site.

6.4.7 Therefore, the proposed design of the development is considered to be a high-quality design and in line with the policies set out above.

6.5 Site layout/Quality of accommodation

6.5.1 As noted above Policy DM 15 requires the standard of housing and facilities are suitable for the intended occupiers in terms of the provision of appropriate amenity space, parking and servicing; the level of independence; and level of supervision, management and care/support.

6.5.2 All rooms will benefit from generous floor space (above market ‘standard’), wheelchair friendly wet room en-suites (large enough to allow for staff assistance) and their own private kitchenettes with drink making facilities. Suites will also provide seating areas. Private patios will be utilised at ground floors, whilst balconies or Juliet balconies will be provided at first floor. All rooms will benefit from 2.1m height windows (for views from wheelchairs) and will overlook landscaped external spaces

6.5.3 Corridors are designed to be minimum 2m width, to allow for moving of hospital beds and sufficient width for wheelchairs to pass. All doors to resident areas will be designed with a minimum clear width of 800mm, allowing for wheelchair access.

6.5.4 The main entrance to the care home is sited centrally so as to be the clear focus of the main elevation and be immediately apparent when entering the site. Older

people care and dementia care residents will arrive at the site by way of the basement car park.

- 6.5.5 Convalescent stay guests will arrive by way of private ambulance. All will enter at reception, which will open on to the communal hub, informal eating area and restaurant (which will have garden views and access). From the hub, guests will be directed to their room or suite. Lifts are provided at View, Road, North Hill and one centrally.
- 6.5.6 The second floor of the care home will be dedicated to dementia care, which is in line with dementia friendly design that would allow staff to monitor residents more effectively. The terrace on this floor will enable secure outdoor space for dementia residents only.
- 6.5.7 In terms of activity space throughout the home, the first floor will provide older people's care and includes large lounge, dining room and quiet lounge spaces for residents to undertake a variety of social, physical and cognitively stimulating activities. The quiet lounge will be a multi-function space that could be used for activities. The second floor provides dementia care and also has a quiet lounge which will also be a multi-function space. The ground floor provides short stay care for a different purpose group. Residents on the third floor will have access to a communal terrace that will be staffed 24 hours per day
- 6.5.8 A dedicated nurse station is included centrally and the home will provide state of the art monitoring linked to nurse call systems to ensure beds are monitored and staffed and residents are safeguarded
- 6.5.9 Therefore the quality and layout of the proposed accommodation is considered to be suitable for the intended occupiers in terms of the provision of appropriate amenity space, parking and servicing; the level of independence; and level of supervision, management and care/support in line with the requirements of Policy DM15.

Accessible Accommodation

- 6.5.10 London Plan Policy D5 seeks to provide suitable housing and genuine choice for London's diverse population, including disabled people, older people and families with young children. Local Plan Policy SP2 is consistent with this as is DPD Policy DM2 which requires new developments to be designed so that they can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all.
- 6.5.11 Each floor will provide level access throughout and each entrance into the building, and exit from dayrooms and other similar areas, will have level thresholds for ease of access throughout. Strategically placed lifts will allow for ease of access to the upper floors. The proposed ground floor will sit as per the existing level and will run through as level access to View Road. It is noted that the View

Road entrance level is informed by North Hill, and external levels at the front are graded an additional 200mm lower to suit this. The gardens will provide level access throughout, with no external gradient steeper than 1:20. Two accessible car parking spaces are provided with two larger bays able to be converted to accessible car parking spaces if required. An ambulance drop off bay is proposed at ground level accessed via the two crossovers off View Road. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard.

Outlook and Privacy

6.5.11 The design of the proposed development has carefully considered outlook and privacy between rooms and will safeguard the amenity of future users of the care home facility. The outlook from the rooms and the building generally is one of spaciousness and pleasant, quality landscaping.

Daylight/sunlight/overshadowing – Future Occupiers

6.5.12 Daylight/sunlight and overshadowing for future occupants of the proposed development will be a significant improvement to the existing building as natural light has been incorporated into the proposed building as far as possible.

6.5.13 The facilities such as the shop, barbers and hair and beauty salon located in the proposed basement will not benefit from natural light and would rely on artificial lighting, however given these facilities are for short infrequent visits only, this is considered acceptable. The hydro pool and gym facility at basement level would benefit from lightwells.

6.5.14 Sunlight to the external outdoor garden space varies depending on their location and neighbouring trees. Whilst some on the west side would fall marginally short of BRE guidelines they would benefit from being exceptionally private, with wooded external garden space.

Other Amenity Considerations – Future Occupiers

6.5.15 With regard to air quality, the care home facility will benefit from bedrooms with windows, private patios, private terrace, communal outdoor spaces/terrace, day spaces located away from the closest significant road traffic emissions source (North Hill). Further details of passive design measures can be secured by a condition.

6.5.16 Lighting throughout the site would be controlled by condition so it would not impact negatively on future occupiers.

6.5.17 The refuse store for the care home facility is located at ground floor level accessed off View Road. The Council's Waste Management Officer is satisfied the refuse store is sufficient to store waste for one week.

Security

6.5.18 Secure entrance points will be provided to the entrances on View Road and North Hill. These entrance points will be managed by reception staff in order to prevent any unauthorised access. The Secure by Design Officer does not object to the proposed development subject to standard conditions requiring details of and compliance with the principles and practices of the Secured by Design Award Scheme. It is also recommended that a condition be imposed on any grant of planning permission requiring provision and approval of lighting details in the interests of security.

6.6 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

6.6.1 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

6.6.2 DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring residents.

Daylight and sunlight Impact

6.6.3 Concerns have been raised regarding the effect of this development on the daylight and sunlight received by residential neighbours. The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment that assesses daylight and sunlight to the windows of the surrounding neighbouring properties. The assessment finds that the impact of the development on existing neighbouring windows is exceptionally favourable for both daylight and sunlight as 98% of the windows pass the BRE's Vertical Sky Component guidelines and 99% of these windows pass the BRE's No Skyline guidelines. In terms of sunlight, 117 rooms were assessed, and all comply with the BRE's primary annual sunlight criteria.

6.6.4 In terms of sunlight to neighbouring gardens/amenity space, the assessments finds that 9 out of the 12 gardens/amenity space would satisfy the BRE guidelines. The neighbouring gardens that are affected i.e. the rear gardens of Yeatman Road are already overshadowed by an existing tree along the rear boundary. The neighbouring property at 109 North Hill which is in closest proximity to the site is

already overshadowed due to its close proximity to the existing care facility building and trees in the garden.

- 6.6.5 Overall the proposal would not have a significant impact on daylight and sunlight to residents of neighbouring properties.

Privacy/Overlooking and outlook

- 6.6.6 Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would result in a loss of privacy/overlooking issues, particularly with regards to the properties on Yeatman Road, View Road and North Hill. Given the 20-30 metre distance between the main rear wall of the properties on Yeatman Road and that of the proposal, the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to these neighbouring occupants. This is also helped by the site itself and many of its neighbours being densely landscaped, with a particularly dense belt of existing trees to its north-west, and that such care is proposed to be taken to retain and protect existing trees on the site and supplement them with additional trees. Given also the proposed development although taller in scale, broadly follows the form and footprint of the existing building, with the proposed building line pulled away from boundaries to neighbouring gardens, in particular to the rear of 1A View Road.

- 6.6.7 In terms of outlook, existing surrounding residents would experience both actual and perceived changes in their amenity as a result of the development. Nevertheless, taking account of the urban setting of the site and the established pattern and form of the neighbouring development the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity in this respect.

- 6.6.8 Therefore, it is considered that residents of nearby residential properties would not be materially affected by the proposal in terms of loss of outlook or privacy

Other Amenity Considerations

- 6.6.9 Policy DM23 states that developments should not have a detrimental impact on air quality, noise or light pollution.

- 6.6.10 The submitted Air Quality Assessment (AQA) concludes that the development is not considered to be contrary to any of the national and local planning policies regarding air quality. The Council's Pollution Officer concurs with this view.

- 6.6.11 The site is currently in use as a traditional care home. The proposed development would see the principal use of the site remain the same and therefore there will be no increase in noise levels and general disturbance in comparison to the existing facility.

- 6.6.12 It is anticipated that light emitted from internal rooms would not have a significant impact on neighbouring occupiers in the context of this urban area.
- 6.6.13 Any dust and noise relating to demolition and construction works would be temporary impacts that are typically controlled by non-planning legislation. Nevertheless, the demolition and construction methodology for the development would be controlled by condition.
- 6.6.14 The increase in noise from occupants of the proposed care home facility would not be significant to existing residents given the current existing use of the site will be retained and the current urbanised nature of the surroundings.
- 6.6.15 Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not have a material impact on the amenity of residents and occupiers of neighbouring and surrounding properties.

6.7 Parking and Highways

- 6.7.1 Local Plan Policy SP7 states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling. This approach is continued in DM Policies DM31 and DM32.
- 6.7.2 London Plan Policy T1 sets out the Mayor's strategic target for 80% of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. This policy also promotes development that makes the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport. Policy T6 sets out cycle parking requirements for developments, including minimum standards. T7 concerns car parking and sets out that 'car-free' development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are well-connected by public transport. Policy T6.1 sets out requirements for residential car parking spaces.
- 6.7.3 Policy TR3 and TR4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan seeks to minimise the impact of traffic arising from new development and reduce the negative impact of parking in Highgate.
- 6.7.4 The site is located within an area with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3, which is considered 'moderate' in terms of access to public transport services. Five different bus services are accessible within 2 to 8-minutes' walk of the site, and Highgate Underground Station is a 9-minute walk away. The site is located within the Highgate Outer Controlled Parking Zone, which operates between the hours of 10.00 to 12.00 Monday to Friday.

Parking Stress

- 6.7.5 The Council's Transport Planning Officers have considered the potential parking and public highway impact of this proposal.
- 6.7.6 In terms of the revised trip generation applied and predicted numbers of cars that will attend either as employees, visitors or therapy/physio outpatients, there will be additional parking demands generated on-street.
- 6.7.7 There are very high parking stresses recorded on some streets within the stress survey and the predicted impacts arising from this proposal will need to be mitigated and managed. However, the Council's Transport Planning Officers raise no objections to the proposals subject to conditions being imposed in respect of gym restrictions and the outpatients facility to reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads. A contribution towards parking management measures would also need to be secured. This figure would be secured by legal agreement should consent be granted.

Access and Parking

- 6.7.8 The Transport Planning Officers note that at present there are two vehicle crossovers/accesses off View Road and one-off North Hill. There are 3 parking spaces at the North Hill entrance and additional car parking is available within the site accessed from the crossovers off View Road.
- 6.7.9 The proposal seeks to retain the two crossovers off View Road to facilitate access to a drop off facility and also the proposed basement parking.
- 6.7.10 The existing access on North Hill is no longer required so the applicant will need to enter into the appropriate Highways Act Agreement to meet the physical and administrative costs of reinstating the crossover to full height kerb and footway. This can be secured by legal agreement should consent be granted.
- 6.7.11 Pedestrian access will be primarily from the View Road side of the care home however it will also be possible from the North Hill side of the site.
- 6.7.12 The proposal would provide basement parking for 17 car parking spaces in total, including two blue badge bays with two larger bays able to be converted to blue badge if required. An ambulance drop off bay is proposed at ground level accessed via the two crossovers off View Road. This bay can also be used for informal drop off and pickups.
- 6.7.13 The ramp starts within the site several metres from the View Road crossover, and it is not expected that the proposed arrangement will create any highway or safety issues. The ramp will be able to accommodate two-way vehicle movements and it is expected cyclists will access the basement long stay cycle parking via the

ramp or alternatively use one of the lifts. The Council's Transport Planning Officers consider the access and parking to be acceptable.

Electric Car Charging Points

6.7.14 London Plan policy T6.1 requires at least 20 per cent of spaces to have active charging facilities with passive provision for the remaining spaces however there are no specific requirements in the London Plan for charging point provision for care homes. The Council's Transport Planning Officers note that the scheme provides two car charging points which complies with the 20% requirement and is considered acceptable,

Cycle Parking

6.7.15 The proposal provides 8 long stay cycle parking spaces in the basement. This level of cycle parking provision meets the London Plan cycle parking requirement for care homes.

6.7.16 Short stay spaces are to be provided at ground floor level. 4 short stay spaces are required for the care home and 2 for the gym. 5 spaces are referred to in the Transport Assessment, however the waste arrangements drawing indicates ten spaces.

6.7.17 This information can be clarified at a later stage, but prior to the commencement of works, and as such this matter can be secured by the imposition of a condition.

6.7.18 As such, Officers raise no objections to the proposals on transport grounds subject to the relevant condition being imposed in respect of proposed cycle parking arrangements

Deliveries and Servicing

6.7.19 With regards to delivery and servicing considerations, 4 delivery and servicing trips are predicted per day. A delivery bay is included within the basement for visiting service vehicles, and the ground level drop off bay can also be used. Servicing activity takes place from both North Hill and View Road at present, however with this proposal is it intended to take place from View Road only, accommodated off of the highway.

6.7.20 A private contractor will be used to make refuse and recycling collections, using a smaller vehicle than those used by the Council, and collections will be made from within the site utilising the internal drop off bay accessed off View Road.

6.7.21 As such, the provision for deliveries and servicing for the care home is considered acceptable.

Construction Logistics and Management

- 6.7.22 No specific details of construction logistics have been submitted at application stage. However, it is appropriate for this to be provided at a later stage as such this matter can be secured by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission.
- 6.7.23 Overall it is considered that the application is acceptable in transport and parking terms, and in terms of its impact on the public highway.

6.8 Basement Development

- 6.8.1 London Plan policy D10 states Boroughs should establish policies in their Development Plans to address the negative impacts of large-scale development beneath existing buildings, where this is identified as an issue locally.
- 6.8.2 Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan requires that new development should ensure that impacts on natural resources, among other things, are minimised by adopting sustainable construction techniques.
- 6.8.3 A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been submitted with this application, which seeks to demonstrate that the impacts of the works would be acceptable, as required by Policy DM18 of the Council's 2017 DMDPD. This policy requires proposals for basement development to demonstrate that the works will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building and neighbouring buildings, does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties, avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area, and will not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment. Policy DH7: basements of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) seeks to ensure that full consideration is given to the potential impacts of basement developments at application stage.
- 6.8.4 The proposal seeks to extend the existing basement to facilitate 17 parking spaces, 8 cycle parking spaces, a well-being and physiotherapy centre and other ancillary facilities. The applicant has submitted a detailed Basement Impact Assessment which meets the above policy requirement. It will be the responsibility of the structural engineer and the applicant to ensure that the basement construction is sound.
- 6.8.5 While it is recognised that certain aspects of the works here cannot be determined absolutely at the planning stage (i.e. structural works to the party walls) a detailed construction management plan is adequately able to be provided at a later stage, but prior to the commencement of works, and as such this matter can be secured by condition.

6.8.6 Other legislation provides further safeguards to identify and control the nature and magnitude of the effect on neighbouring properties. Specifically, the structural integrity of the proposed basement works here would need to satisfy modern day building regulations. In addition, the necessary party-wall agreements with adjoining owners would need to be in place prior to the commencement of works on site. In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

6.9 Trees

6.9.1 The supporting text to Local Plan 2017 Policy SP13 recognises, “trees play a significant role in improving environmental conditions and people’s quality of life”, where the policy in general seeks the protection, management and maintenance of existing trees. Policy SO4.4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ‘protect and enhance the area’s village character through conservation of its natural features, including trees’ while policy OS2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan states that there should be no net loss of trees as a result of development and pro rata replacement will be expected.

6.9.2 This proposal includes the removal of 7 trees. The Council’s Tree Officer considers that the trees to be removed are of low quality and value. It is noted that no high-quality trees will be lost and the trees within 109 North Hill, North Hill Highway and Wetherley Court will not be significantly impacted by the proposed development.

6.9.3 The proposed new landscape plan includes the planting of 8 new trees that will be planted within the outdoor garden space including 2 trees along North Hill Road. These 8 newly planted trees will ensure there is no net loss of trees (a gain of 1 tree) which is in line with Policy OS2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed 8 new trees will also enhance biodiversity on the site and contribute to the provision of a quality and substantially sized landscape area which will benefit for future users of the care home and also the visual amenity of the locality generally.

6.9.4 An updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) was submitted with the application which provides initial recommendations for the protection of the retained trees during the construction phase of the development. An Arboricultural Method Statement that details all the necessary measures to be implemented to ensure the trees being retained will be adequately protected will be required. The Council’s Tree Officer has confirmed that this can be adequately provided at a later stage, but prior to the commencement of works, and as such this matter can be secured by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission

6.9.5 As such, the tree officer raises no objections to the proposals subject to the relevant conditions being imposed in respect of the tree protection plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and Landscape Plan and aftercare programme

6.10 Sustainability and Biodiversity

6.10.1 The NPPF requires development to contribute to the transition to a low carbon future, reduce energy consumption and contribute to and conserve the natural environment.

6.10.2 London Plan Policy SI 2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions, states that major developments should be zero carbon, and in meeting the zero-carbon target, a minimum on-site reduction of at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations is expected. Local Plan Policy SP4 requires all new developments to introduce measures that reduce energy use and carbon emissions. Residential development is required to achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions. Local Plan Policy SP11 requires all development to adopt sustainable design and construction techniques to minimise impacts on climate change and natural resources.

6.10.3 DPD Policy DM1 states that the Council will support design-led proposals that incorporate sustainable design and construction principles and Policy DM21 expects new development to consider and implement sustainable design, layout and construction techniques.

6.10.4 The proposed development has sought to adopt a progressive approach in relation to sustainability and energy to ensure that the most viable and effective solution is delivered to reduce carbon emissions. An energy statement was submitted with the application which demonstrates that consideration has been given to sustainable design principles throughout the design of the proposed scheme. The building is designed to minimise its environmental impact through various means and minimise carbon dioxide emissions in line with the prescribed energy hierarchy. The scheme achieves a 62% improvement in CO2 emissions over the baseline requirements within Building Regulations Approved Document Part L. The development will further achieve 'zero carbon' through an offset payment in line with the London Plan guidance.

6.10.5 The development employs an efficient building fabric, mechanical ventilation heat recovery (MVHR), air source heat pumps for 100% space heating and minimum 70% hot water demand, gas boilers and PV panels. An Overheating Assessment has been submitted which details various measures that have been incorporated to minimise the risk of overheating as part of the overall energy strategy. Details of the proposed mitigation measures for the future weather will need to be modelled however the Council's Carbon Officer is satisfied this can be adequately addressed at a later stage, and as such this matter can be secured by condition.

6.10.6 The Council's Carbon Management Team supports the scheme based on its carbon reductions. The shortfall of the care home will need to be offset to achieve a zero-carbon target, in line with Policy SP4 (1). The estimated carbon offset contribution (£404,700 inclusive of 10% monitoring fee) will be subject to the detailed design stage. This figure would be secured by legal agreement should consent be granted.

6.10.7 A BREEAM Pre-Assessment for the care home has been submitted with the application with a score of 66.94% expected to be achieved, equivalent to 'Very Good' rating. A Design Stage accreditation certificate confirming that the development will achieve a BREEAM 'Very Good' outcome (or equivalent), aiming for 'Excellent' will be submitted at a later stage, but prior to the commencement of works, and as such this matter can be secured by condition should consent be granted.

Biodiversity

6.10.8 Consistent with the NPPF, London Plan Policy G6 seeks to ensure that development proposals manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain, while G5 requires major developments to contribute to urban greening. DPD Policy DM6 requires proposals for taller buildings to consider their ecological impact.

6.10.9 The site primarily comprises hardstanding, amenity grassland, shrubs and trees. The proposal would include comprehensive landscaping around the development including to the frontages along View Road and North Hill. Some of the new landscaping features will include a healing garden, water features, 8 new trees, green walls, paving, soft planting, semi-private terraces for the residence and accessible paths. Whilst these objectives are acceptable in principle, further information is required in respect of the soft landscaping and biodiversity provision. This can be secured by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission.

6.10.10 An Ecological Assessment Report has been submitted which comprises a desk study search for baseline information on designated sites, habitats and protected species, and a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) within the site has been prepared to current good practice guidance covering relevant legislation and policy. The Council's Nature Conservation Team has been consulted on the application and is satisfied that the development seeks to enhance ecological features. Whilst these objectives are acceptable in principle, further information is required in respect of proposed mitigation and enhancement measures. This can be secured by the imposition of a condition on any grant of planning permission.

Urban Greening Factor

6.11.3 Thames Water raises no objection with regards to foul water sewerage network infrastructure, surface water network infrastructure capacity, water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity. Thames Water recommend an informative regarding Thames Waters underground assets and water pressure

6.11.4 As such, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its water management arrangements subject to the relevant informative being imposed.

6.12 Air Quality and Land Contamination

Air Quality

6.12.1 DPD Policy DM23 requires all development to consider air quality and improve or mitigate the impact on air quality in the borough and users of the development. An Air Quality Assessment ('AQA') was prepared to support the planning application and concluded that future occupants would experience acceptable air quality with pollutant concentrations below the air quality objectives. It also highlighted that the air quality impacts from the proposed development during its construction phase would not be significant and that in air quality terms it would not conflict with national or local planning policies

6.12.2 Officers have reviewed this assessment and agree that while concerns raised about construction works are noted, these are temporary and can be mitigated through the requirements of the Air Quality and Dust Management Plan to include air quality control measures such as dust suppression. The proposal is not considered an air quality risk or harm to nearby residents, or future occupiers.

Land Contamination

6.12.3 DPD Policy DM23 (Part G) requires proposals to demonstrate that any risks associated with land contamination can be adequately addressed to make the development safe.

6.12.4 Prior to redevelopment of the site a desktop study will need to be carried out and include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, give those uses, and other relevant information.

6.12.5 As such, the Pollution Officer raises no objections to the proposal subject to the relevant conditions being imposed in respect of land contamination and unexpected contamination and an informative regarding asbestos should consent be granted.

6.13 Employment

6.13.1 Local Plan Policies SP8 and SP9 aim to support local employment, improve skills and training, and support access to jobs. The Council's Planning Obligations SPD

requires all major developments to contribute towards local employment and training.

6.13.2 There would be opportunities for borough residents to be trained and employed as part of the development's construction process. The Council requires the developer (and its contractors and sub-contractors) to notify it of job vacancies, to employ a minimum of 20% of the on-site workforce from local residents (including trainees nominated by the Council). These requirements would be secured by legal agreement should permission be granted.

6.13.3 As such, the development is acceptable in terms of employment provision.

6.14 Fire Safety

6.14.1 London Plan Policy D12 states that all major development proposals should be submitted with a Fire Statement, which is an independent fire strategy, produced by a third party, suitably qualified assessor. The applicant has submitted a fire safety strategy report which confirms that that fire safety details are sufficient for the purpose of planning. A formal detailed assessment will be undertaken for fire safety at the building control stage. The London Fire Brigade has confirmed that there are no objections to the application in respect of fire safety.

6.15 Conclusion

- The scheme optimises the potential of the site for a new modern care home (Class C2);
- The care home facility would provide traditional long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia palliative care), a well-being and physiotherapy centre and an area for residents to recuperate from surgery that will include specialist staff and tailored care;
- The impact of the development on residential amenity is acceptable;
- There would be no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding highway network or on car parking conditions in the area;
- The proposed development would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and not cause harm to it, it would be a high-quality design of an appropriate scale to its context and would respect the visual amenity of the streetscape and locality generally;
- The proposed scheme will be more sustainable and energy efficient than the existing buildings;
- The proposed development would result in the loss of 7 low grade trees but would be replaced with 8 newly planted trees - ensuring there is no net loss off trees. The 8 new trees will form part of a high quality and comprehensive landscaping scheme as part of the proposed development;
- The scheme would provide a number of section 106 obligations.

6.15.1 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7.0 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Based on the information provided the proposal is subject to a NIL rate for CIL.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS/ PLANNING CONDITIONS & INFORMATIVES

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions subject to conditions and subject to section 106 Legal Agreement

Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

01, 02, 11, 91, 92, 93 ,94, 101, 102, 103, 104 Rev A, 105 Rev A, 106 Rev A, 111 Rev C, 112 Rev B, 113 Rev C, 114 Rev C, 115 Rev A, 116, 121, 122, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137 Rev B, 141, 151 Rev A.152 Rev A, 153 Rev A, 154, 155, 156 Rev A, 157 Rev A, 158 Rev A, 159 Rev A, 160 Rev A, 161 Rev A, 162 Rev A, 163 Rev A, 165, 166, 167

Documents

Air Quality Assessment, November 2021 (Air Quality Consultants), Drainage Statement and Drainage Strategy, November 2021 (Ardent Consulting Engineers), Daylight and Sunlight Report, November 2021 (Delva Patman Redler), Design & Access Statement, November 2021 and Amended Design & Access Statement, May 2022, Planning Construction Method Statement, November 2021 (Elite Designers), Basement Impact Assessment, January 2022 (Soils Ltd and Elite Designers), Statement of Community Involvement, November 2021 (Forty Shillings), Illustrative Landscape Masterplan, November 2021 (Guarda Landscape), Landscape General Arrangement, November 2021 (Guarda Landscape), Planting Schedules, November 2021 (Guarda Landscape), Urban Greening Factor Plan, November 2021 (Guarda Landscape), Circular Economy

Statement, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy), Dynamic Overheating Report, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy), Energy Statement, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy), Sustainability Statement, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy), Whole Life Carbon Assessment, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy), GLA Whole Life Carbon Assessment Template, November 2021 (Hodkinson Consultancy) Fire Statement, November 2021 (Innovation Fire Engineering), Heritage Assessment, November 2021 (KM Heritage), Transport Assessment, November 2021 and Transport Addendum, March 2022 (Markides Associates), Planning Statement, November 2021 (ND Planning), Topographical Survey, March 2021 (Malcolm Hughes Chartered Land Surveyors), Arboricultural Impact Assessment, November 2021 and Updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment, March 2022 (Tyler Grange), Ecological Impact Assessment, November 2021 (Tyler Grange)

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, detailed drawings, including sections, to a scale of 1:20 to confirm the detailed design and materials of the:
 - a) Detailed elevational treatment;
 - b) Detailing of roof and parapet treatment;
 - c) Details of windows, which shall include a recess of at least 115mm and obscuring of the flank windows;
 - d) Details of entrances, which shall include a recess of at least 115mm;
 - e) Details and locations of rain water pipes; and
 - f) Details of balustrade

Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted.

Samples of brickworks, windows, roof, glazing, balustrade, should also be provided. A schedule of the exact product references for other materials. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with Policies DM1, DM8 and DM9 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017

4. Prior to occupation of the development details of exact finishing materials to the boundary treatments and site access controls shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval of the development hereby approved. Once approved the details shall be provided as agreed.

Reason: In order to provide a good quality local character, to protect residential amenity, and to promote secure and accessible environments in accordance with Policies DM1, DM2 and DM3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

- 5 Prior to the commencement of the development above slab level full details of both hard and soft landscape works that shall achieve an urban greening factor of 0.4 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and these works shall thereafter be carried out as approved. These details shall include information regarding, as appropriate:

- a) Proposed finished levels or contours;
- b) Means of enclosure;
- c) Hard surfacing materials;
- d) Minor artefacts and structures (e.g. Furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); and
- e) Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. Drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. Indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.).

Soft landscape works shall include:

- f) Planting plans;
- g) Written specifications (including details of cultivation and other operations associated with plant and/or grass establishment);
- h) Schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; and
- i) Implementation and management programmes.

The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed drawings of:

- j) Any new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species.

The approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy D4 and G1 of the London Plan, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1 and DM2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017

- 6 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved details of all external lighting to building facades, street furniture, communal and public realm areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Met Police. The agreed lighting scheme shall be installed as approved and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the design quality of the development and also to safeguard residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

- 7 No development shall proceed until details of all existing and proposed levels on the site in relation to the adjoining properties be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that any works in conjunction with the permission hereby granted respects the height of adjacent properties through suitable levels on the site.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of above ground works to 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. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a safe and secure development and reduce crime.

- 9 Prior to the first occupation of each building or part of a building or use, 'Secured by Design' certification shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or use.

Reason: To ensure a safe and secure development and reduce crime

- 10 Before development commences other than for investigative work:
 - a. A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information.

- b. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- c. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. 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 the remediation requirements.
- d. 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.
- e. Where remediation of contamination on the site is required, completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.

- 11 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 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.

- 12 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 NO_x 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

- 13 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 (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.

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 works;
 - ii. Details confirming the Plot has been registered at <http://nrmm.london>;
 - iii. Evidence of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant registration shall be available on site in the event of Local Authority Inspection;
 - iv. An inventory of NRMM currently on site (machinery should be regularly serviced, and service logs kept on site, which includes proof of emission limits for equipment for inspection);
 - v. A Dust Risk Assessment for the works; and
 - vi. Lorry Parking, in joint arrangement where appropriate.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Additionally, the site or Contractor Company must be registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the Local Planning Authority prior to any works being carried out.

Reason: To safeguard residential amenity, reduce congestion and mitigate obstruction to the flow of traffic, protect air quality and the amenity of the locality.”

- 14 Prior to installation, details of the gas boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40 mg/kWh (0%).

Reason: As required by The London Plan Policy 7.14.

- 15 Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility of the energy centre or centralised energy facility or other centralised combustion process and associated infrastructure shall be submitted in writing to and for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:

- a) location of the energy centre;

- b) specification of equipment;
- c) flue arrangement;
- d) operation/management strategy; and
- e) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any neighbouring heating network (including the proposed connectivity location, punch points through structure and route of the link)
- f) details of CHP engine efficiency

The Combined Heat and Power facility and infrastructure shall be constructed in accordance with the details approved, installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided and so that it is designed in a manner which allows for the future connection to a district system.

- 16 Prior to the commencement of above ground works a Construction Ecological Management Plan incorporating the mitigation and enhancements options from the Bat survey report shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In order to ensure that the authorised development makes a positive contribution to biodiversity in accordance with Policy G6 of the London Plan (2015), Policy SP13 of the Haringey Local Plan.

- 17 Prior to the commencement of above ground works a Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan to ensure the safeguarding of the proposed net gain shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In order to ensure that the authorised development makes a positive contribution to biodiversity in accordance with Policy G6 of the London Plan (2015), Policy SP13 of the Haringey Local Plan.

- 18 The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with Plan 2 -Tree Protection Plan prepared by Tyler Grange (Drawing No. 13786_P05 Rev A)

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

- 19 No development should take place until a arboricultural method statement for any works within the root protection areas is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

- 20 Prior to the commencement of above ground works a Landscape Plan and aftercare programme shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy D4 and G1 of the London Plan, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1 and DM2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017

- 21 The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the Energy Statement prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) delivering a minimum 62% improvement on carbon emissions over 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with SAP10 emission factors, high fabric efficiencies, air source heat pumps (ASHPs) for 100% space heating and minimum 70% hot water demand, and a minimum 14 kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) array.

(a) Prior to above ground construction, details of the Energy Strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must include:

- Confirmation of how this development will meet the zero-carbon policy requirement in line with the Energy Hierarchy;
- Confirmation of the necessary fabric efficiencies to achieve a minimum 29% reduction in carbon emissions, including details to reduce thermal bridging;
- Confirmation of the modelled heat losses from the heating pipework in corridors and bedrooms;
- Location, specification and efficiency of the proposed ASHPs (Seasonal Coefficient of Performance, Seasonal Performance Factor, Seasonal Energy Efficiency Rating), with plans showing the ASHP pipework and mitigation measures (noise, exhaust, visual);
- Specification and efficiency of the proposed Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (MVHR), with plans showing the rigid MVHR ducting and location of the units;
- Details of the PV, demonstrating the roof area has been maximised, with the following details: 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);
- A metering strategy.

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. The solar PV array shall be installed with monitoring equipment prior to completion and shall be maintained at least annually thereafter.

(b) Within six months of first occupation, evidence that the solar PV and ASHPs installation has/have been installed correctly shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, including photographs of the solar array, a six-month energy generation statement, 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.

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 (2017) Policies SP4 and DM22.

22 All gas boilers that are to be installed throughout the development shall achieve a minimum seasonal space heating energy efficiency rating of 92% as defined under the Energy-related Performance Directive (ErP), without relying on additional technologies to control the operation of the boiler. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance by supplying installation specification within three months post-completion of the development. Once installed these boilers shall be operated and maintained as such thereafter.

The use of the gas boilers shall be restricted to 30% of hot water demand only during the operation of the development, if and when the capacity cannot solely be met by the air source heat pump system.

Reason: In the interest of reducing the impacts of climate change, in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy SI2, and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.

23 (a) Prior to above ground works, an updated Overheating Report modelling future weather files shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall assess the future overheating risk and propose a retrofit plan. This assessment shall be based on the Dynamic Overheating Report prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021).

This report shall include:

- Further modelling of units modelled based on CIBSE TM59, using the CIBSE TM49 London Weather Centre files for: DSY1 2050s, high emissions, 50% percentile;
- Modelling of mitigation measures required to pass future weather files, clearly setting out which measures will be delivered before occupation and which measures will form part of the retrofit plan;
- Confirmation that the retrofit measures can be integrated within the design (e.g., if there is space for pipework to allow the retrofitting of cooling and

ventilation equipment), setting out mitigation measures in line with the Cooling Hierarchy.

(b) Prior to occupation, the development must be built in accordance with the approved overheating measures and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development:

- Natural ventilation
- MVHR with summer bypass
- Glazing g-value of 0.30
- External shading including pergola structures on internal courtyard
- No active cooling (except for specialist dayrooms, foyer and restaurant).

Reason: In the interest of reducing the impacts of climate change, to enable the Local Planning Authority to assess overheating risk and to ensure that any necessary mitigation measures are implemented prior to construction, and maintained, in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy S14 and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.

24 (a) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the living roof(s) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Living roofs must be planted with flowering species that provide amenity and biodiversity value at different times of year. Plants must be grown and sourced from the UK and all soils and compost used must be peat-free, to reduce the impact on climate change. The submission shall include:

- i) A roof plan identifying where the living roof(s) will be located;
- ii) A section demonstrating settled substrate levels of no less than 120mm for extensive living roofs (varying depths of 120-180mm);
- ii) Roof plans annotating details of the substrate: showing at least two substrate types across the roof, annotating contours of the varying depths of substrate
- iii) Details of the proposed type of invertebrate habitat structures with a minimum of one feature per 30m² of living roof: substrate mounds and 0.5m high sandy piles in areas with the greatest structural support to provide a variation in habitat; semi-buried log piles / flat stones for invertebrates with a minimum footprint of 1m², rope coils, pebble mounds of water trays;
- iv) Details on the range and seed spread of native species of (wild)flowers and herbs (minimum 10g/m²) and density of plug plants planted (minimum 20/m² with roof ball of plugs 25m³) to benefit native wildlife, suitable for the amount of direct sunshine/shading of the different living roof spaces. The living roof will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native);
- v) Roof plans and sections showing the relationship between the living roof areas and photovoltaic array; and
- vi) Management and maintenance plan, including frequency of watering arrangements.

(b) Prior to the occupation of the development, evidence must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that the living roof has been delivered in line with the details set out in point (a). This evidence shall include photographs demonstrating the measured depth of substrate, planting and biodiversity measures. If the Local Planning Authority finds that the living roof(s) have not been delivered to the approved standards, the applicant shall rectify this to ensure it complies with the condition. The living roof(s) shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved management arrangements.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and supports the water retention on site during rainfall. In accordance with London Plan (2021) Policies G1, G5, G6, SI1 and SI2 and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4, SP5, SP11 and SP13.

25 (a) Prior to commencement of development, a design stage accreditation certificate must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development will achieve a BREEAM “Very Good” outcome (or equivalent), aiming for “Excellent”. The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance with the details so approved, shall achieve the agreed rating and shall be maintained as such thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

(b) Within three months prior to occupation of development, a post-construction certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment must be submitted to the local authority for approval, confirming this standard has been achieved.

In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the development, a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the Local Authority’s approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.

Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policies SI2, SI3 and SI4, and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.

26 No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until details regarding the movement monitoring that will be undertaken at the adjacent properties is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how the contractor will mitigate the following;

Only the approved details shall be implemented and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and safety, and policy DM18 of the Haringey DM DPD 2017

- 27 No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a detailed construction management plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Only the approved details shall be implemented and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and safety, and policy DM18 of the Haringey DM DPD 2017

- 28 Cycle parking must be provided in line with the London Plan and the design and implementation must be in line with the London Cycle Design Standards as produced by TfL.

Reason – to ensure high quality long and short stay cycle parking for employees and visitors and contribute towards the uptake of active travel modes

- 29 A Construction Logistics Plan will be required, to be submitted three months before commencement of the works on site. The Construction Logistics Plan shall include:

- a survey of the existing conditions of adjacent public highways;
- an assessment of the cumulative impacts of demolition and construction traffic;
- details of the likely volume of demolition and construction trips and any mitigation measures;
- site access and exit arrangements including wheel washing facilities and swept paths where required;
- vehicular routes, booking systems and an assessment for the scope of consolidating loads to reduce generated road trips;
- proposed temporary access and parking suspensions and any temporary access and parking solutions required;
- Site compound arrangements including arrival of vehicles, parking, loading, storage and waste arrangements;
- methods for of protection of adjacent highway infrastructure; and,
- an assessment of all matters as are likely to cause nuisance to adjoining occupiers (including but not limited to; noise, dust, smoke, road cleaning, odour control) accompanied by mitigation measures addressing all matters relevant to this particular site.

Works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Logistics Plan.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area, the local highway and manage the impacts of the development.

- 30 The Gym can only be used by residents of the proposed care home facility or patrons of day the treatment centre.

Reason- To reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads.

- 31 The outpatients facility should only be opened to patients between the hour of 08:00 to 18:30 hours, and should have no more than 7 treatment rooms and no more than 67 appointments per day.

Reason - To reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads.

- 32 The placement of a satellite dish or television antenna on any external surface of the development is precluded, with the exception of a communal solution for the residential units details of which are to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. The provision shall be retained as installed thereafter.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the locality in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

- 33 Prior to the implementation of the permission, details of any extract fans or flues shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of use".

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties

- 34 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order, the care home shall be occupied by Use Class C2 only with a smaller component accounting for a well-being and physiotherapy centre. and shall not be used for any other purpose, unless approval is obtained to a variation of this condition through the submission of a planning application

Reason: In order to restrict the use of the premises in the interest of the amenities of the area in line with DM1 of the Haringey DM DPD 2017.

- 35 Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, no telecommunications apparatus shall be installed on the building without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to control the visual appearance of the development.

- 36 The proposed development should include appropriate fire safety solutions and represent best practice in fire safety planning in both design and management and should include a more detailed fire strategy/fire engineered design in order to satisfy Part B of the Building Regulations – Fire Safety. This will be subject to a more detailed check by Building Control and the Fire Authority.

Reason: In the interest of fire safety to comply with London Plan Policy D12

- 37 Noise arising from the use of any plant and associated equipment shall not increase the existing background noise level (LA90 15mins) when measured (LAeq 15mins) 1 metre external from the nearest residential or noise sensitive premises. The applicant shall also ensure that vibration/structure borne noise derived from the use of any plant or equipment does not cause nuisance within any residential unit or noise sensitive premises.

Reason: To protect residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE:

In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

INFORMATIVE :

Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE:

Party Wall Act: The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE:

The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE:

The London Fire Brigade strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposals relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to businesses and housing providers, and can reduce the risk to life. The Brigade opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems in order to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupier. .

INFORMATIVE:

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. 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.

INFORMATIVE:

The applicant must seek the advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) to achieve accreditation. The services of MPS DOCOs are available free of charge and can be contacted via docomailbox.ne@met.police.uk or 0208 217 3813.

INFORMATIVE:

The proposed development is located within 15 metres of Thames Waters underground assets and as such, the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are 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 Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to

Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

INFORMATIVE:

Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minum 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.

INFORMATIVE:

There is Institution of Structural Engineers Guidance for the design and detailing of ramps and underground car parks and the applicant will need to adhere to this.

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses - internal and external consultees and Neighbour Representations

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
Design	<p>Thank you for asking for my comments on this application. I have been involved in extensive pre-application discussions on these proposals, in addition to two Haringey Quality Review Panel (QRP) reviews, and am confident it is an excellent design of the highest quality, eminently suitable for the sensitive location and proposed use.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposals would replace an ad-hoc series of modified and outdated purpose built buildings that make little contribution or act as detractors from the Conservation Area, with contemporary specialist care accommodation designed to accommodate sensitive users to the highest modern standards, in a building of architecture that adapts to the different contexts of the different sides of the development. The North Hill frontage takes the form of a contemporary reinterpretation of the prevailing Georgian architecture, particularly as found in the Statutory Listed adjacent terrace immediately to the north of the site, whilst the View Road frontage takes the form of a contemporary reinterpretation of the Arts & Crafts architecture of many of the original grand detached houses in that street, including the immediate neighbour to the west.</p> <p><u>Massing and Roofscape</u> All the specific concerns raised by officers and the QRP have been satisfactorily addressed. The roof line and roof profile has been improved by reducing the ridge level of the two side wings facing View Road, with the proportion hipped made more comfortable, a gabled bay introduced on the garden side, and roof top plant has been relocated from the flat roofed area between the north Hill block and the main block to a secluded area within the pitched roofed volume, making it virtually invisible and any sound well dampened from any neighbours. Overall, the pitched roof form will appear from View Road and surrounding properties to be in a comfortable proportion in relation to the building. The panel welcomed the footprint and North Hill massing and officers agree that the proposed footprint, massing and roofscape are all appropriate.</p> <p><u>Landscape Design</u></p>	Comments noted

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>As the QRP notes, the proposal involves some modest reduction on overall area devoted to landscaping compared to the lavishly landscaped existing former care home, but following modifications is pulled well away from boundaries to neighbours' gardens and is in any case well screened by trees on all those boundaries. The concepts and details proposed for landscape design have been welcomed by the panel and officers, and will be further controlled in conditions.</p> <p><u>Scheme layout and quality of accommodation</u> A major change since the last QRP was to, as requested by the panel, relocate the restaurant to the ground floor facing the main garden area, with various medical treatment suites moved to the lower ground. Communal spaces and terraces to the upper floors have also been refined so that the main garden elevation will be animated by those main social, communal rooms and terraces. Circulation and layout of the treatment suites in the North Hill block have also been refined, including improving natural light to circulation, with servicing and refuse storage better defined and disguised. Overall the panel and officers agree that the quality and layout of proposed accommodation is now excellent.</p> <p><u>Architectural Expression</u> Since the last QRP there have been further refinements to the architectural expression, materials and architectural detailing, in consultation with officers, local ward members and Historic England, to all their satisfaction. This has included simplification of the northern elevation, replacing the proposed green wall with fenestration to circulation and brick recesses, and enriching detailing to both entrances, window surrounds, gables to View Road and walls to landscaping, especially in front of lightwells. All the above agreed that these changes were preferable and more successful to excessive use of use of different coloured bricks, resulting in a calm, well proportioned and well detailed proposal that responds well to different contexts.</p> <p>Other ideas discussed by the QRP included memory of Mary Fielding in the architecture, and the applicants have stated this will be done through artwork. The panel also suggested retention of the existing 1960s "brutalist" North Hill block on grounds of embodied carbon, but officers have always been supportive of its replacement, on grounds of its rather ugly architecture currently being a detractor from the conservation area, in the immediate context of a listed Georgian terrace, to which the proposed North Hill block, a contemporary reinterpretation of Georgian architecture. Overall, the applicants have produced detail on their low carbon design and environmental sustainability to the satisfaction of specialist officers.</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u> The proposals would replace existing buildings of varied quality in consistent high quality designs in contemporary reinterpretations of the local context Georgian and Arts & Crafts architecture, of a compatible and appropriate scale to the context, elegantly proportioned, in attractive, appropriate</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>materials and detailing, set in lush, high quality landscaping. Screening vegetation and distances will protect neighbours privacy, daylight and sunlight, and the quality of accommodation provided by the proposal will be spacious, comfortable, well laid out, well day lit and well connected to its landscaped setting.</p>	
Conservation	<p>This generous development site sits within Highgate Conservation Area and spans across North Hill and View Road, two thoroughfares with a different yet complementary historic townscape and character.</p> <p>On North Hill the existing care home building is flanked by a listed terrace, whereas it is adjoined on View Road by a locally listed house.</p> <p>The townscape along North Hill is characterised by the varied and down-sloping topography of The Bank, by the spacious road section, three to four storey buildings of various age well set-back from the pavement behind their front gardens.</p> <p>The main elevation of the existing office building of the Mary Feilding Guild Care Home fronts North Hill and forms part of this townscape.</p> <p>The existing office building on North Hill is linked through a series of utilitarian extension buildings to the original 1920's care home building fronting View Road; despite various side and rear alterations this historic building is deemed to be a positive contributor to the character of the CA.</p> <p>View Road is a quiet residential street where several listed and locally listed large houses comfortably set in large sites are complemented by leafy front gardens and generous, deep rear gardens and contribute to a more suburban character than the busy North Hill.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment of the Mary Feilding Guild Care Home rests on a thorough assessment of the architectural proportions, quality, heritage significance and conditions of the existing buildings and their site, a careful analysis of the existing topography and gardens forming part of a well-rounded and comprehensive site analysis.</p> <p>Both contextual analysis and the assessment of susceptibility to change and reuse of the original care home have demonstrated the need for and the benefits descending from the replacement and coherent redesign of both existing buildings, poorly proportioned and difficulty accessible interiors, dull office building fronting North Hill and scarcely accessible gardens. The loss of the much-altered original 1920s care home which provides a modest contribution to the character of the area along View Road would have a negligible negative impact on the character of the area and would lead to a low level of</p>	Comments noted

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>less than substantial harm that would be outweighed by the improved care home services and design quality that the proposed scheme provides.</p> <p>This contextual awareness and a solid experience in the design of specialist care homes have been the basis for a sound and successful design exploration aimed at maximising the site potential and providing an optimal level of accommodation with related amenities and a sensitive response to the historic townscape and urban context of the Conservation Area. The extensive pre-application discussion with council officers, review and local groups has informed a very specific design proposal that extends across the site replacing and optimising the footprint, plan form, masses and heights of the existing building, with a carefully proportioned new care home building that would benefit from a fully reconfigured and accessible soft and hard landscaped garden space that will pleasantly complement the architectural design of the new buildings. The whole project has been sensitively shaped, both externally and internally by the need to complement the historic townscape of the conservation area respectively on its North Hill and View Road frontages while expressing the genuinely contemporary character of the new care home.</p> <p>The proposed office building along North Hill retains the proportions of the existing one, which is bland and monolithic and offers a straightforward opportunity for improvement. The proposed design seizes this opportunity to enhance forms, functions, and setting of the listed terrace and introduces an interesting articulation of heights and masses and a facade design inspired by the adjacent Georgian terrace and softened by the elegantly multifaceted brickwork façade. The proposal has been carefully shaped and assessed in views across the conservation area along North Hill and by virtue of its sensitive design approach, it fully respects the architectural primacy and legibility of the listed terrace in its urban context and is supported from conservation grounds.</p> <p>The care home building fronting View Road respects the height of neighbouring houses and has been designed as contemporary reinterpretation of a suburban villa with symmetric façade, generous fenestration and an interesting roof articulation that draws inspiration from the traditional roofs, dormers, and prominent gables of the adjacent buildings. The subtly elaborated brick façade would be complemented by the soft landscaped garden hidden behind the retained boundary wall located on a raised street level along View Road where the proposed building will positively complement its varied context while retaining a number of established features of this part of the conservation area such as the enclosed nature of the View Road building, the suburban, residential, verdant character of View Road as well as featuring the established architectural forms and materials reinterpreted in a more contemporary key. The building fronting View Road is supported from the conservation perspective with encouragement to further refine the façade treatment, dormers, and porch.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>The proposed development has been rooted in deep understanding of the site potential and full awareness of the value of its heritage setting. It is a design proposal that creatively seizes the opportunities offered by this challenging and multifaceted heritage site through a conservation-led, context-responsive, well-articulated design concept that provides a specialist development response to this part of the conservation area, a well- founded design response that can be certainly refined and honed at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The submitted scheme will lead to a very low, less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation area and its assets while optimising the use of the site and its garden and while enhancing the townscape along North Hill and is therefore fully supported.</p>	
<p>Transportation</p>	<p><u>Application Proposal</u> This application seeks to demolish the existing Mary Feilding Guild Care Home which closed during 2021, and construct a new 70 bedroom care home with wellbeing and physiotherapy centre. Basement parking with 17 spaces is also proposed, created by extending the existing basement at the site.</p> <p>The existing home accommodated 43 rooms and was closed as considered unviable by the current owners.</p> <p>The new home will operate over 4 floors plus the basement, with reception on the ground floor, elderly care bedrooms on the first floor, dementia care on the second floor and the wellbeing centre on the third floor. Of the 70 rooms proposed, 43 will be for long stay patients and 27 short stay for post operative recuperation.</p> <p>The well being centre will include a hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon. There will be a mix of inpatient and outpatient/public use for these facilities.</p> <p><u>Location and access</u> The site is located to the western side of North Hill, at the junction of North Hill with View Road (to the northern side of the junction). The site has frontages to both North Hill and View Road.</p> <p>The site has a PTAL value of 3, considered 'moderate' access to public transport services. 5 different bus services are accessible within 2 to 8 minutes walk of the site, and Highgate Underground Station is a 9 minute walk away.</p>	<p>Observations have been taken into account. The Recommended legal agreement clauses and conditions will be included with any grant of planning permission as appropriate</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>It is also located within the Highgate Outer CPZ, which has operating hours of 10.00 to 12.00 Monday to Friday.</p> <p>At present there are two vehicle crossovers/accesses off view Road and one off North Hill. There are 3 parking spaces at the North Hill entrance and additional car parking is available within the site accessed from the crossovers off View Road.</p> <p>It is intended to retain the two crossovers off View Road to facilitate access to a drop off facility and also the basement parking. These appear to be retained as existing, there is no reference in the application to any physical changes to these highway accesses.</p> <p>The existing access on North Hill is no longer required, so the applicant will need to enter into the appropriate Highways Act Agreement to meet the physical and administrative costs of reinstating the crossover to full height kerb and footway. This can be covered by the S106 for the development.</p> <p>Pedestrian access will be primarily from the View Road side of the care home however it will also be possible from North Hill side of the site.</p> <p><u>Transportation Assessment</u></p> <p>A Transportation Assessment accompanied the application, a number of queries arising from this have been examined and discussed with the applicant, and a subsequent Transport Statement Addendum has been drafted and submitted by the applicant during March 2022 to update the proposals to reflect these discussions. Overall there will be an uplift in transportation demands and activity at the site given the expansion in room numbers and other services that will be available as proposed.</p> <p><u>Trip generation.</u></p> <p>The existing facility was a 43 bed care home, and with this larger proposal, and associated other facilities (wellbeing and physiotherapy centre), an uplift in trips to and from the site will occur.</p> <p>It is detailed that there will be 82 members of staff overall, with a maximum 38 employees at the care home during the 0900 – 1400 period, and up to 67 daily attendees for outpatient physiotherapy sessions at the wellbeing facility (operating 0700 – 1900). The Gym will be able to accommodate up to 13 users at any time.</p> <p>The application TA originally detailed the following with respect to predicted trips;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>218 two way trips daily, by all modes, 15 in the AM peak and 13 in the PM Peak hours.</i> • <i>26 two way trips are predicted for the busiest hourly period during the day (1400 – 1500)</i> 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Staff car mode share predicted to be 15% based on census journey to work records (9%) and TRICS survey information (10%), however this has been increased for robustness</i> • <i>A 10% turnover of patients is expected by day (7 arrivals/departures) with patient transport by ambulance</i> • <i>Visiting hours are to be 0900 – 1400 and 1800 – 1900, with 30% of patients having visitors per day. The TA assumes all patient visitors will drive to the care home.</i> • <i>The well being centre mode share is predicted to be 25% by car, based on a mix of gym users (expected to not use cars on the whole) and a proportion of rehab visitors using cars due to their medical difficulties.</i> <p>Following review of the trip generation predictions, Transportation have queried a number of aspects of it, which have been discussed with the applicant, and revised trip generation assumptions have now been provided within the transport addendum. These are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation consider that the 15% mode share proposed for staff is an underestimate, particularly with respect to staff that work shifts and travel in from outside of the Borough. The applicant has subsequently revisited this within the addendum taking into account journey to work census data from adjoining Boroughs and revised the mode share upwards to 41% for car journeys to work. • Evidence relating to visitor trips was requested to underpin the trip generation assumptions. • The gym was originally expected to be open for wider public use, however the applicant has now revised their proposals to no longer include ‘walk in’ use by the general public. <p><u>Car parking arrangements</u> At present, the site has 5 off street parking spaces accessed off North Hill.</p> <p>Basement car parking (17 spaces) is proposed at the site. 2 blue badge spaces are included along with two larger bays able to be converted to blue badge if required. An ambulance drop off bay is proposed at ground level accessed via the two crossovers off View Road. This bay can also be used for informal drop off and pick ups. 2 electric vehicle charging spaces are shown, there are no specific requirements in the London Plan or charging point provision for care homes.</p> <p>The ramp appears to start within the site several metres from the View Road crossover, and it is not expected that the proposed arrangement will create any highway or safety issues. The ramp appears to be able to accommodate two way vehicle movements and it is expected cyclists will access the</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>basement long stay cycle parking via the ramp or alternatively use one of the lifts. There is Institution of Structural Engineers Guidance for the design and detailing of ramps and underground car parks and the applicant will need to adhere to this.</p> <p><u>Car trips predicted to and from the site</u> Based on the revised 41% mode share for employees, the peak arrival numbers by staff driving is 13 vehicles during the period 0730 to 0800, and 12 vehicles during the period 1330 to 1430. The applicant considers these demands can be met by the parking available within the site.</p> <p>With respect to car trips made by visitors, the TA proposed similar to other surveyed sites, a rate of 30% visitors per day which would result in 22 car arrivals during visiting hours. The accumulation shows the peak numbers of cars attending in any hour to be 7 during the period between 12.00 and 14.00</p> <p>In addition to the above, there will also be car trips made by physiotherapy outpatients, during the period 0800 – 1830, and with 10 practitioners able to see 10 patients per hours/appointment, there will be additional car trips requiring parking during these periods.</p> <p>Taking the above components of car trips to and from the site into account, a revised vehicular trip generation has been derived within the transport addendum and this now predicts a peak car parking demand from the site for 39 vehicles during the 1300 – 1400 period, creating on street parking demands for 22 parking spaces.</p> <p><u>Local parking conditions and parking stress survey</u> The TA includes a parking stress survey, carried out for different daytime periods to match the AM/PM Peaks and expected shift changeovers. Recorded local parking levels are quite variable with some streets during the daytime appearing to be relatively low, with stresses off 28% to 38% recorded on View Road, 38 spaces available out of 61 on the road at the busiest time. It is also noted that very high stresses are recorded on North Hill Avenue, Church Road and Toyne Way, with stresses recorded upwards of 80% and up to 97% on these roads (based on a 5m car length).</p> <p><u>Car Parking impacts and mitigation required</u> With the revised trip generation applied and predicted numbers of cars that will attend either as employees, visitors or therapy/physio outpatients, there will be additional parking demands generated on street.</p> <p>There are very high parking stresses recorded on some streets within the stress survey and the predicted impacts arising from this proposal will need to be mitigated and managed. Therefore, it will</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>be appropriate for the following conditions and S106 contribution to be required should this be granted consent;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gym can only be used by residents of the proposed care home facility or patrons of day the treatment centre. • The outpatients facility should only be opened to patients between the hours of 08:00 to 18:30 hours, and should have no more than 7 treatment rooms and no more than 67 appointments per day. • The applicant will be required to contribute £20,000 towards parking management measures in the local area to deal with any potential overspill or parking outside the CPZ operational hours on Storey Road, North Hill, Church Road, Talbot Road and other roads within the local area. <p><u>Cycle parking</u> London Plan standards for care homes require 1 long stay space per 5 FTE staff and 1 visitor space per 20 bedrooms. The proposed provision numerically meets that. 8 long stay spaces are proposed for location in the basement, accessed via the ramp or alternatively from one of the available lifts to the basement.</p> <p>There is also the gym to be provided with this development, which will be able to be used by external individuals who book (no 'walk ups'). The London Plan requires 1 space per 8 staff, the staff numbers for the centre include gym staff so the long stay cycle parking for them is included. Short stay for the gym requires two spaces.</p> <p>Short stay spaces are to be provided at ground floor level and these appear to be located adjacent to the bin stores. 5 are referred to in the TA, however the waste arrangements drawing indicates ten spaces, it would seem that 4 are required for the care home and two for the gym, this does need to be clarified.</p> <p>The usage of cycle parking will be monitored under the travel plan and if demand requires Additional cycle parking will be able to be provided within the site.</p> <p>Full details of the proposed cycle parking arrangements will be required for review and approval prior to commencement of the development construction works and this can be covered by a pre commencement condition. Dimensioned drawings showing centres, spacing, manoeuvring space and</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>the like are required along with details of the system intended for use. All cycle parking will need to be designed to meet the requirements of the London Cycles Design Standards as produced by TfL.</p> <p><u>Deliveries and servicing</u> 4 delivery and servicing trips are predicted per day. A delivery bay is included within the basement for visiting service vehicles, and the ground level drop off bay can also be used. Servicing activity takes place from both North Hill and View Road at present, however with this proposal is it intended to take place from View Road Only, accommodated off of the highway.</p> <p><u>Refuse and recycling storage and collections</u> A private contractor will be used to make refuse and recycling collections, using a smaller vehicle than those used by the Council, and collections will be made from within the site utilising the internal drop off bay accessed off View Road.</p> <p><u>Travel plan</u> A full Travel Plan is appropriate for this development proposal, to ensure that the development proposal encourages travel by sustainable modes of transport to and from the development and is in line with the Councils Local Plan Policies SP1, SP4 and SP7. Provision of a Travel Plan is referenced within the TA, including a mechanism to monitor cycle parking and provide more if demands require. This can be covered by the S106 and a Travel Plan monitoring fee will be required.</p> <p><u>Construction phase</u> A comprehensive Construction Logistics Plan will be required for this development, and a condition requiring a detailed draft for submission and approval 3 months prior to proposed commencement of the works will be required.</p> <p>The applicant will need to detail how impacts on the public highway and adjacent neighbours will be minimised and managed, and it is strongly recommended the applicant engages with Haringey's Network Management officers to discuss and agree any temporary measures, routing to and from the site, and especially with regards to Highgate Primary school which is close by to the site.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> This application is for redevelopment of the Mary Feilding Guild Care Home site in Highgate, to provide a larger care home with accompanying wellbeing centre. A basement car park with 17 spaces is also included in the proposal.</p> <p>From the transportation perspective, this will increase trips compared to the previous establishment, but not to any extent that will be problematical for the capacity or functioning of local highway and</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>public transport networks. The onsite car parking should meet almost all of the potential demands from employees, however external parking demands will be generated by the combination of visitors and those attending the therapy and wellbeing services. These external demands will raise parking stresses in the locality of the site and will require mitigation as referenced earlier in this response, including restrictions on aspects of the services running at the site, and a financial contribution to investigate, design and implement parking management measures to manage these impacts.</p> <p>Long stay cycle parking is provided to meet London Plan standards, there is some ambiguity about the short stay provision however and this needs to be clarified. The details can be covered by a pre commencement cycle parking condition. All delivery and servicing, and refuse/recycling collections appear to be able to be accommodated off of the highway as well which is welcomed.</p> <p>Transportation has no objection to this application subject to the following;</p> <p><u>Conditions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cycle parking must be provided in line with the London Plan and the design and implementation must be in line with the London Cycle Design Standards as produced by TfL. <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Reason – to ensure high quality long and short stay cycle parking for employees and visitors and contribute towards the uptake of active travel modes</p> 2. A Construction Logistics Plan will be required, to be submitted three months before commencement of the works on site. The Construction Logistics Plan shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a survey of the existing conditions of adjacent public highways; • an assessment of the cumulative impacts of demolition and construction traffic; • details of the likely volume of demolition and construction trips and any mitigation measures; • site access and exit arrangements including wheel washing facilities and swept paths where required; • vehicular routes, booking systems and an assessment for the scope of consolidating loads to reduce generated road trips; • proposed temporary access and parking suspensions and any temporary access and parking solutions required; • Site compound arrangements including arrival of vehicles, parking, loading, storage and waste arrangements; • methods for of protection of adjacent highway infrastructure; and, • an assessment of all matters as are likely to cause nuisance to adjoining occupiers (including but not limited to; noise, dust, smoke, road cleaning, odour control) accompanied by mitigation measures addressing all matters relevant to this particular site. 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Logistics Plan. Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area, the local highway and manage the impacts of the development.</p> <p>3. The Gym can only be used by residents of the proposed care home facility or patrons of day the treatment centre. Reason- To reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads.</p> <p>4. The outpatients facility should only be opened to patients between the hour of 08:00 to 18:30 hours, and should have no more than 7 treatment rooms and no more than 67 appointments per day. Reason - To reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads.</p> <p><u>S106 Obligations</u></p> <p>1. The applicant will be required to submit a travel plan no less than 3 months before the development is occupied and will be required to pay a travel plan contribution of £2k per year for a period of 5 years.</p> <p>2. The applicant will be required to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority Reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access, and meet all of the Council's costs.</p> <p>3. The applicant will be required to contribute £20,000 towards parking management measures in the local area to deal with any potential overspill or parking outside the CPZ operational hours on Storey Road, North Hill, Church Road, Talbot Road and other roads within the local area.</p> <p>4. The development will need to be formally designated as 'permit free' with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ, with the applicant meeting the Council's costs of £4,000 to administer.</p>	
Lead Pollution	Having considered all the relevant supportive information on pollution especially the Air Quality Assessment Report with reference J10/13064/10/1/F2 prepared by Air Quality Consultants Ltd dated 26 th November 2021 taken note of sections 4 (Assessment Approach), 5 (Baseline Conditions), 8 (Air	Comments noted. Conditions/informative included

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Quality Neutral), 9 (Mitigation) and 10 (Conclusions), Energy Statement Report dated November 2021 with the proposed use of Air Source Heat Pumps and Gas Boilers as the main source of energy as well as considering the nature of the proposed development end use, landscapes and garden plan, 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.</p> <p>1. <u>Land Contamination</u> Before development commences other than for investigative work:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. b. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. c. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. 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 the remediation requirements. d. 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. e. Where remediation of contamination on the site is required, completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied. <p>Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.</p> <p>2. <u>Unexpected Contamination</u></p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. NRMM</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To protect local air quality and comply with Policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the GLA NRMM LEZ</p> <p>4. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The following applies to both Parts a and b above:</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>a) The DEMP/CEMP shall include a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP).</p> <p>b) The DEMP/CEMP shall provide details of how demolition/construction works are to be undertaken respectively and shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>c) The CLP will be in accordance with Transport for London's Construction Logistics Plan Guidance (July 2017) and shall provide details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>d) The AQDMP will be in accordance with the Greater London Authority SPG Dust and Emissions Control (2014) and shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mitigation measures to manage and minimise demolition/construction dust emissions during works; ii. Details confirming the Plot has been registered at http://nrmm.london; iii. Evidence of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and plant registration shall be available on site in the event of Local Authority Inspection; iv. An inventory of NRMM currently on site (machinery should be regularly serviced, and service logs kept on site, which includes proof of emission limits for equipment for inspection); 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>v. A Dust Risk Assessment for the works; and vi. Lorry Parking, in joint arrangement where appropriate.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Additionally, the site or Contractor Company must be registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the Local Planning Authority prior to any works being carried out.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard residential amenity, reduce congestion and mitigate obstruction to the flow of traffic, protect air quality and the amenity of the locality.”</p> <p>5. Combustion and Energy Plant Prior to installation, details of the gas boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40 mg/kWh (0%).</p> <p>Reason: As required by The London Plan Policy 7.14.</p> <p>6. Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Facility Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility of the energy centre or centralised energy facility or other centralised combustion process and associated infrastructure shall be submitted in writing to and for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) location of the energy centre; b) specification of equipment; c) flue arrangement; d) operation/management strategy; and e) the method of how the facility and infrastructure shall be designed to allow for the future connection to any neighbouring heating network (including the proposed connectivity location, punch points through structure and route of the link) f) details of CHP engine efficiency <p>The Combined Heat and Power facility and infrastructure shall be constructed in accordance with the details approved, installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Reason: To ensure the facility and associated infrastructure are provided and so that it is designed in a manner which allows for the future connection to a district system.</p> <p>Informative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. <p>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/521800.</p>	
Carbon Team	<p>Carbon Management Response 10/02/2022</p> <p>In preparing this consultation response, we have reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Statement prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) • Dynamic Overheating Report prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) • Sustainability Statement prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) • Circular Economy Statement prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) • Whole Life Carbon Assessment prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) • Relevant supporting documents. <p>1. Summary</p> <p>The development achieves a reduction of 62% carbon dioxide emissions on site, which is supported in principle after clarifications are provided. Clarifications must also be provided in regard to the Overheating Strategy and there are concerns over the resiliency of this development in more extreme weather events,</p> <p>Appropriate planning conditions will be recommended once this information has been provided.</p> <p>2. Energy – Overall</p> <p>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.</p>	Comments noted. Conditions and legal agreement Clauses included

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response																																										
	<p>The overall predicted reduction in CO₂ emissions for the development shows an improvement of approximately 62.2% 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 233.5 tonnes of CO₂ from a baseline of 375.5 tCO₂/year.</p> <p>London Plan Policy SI2 requires major development proposals to calculate and minimise unregulated carbon emissions, not covered by Building Regulations. The calculated unregulated emissions are: 69 tCO₂.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="499 540 1608 833"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>(SAP10 emission factors)</i></th> <th>tCO₂</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baseline emissions</td> <td>375.5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Be Lean savings</td> <td>110.2</td> <td>29.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Be Clean savings</td> <td>121</td> <td>32.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Be Green savings</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>0.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cumulative savings</td> <td>233.5</td> <td>62.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carbon shortfall to offset (tCO₂)</td> <td>142</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carbon offset contribution</td> <td colspan="2">£95 x 30 years x 142 tCO₂/year = £404,700 + 10% management fee</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Energy – Lean</p> <p>The applicant has proposed a saving of 125.2 tCO₂ in carbon emissions (28.5%) through improved energy efficiency standards in key elements of the build (unclear which carbon factors). This potentially goes beyond the minimum 15% reduction respectively set in London Plan Policy SI2.</p> <p>The following u-values, g-values and air tightness are proposed:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="499 1084 1665 1401"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Floor u-value</td> <td>0.10 W/m²K (above car park 0.15 W/m²K)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>External wall u-value</td> <td>0.18 W/m²K (wall to car park 0.25 W/m²K)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Roof u-value</td> <td>0.15 W/m²K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Door u-value</td> <td>1.80 W/m²K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Window u-value</td> <td>1.30 W/m²K</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G-value</td> <td>0.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Air permeability rate</td> <td>5 m³/hm² @ 50Pa</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ventilation strategy</td> <td>Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR >85% efficiency)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low energy lighting</td> <td>100 lum/Watt</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>(SAP10 emission factors)</i>	tCO ₂	%	Baseline emissions	375.5		Be Lean savings	110.2	29.3%	Be Clean savings	121	32.2%	Be Green savings	2.3	0.6%	Cumulative savings	233.5	62.2%	Carbon shortfall to offset (tCO₂)	142		Carbon offset contribution	£95 x 30 years x 142 tCO ₂ /year = £404,700 + 10% management fee		Floor u-value	0.10 W/m ² K (above car park 0.15 W/m ² K)	External wall u-value	0.18 W/m ² K (wall to car park 0.25 W/m ² K)	Roof u-value	0.15 W/m ² K	Door u-value	1.80 W/m ² K	Window u-value	1.30 W/m ² K	G-value	0.30	Air permeability rate	5 m ³ /hm ² @ 50Pa	Ventilation strategy	Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR >85% efficiency)	Low energy lighting	100 lum/Watt	
<i>(SAP10 emission factors)</i>	tCO ₂	%																																										
Baseline emissions	375.5																																											
Be Lean savings	110.2	29.3%																																										
Be Clean savings	121	32.2%																																										
Be Green savings	2.3	0.6%																																										
Cumulative savings	233.5	62.2%																																										
Carbon shortfall to offset (tCO₂)	142																																											
Carbon offset contribution	£95 x 30 years x 142 tCO ₂ /year = £404,700 + 10% management fee																																											
Floor u-value	0.10 W/m ² K (above car park 0.15 W/m ² K)																																											
External wall u-value	0.18 W/m ² K (wall to car park 0.25 W/m ² K)																																											
Roof u-value	0.15 W/m ² K																																											
Door u-value	1.80 W/m ² K																																											
Window u-value	1.30 W/m ² K																																											
G-value	0.30																																											
Air permeability rate	5 m ³ /hm ² @ 50Pa																																											
Ventilation strategy	Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR >85% efficiency)																																											
Low energy lighting	100 lum/Watt																																											

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response						
	<table border="1" data-bbox="499 233 1667 483"> <tr> <td data-bbox="499 233 968 261">Heating system (efficiency / emitter)</td> <td data-bbox="968 233 1667 261">Gas boiler (96% efficiency)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="499 261 968 418">Cooling strategy</td> <td data-bbox="968 261 1667 418">For specialist rooms that require controlled indoor temperatures. Air source heat pump (EER 4.0 and SEER of 6.5) 12 MJ/m² and 69,936 MJ/year area-weighted cooling demand</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="499 418 968 483">Wastewater</td> <td data-bbox="968 418 1667 483">Wastewater heat recovery system (54% efficiency, 8l/min flow rate)</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="499 516 596 544"><u>Actions:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="541 548 1675 824" style="list-style-type: none"> - Please identify on a plan where the MVHR units will be located within the spaces. The units should be less than 2m away from external walls if possible. - How is lighting energy demand improved? Should consider daylight control and occupancy sensors for communal areas. - Provide the average space heating requirement in kWh/m²/year. - Specify the individual end use BER for specific end users in line with CIBSE Guide F. - Active cooling is not acceptable unless the dynamic thermal simulation has demonstrated that this is required, after all other mitigation measures have been exhausted. The overheating assessment currently states that active cooling is not required. <p data-bbox="499 857 1381 885">Overheating and the demand for cooling is dealt with in more detail below.</p> <p data-bbox="499 917 709 945">Energy – Clean</p> <p data-bbox="499 950 1640 1010">The site is not within reasonable distance of a proposed Decentralised Energy Network (DEN). A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant would not be appropriate for this site.</p> <p data-bbox="499 1042 1667 1102">Instead, the applicant has proposed a low-carbon heat network for this development, based on air source heat pumps (ASHPs):</p> <ul data-bbox="541 1107 1486 1230" style="list-style-type: none"> - 70% primary source, baseload supply by 204 kW ASHPs (SCOP 3.15) - 30% backup supply of peak energy by 102 kW gas boilers (efficiency 96%) - Operating temperatures of 55/47°C - Thermal stores and other ancillary plants in 102 m² plant room. <p data-bbox="499 1263 596 1291"><u>Actions:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="541 1295 1675 1383" style="list-style-type: none"> - How will the system be managed to prioritise the use of ASHPs over gas boilers? - Please see where the pipes will run. How will heat losses from the pipework be minimised? - How large will the thermal store be? 	Heating system (efficiency / emitter)	Gas boiler (96% efficiency)	Cooling strategy	For specialist rooms that require controlled indoor temperatures. Air source heat pump (EER 4.0 and SEER of 6.5) 12 MJ/m ² and 69,936 MJ/year area-weighted cooling demand	Wastewater	Wastewater heat recovery system (54% efficiency, 8l/min flow rate)	
Heating system (efficiency / emitter)	Gas boiler (96% efficiency)							
Cooling strategy	For specialist rooms that require controlled indoor temperatures. Air source heat pump (EER 4.0 and SEER of 6.5) 12 MJ/m ² and 69,936 MJ/year area-weighted cooling demand							
Wastewater	Wastewater heat recovery system (54% efficiency, 8l/min flow rate)							

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response								
	<p>Energy – Green As part of the Be Green carbon reductions, all new developments must achieve a minimum reduction of 20% from on-site renewable energy generation to comply with Policy SP4.</p> <p>The application has reviewed the installation of various renewable technologies. The report concludes that air source heat pumps (included under Be Clean) and solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are the most viable options to deliver the Be Green requirement. A total of 2.3 tCO₂ (0.6%) reduction of emissions are proposed under Be Green measures.</p> <p>The solar array peak output would be 14 kWp. The array of panels would be mounted the third-floor roof at a 15° angle, facing south-west/south-east.</p> <p>3. Carbon Offset Contribution A carbon shortfall of 142 tCO₂/year remains. The remaining carbon emissions will need to be offset at £95/tCO₂ over 30 years: £404,700 + 10% management fee.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In accordance with the Energy Assessment Guidance, the applicant has undertaken a dynamic thermal modelling assessment, and the cooling hierarchy has been followed in the design. The report has modelled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11 bedrooms under CIBSE TM59 - 3 communal areas (ground floor central hub, 2nd floor dining room, 2nd floor lounge) under CIBSE TM52 - Using the TM49 London Heathrow files, high emissions, 50% percentile scenario - Assessed against Category I criteria of the adaptive method (vulnerable occupants). <p>Results are listed in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="499 1317 1703 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="499 1317 701 1409"></th> <th data-bbox="701 1317 1068 1409">Number of habitable rooms pass TM59 (bedrooms)</th> <th data-bbox="1068 1317 1346 1409">Number of spaces pass TM52 (communal areas)</th> <th data-bbox="1346 1317 1703 1409">Number of corridors pass</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="499 1409 701 1409"></td> <td data-bbox="701 1409 1068 1409"></td> <td data-bbox="1068 1409 1346 1409"></td> <td data-bbox="1346 1409 1703 1409"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of habitable rooms pass TM59 (bedrooms)	Number of spaces pass TM52 (communal areas)	Number of corridors pass					
	Number of habitable rooms pass TM59 (bedrooms)	Number of spaces pass TM52 (communal areas)	Number of corridors pass							

Stakeholder	Question/Comment			Response
	DSY1 2020s	11/11	3/3	
DSY2 2020s	1/11	0/3	Not modelled	
DSY3 2020s	0/11	0/3		
<p>All rooms pass the overheating requirements for 2020s DSY1. In order to pass this, the following measures will be built:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural ventilation - MVHR – stated in Energy Strategy - Glazing g-value of 0.30 - External shading: balconies and some pergola structures (on internal courtyard only) - No active cooling <p>Proposed future mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacement windows with higher thermal performance (such as triple glazing and/or panes with a lower g-value); - Installing solar reflective internal blinds - Allow for installation of active cooling in ceiling voids - Planting additional trees and green areas <p><u>Overheating Actions:</u></p> <p>Modelling inputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The overheating report does not mention anything about mechanical ventilation with heat recovery, has this been included? Does it have a summer bypass? - What are the openable areas of the windows? - What heat losses have been assumed from the communal heating pipework? - What secure by design measures have been included in the design to prevent the risk of crime to ground floor dwellings? Will these windows be openable at night? <p>Additional modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please model the top floor corridor. - The applicant should also model the ground floor café (south and westerly aspects). - The DSY1 2050s weather file has not been modelled and this should help inform what mitigation measures may be appropriate to implement now, and in the future (see the point below about resiliency in more extreme weather events). <p>Modelling results/mitigation measures</p>				

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Energy Strategy notes that cooling is required for specialised rooms without specifying what that means and which rooms this would concern. This has not been cross-referenced in this report. The overheating assessment should first model the baseline without active cooling, and after all mitigation measures following the Cooling Hierarchy have been exhausted, can active cooling be proposed. - Although the spaces pass the minimum requirement with 2020s DSY1 weather file, future modelling shows a lack of resiliency against more extreme and different types of heatwaves. The applicant is strongly advised to improve the resiliency of this development as it concerns vulnerable residents. - In addition, the future mitigation measures are helpful, but can the applicant please demonstrate how this will improve the overheating results in the future? - Please demonstrate that sufficient space been left within the ceiling voids to install any necessary additional ventilation/cooling equipment. - Identify communal spaces (indoor and outdoor) where residents can cool down if their flats are overheating. - Confirm who will own the overheating risk when the building is occupied (not the residents). <p>5. Sustainability</p> <p>Policy DM21 of the Development Management Document requires developments to demonstrate sustainable design, layout and construction techniques. The Sustainability section in the report sets out the proposed measures to improve the sustainability of the scheme, including transport, health and wellbeing, materials and waste, water consumption, flood risk and drainage, biodiversity, climate resilience, energy and CO2 emissions and landscape design.</p> <p><u>Action:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will bicycle users have the opportunity to safely park and charge e-bikes if they have one? Some users may prefer e-bikes due to the hilly nature of Highgate. - It is noted that more car parking will be provided than cycle parking, please include justification for this difference in approach. - Climate change mitigation should also be considered for the external spaces (shading, etc) and the impact of the increase in severity and frequency of weather events on the building structures. <p><i>Non-Domestic BREEAM Requirement</i></p> <p>Policy SP4 requires all new non-residential developments to achieve a BREEAM rating 'Very Good' (or equivalent), although developments should aim to achieve 'Excellent' where achievable.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response									
	<p>The applicant has also prepared a BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report for the care home. Based on this report, a score of 66.94% is expected to be achieved, equivalent to 'Very Good' rating.</p> <p>Living roofs All development sites must incorporate urban greening within their fundamental design, in line with London Plan Policy G5. The development is proposing living roofs in the development.</p> <p>All landscaping proposals and living roofs should stimulate a variety of planting species. Mat-based, sedum systems are discouraged as they retain less rainfall and deliver limited biodiversity advantages. The growing medium for extensive roofs must be 120-150mm deep, and at least 250mm deep for intensive roofs (these are often roof-level amenity spaces) to ensure most plant species can establish and thrive and can withstand periods of drought. Living walls should be rooted in the ground with sufficient substrate depth.</p> <p>Living roofs are supported in principle, subject to detailed design. Details for living roofs will need to be submitted as part of a planning condition.</p> <p>Biodiversity The development achieves an Urban Greening Factor of 0.42, which complies with the interim minimum target of 0.4 for predominantly residential developments in London Plan Policy G5.</p> <p>Whole Life Carbon Policy SI2 requires developments referable to the Mayor of London to submit a Whole Life Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions undertaken to reduce life-cycle emissions. This application is not required to submit a full statement, however a report was submitted nevertheless.</p> <p>The total calculated emissions based on the GIA (without grid decarbonisation) is estimated at:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="499 1096 1696 1318"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Estimated carbon emissions</th> <th>Meets benchmark?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Modules A1-A5</td> <td>445 kgCO₂e/m²</td> <td>Meets GLA target (800 kgCO₂e/m²) and aspirational benchmark (450-500 kgCO₂e/m²) Meets LETI aspirational target (500 kgCO₂e/m²)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Modules B-C (excl. B6 and B7)</td> <td>331 kgCO₂e/m²</td> <td>Meets GLA target (400 kgCO₂e/m²) Misses LETI aspirational target (240 kgCO₂e/m²)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Potential savings could amount to savings of 172 or 181 kgCO₂/m²GIA (two figures cited):</p>		Estimated carbon emissions	Meets benchmark?	Modules A1-A5	445 kgCO ₂ e/m ²	Meets GLA target (800 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) and aspirational benchmark (450-500 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) Meets LETI aspirational target (500 kgCO ₂ e/m ²)	Modules B-C (excl. B6 and B7)	331 kgCO ₂ e/m ²	Meets GLA target (400 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) Misses LETI aspirational target (240 kgCO ₂ e/m ²)	
	Estimated carbon emissions	Meets benchmark?									
Modules A1-A5	445 kgCO ₂ e/m ²	Meets GLA target (800 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) and aspirational benchmark (450-500 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) Meets LETI aspirational target (500 kgCO ₂ e/m ²)									
Modules B-C (excl. B6 and B7)	331 kgCO ₂ e/m ²	Meets GLA target (400 kgCO ₂ e/m ²) Misses LETI aspirational target (240 kgCO ₂ e/m ²)									

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced material use: concrete as finish, future dismantling, durable materials, maintenance and repair schedule - Recycled materials: innovative cement mixed, end-of-life concrete recycling, steel with high recycled content - Re-use of materials - Sustainable procurement <p><i>Circular Economy</i> Policy SI7 requires applications referable to the Mayor of London to submit a Circular Economy Statement demonstrating how it promotes a circular economy within the design and aim to be net zero waste. Haringey Policy SP6 requires developments to seek to minimise waste creation and increase recycling rates, address waste as a resource and requires major applications to submit Site Waste Management Plans.</p> <p>This application is not required to submit a full statement. The principles used for this development are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Material efficiency and lean design principles - Design adaptability and flexibility - Structural and fabric robustness and resilience - Material circularity, material procurement via leasing frameworks and enabling ease for disassembly and maintenance - Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessments - Tenant and community engagement <p>The report sets out the Key Commitments and the draft Bill of materials (Table 4-2).</p> <p>Planning Conditions To be secured (with detailed wording TBC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy strategy - Overheating - BREEAM Certificate - Living roofs - Biodiversity <p>Planning Obligations Heads of Terms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be Seen commitment to uploading energy data - Energy Plan and Sustainability Review 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £404,700 (indicative), plus a 10% management fee (based on £2,850 per tonne of carbon emissions) <p>Carbon Management Response 15/03/2022</p> <p>In preparing this consultation response, we have reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on the CM response issued 10th February (dated 18 February 2022) • Relevant supporting documents. <p>Energy Strategy</p> <p>Be Lean The applicant has clarified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MVHR to serve office areas consult, gym, studios, barbers, hair and beauty, reception, shop, admin, café, manager, restaurant, servery, treatment/medical room, lounge, staff room and juice bar - Space heating demand at 8.87 kWh/m²/year seems low, how has this been calculated? - Cooling is only proposed for a few specialist rooms (not defined where), and not for bedrooms, transitory spaces or generally unoccupied spaces. <p>Be Clean The applicant has clarified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ASHP will provide 100% of space heating requirement and 70% of the hot water provision. Gas boilers will supply the remaining demand at peak times (weekday mornings and evenings). <p>Overheating The applicant has clarified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MVHR and MEV has been included in the model. - Windows are assumed to be fully openable to a minimum 60 degrees. Secure by Design principles have been followed according to the applicant. Ground floor openable windows will be restricted to 100mm to ensure resident safety. - Heat loss calculations have not yet been undertaken. This will be conditioned. - Sufficient space is included in the ceiling voids for necessary ventilation/cooling equipment. It assumes an internal floor-to-ceiling height of 2.6m (basement and ground floor) or 2.4m (upper floors) with voids of c. 688mm and 588mm respectively. However, the London Design 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Guide advocates for minimum internal floor-to-ceiling heights of 2.5m, so the space would not be sufficient on upper floors.</p> <p>The applicant states that modelling of the top floor corridor is not required, which goes against requirements in the GLA Energy Assessment Guidance and CIBSE TM59. Only one of the corridors is required for testing, this will be conditioned.</p> <p>The applicant has not modelled DSY1 2050s weather file, which was requested at pre-application stage. The proposed mitigation measures for the future have also not been modelled. This will be conditioned.</p> <p>Conditions <u>Energy Strategy</u> <i>The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the Energy Statement prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021) delivering a minimum 62% improvement on carbon emissions over 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with SAP10 emission factors, high fabric efficiencies, air source heat pumps (ASHPs) for 100% space heating and minimum 70% hot water demand, and a minimum 14 kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) array.</i></p> <p><i>(a) Prior to above ground construction, details of the Energy Strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Confirmation of how this development will meet the zero-carbon policy requirement in line with the Energy Hierarchy;</i> - <i>Confirmation of the necessary fabric efficiencies to achieve a minimum 29% reduction in carbon emissions, including details to reduce thermal bridging;</i> - <i>Confirmation of the modelled heat losses from the heating pipework in corridors and bedrooms;</i> - <i>Location, specification and efficiency of the proposed ASHPs (Seasonal Coefficient of Performance, Seasonal Performance Factor, Seasonal Energy Efficiency Rating), with plans showing the ASHP pipework and mitigation measures (noise, exhaust, visual);</i> - <i>Specification and efficiency of the proposed Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (MVHR), with plans showing the rigid MVHR ducting and location of the units;</i> - <i>Details of the PV, demonstrating the roof area has been maximised, with the following details: 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);</i> - <i>A metering strategy.</i> 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p><i>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. The solar PV array shall be installed with monitoring equipment prior to completion and shall be maintained at least annually thereafter.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Within six months of first occupation, evidence that the solar PV and ASHPs installation has/have been installed correctly shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, including photographs of the solar array, a six-month energy generation statement, and a Microgeneration Certification Scheme certificate.</i></p> <p><i>(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.</i></p> <p><i>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 (2017) Policies SP4 and DM22.</i></p> <p><u><i>Gas boiler(s)</i></u> <i>All gas boilers that are to be installed throughout the development shall achieve a minimum seasonal space heating energy efficiency rating of 92% as defined under the Energy-related Performance Directive (ErP), without relying on additional technologies to control the operation of the boiler. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance by supplying installation specification within three months post-completion of the development. Once installed these boilers shall be operated and maintained as such thereafter.</i></p> <p><i>The use of the gas boilers shall be restricted to 30% of hot water demand only during the operation of the development, if and when the capacity cannot solely be met by the air source heat pump system.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: In the interest of reducing the impacts of climate change, in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy SI2, and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.</i></p> <p><u><i>Overheating</i></u> <i>(a) Prior to above ground works, an updated Overheating Report modelling future weather files shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall assess the future overheating risk and propose a retrofit plan. This assessment shall be based on the Dynamic Overheating Report prepared by Hodkinson (dated November 2021).</i></p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p><i>This report shall include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further modelling of units modelled based on CIBSE TM59, using the CIBSE TM49 London Weather Centre files for: DSY1 2050s, high emissions, 50% percentile; - Modelling of mitigation measures required to pass future weather files, clearly setting out which measures will be delivered before occupation and which measures will form part of the retrofit plan; - Confirmation that the retrofit measures can be integrated within the design (e.g., if there is space for pipework to allow the retrofitting of cooling and ventilation equipment), setting out mitigation measures in line with the Cooling Hierarchy. <p><i>(b) Prior to occupation, the development must be built in accordance with the approved overheating measures and retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural ventilation - MVHR with summer bypass - Glazing g-value of 0.30 - External shading including pergola structures on internal courtyard - No active cooling (except for specialist dayrooms, foyer and restaurant). <p><i>REASON: In the interest of reducing the impacts of climate change, to enable the Local Planning Authority to assess overheating risk and to ensure that any necessary mitigation measures are implemented prior to construction, and maintained, in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy SI4 and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.</i></p> <p><u><i>Living roofs</i></u></p> <p><i>(a) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the living roof(s) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Living roofs must be planted with flowering species that provide amenity and biodiversity value at different times of year. Plants must be grown and sourced from the UK and all soils and compost used must be peat-free, to reduce the impact on climate change. The submission shall include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i) A roof plan identifying where the living roof(s) will be located;</i> <i>ii) A section demonstrating settled substrate levels of no less than 120mm for extensive living roofs (varying depths of 120-180mm);</i> <i>ii) Roof plans annotating details of the substrate: showing at least two substrate types across the roof, annotating contours of the varying depths of substrate</i> <i>iii) Details of the proposed type of invertebrate habitat structures with a minimum of one feature per 30m² of living roof: substrate mounds and 0.5m high sandy piles in areas with the greatest structural support to provide a variation in habitat; semi-buried log piles / flat stones for invertebrates with a minimum footprint of 1m², rope coils, pebble mounds of water trays;</i> 	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p><i>iv) Details on the range and seed spread of native species of (wild)flowers and herbs (minimum 10g/m²) and density of plug plants planted (minimum 20/m² with roof ball of plugs 25m³) to benefit native wildlife, suitable for the amount of direct sunshine/shading of the different living roof spaces. The living roof will not rely on one species of plant life such as Sedum (which are not native);</i></p> <p><i>v) Roof plans and sections showing the relationship between the living roof areas and photovoltaic array; and</i></p> <p><i>vi) Management and maintenance plan, including frequency of watering arrangements.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Prior to the occupation of the development, evidence must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that the living roof has been delivered in line with the details set out in point (a). This evidence shall include photographs demonstrating the measured depth of substrate, planting and biodiversity measures. If the Local Planning Authority finds that the living roof(s) have not been delivered to the approved standards, the applicant shall rectify this to ensure it complies with the condition. The living roof(s) shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved management arrangements.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure that the development provides the maximum provision towards the creation of habitats for biodiversity and supports the water retention on site during rainfall. In accordance with London Plan (2021) Policies G1, G5, G6, SI1 and SI2 and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4, SP5, SP11 and SP13.</i></p> <p><u><i>BREEAM Certification</i></u></p> <p><i>(a) Prior to commencement of development, a design stage accreditation certificate must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development will achieve a BREEAM “Very Good” outcome (or equivalent), aiming for “Excellent”. The development shall then be constructed in strict accordance with the details so approved, shall achieve the agreed rating and shall be maintained as such thereafter for the lifetime of the development.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Within three months prior to occupation of development, a post-construction certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment must be submitted to the local authority for approval, confirming this standard has been achieved.</i></p> <p><i>In the event that the development fails to achieve the agreed rating for the development, a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve this rating shall be submitted for our written approval with 2 months of the submission of the post construction certificate. Thereafter the schedule of remedial works must be implemented on site within 3 months of the Local Authority’s approval of the schedule, or the full costs and management fees given to the Council for offsite remedial actions.</i></p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p><i>Reasons: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable development in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policies SI2, SI3 and SI4, and Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM21.</i></p>	
<p>Flood and Water Management</p>	<p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above planning application following a receipt of revised submission from the applicant.</p> <p>Having reviewed the submitted information via applicant's letter dated 11th February 2022, we are content with the information and we have no further comments to make on the above planning application.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
<p>Nature Conservation</p>	<p>Documents A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for the Proposed Development (Tyler Grange Ecological Impact Assessment Report No. 13786_R01a_AP_CW), comprising a desk study search for baseline information on designated sites, habitats and protected species, and a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) within the Site has been prepared to current good practice guidance covering relevant legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conclusion The development seeks to enhance ecological features and the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures can be secured by appropriately worded planning conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately half the total area of scattered trees within the site will be retained and protected from works. Trees outside the boundaries of the site will be protected from development works. Those habitats of up to local ecological importance that are proposed to be subject to habitat loss (namely, scattered trees) will be more than mitigated through the proposed habitat creation. These enhancements will achieve a biodiversity net gain of +5.71% and are likely to offer nesting, foraging and commuting opportunities for species such as bats, birds, reptiles, amphibians and west European hedgehogs • The bat roost present within building B1 should be protected from disturbance and development activities until it can be carefully removed under a licence (such as a BLICL). An alternative roost location determined by the licenced ecologist should be provided as close to the previous roost location as possible, ideally integrated within building design. • Any vegetation removal should be undertaken outside of the core nesting bird season (March-August, inclusive), otherwise, a pre-works check by an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) should be undertaken to determine whether active birds' nests are present. If nest(s) are present, no nests, eggs or young should be destroyed and an appropriate buffer must be instated until the chicks have been confirmed as fledged by an ECoW. 	<p>Comments noted. Conditions included</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation and enhancement recommendations, such as the provision of bird and bat boxes, sensitive construction methods, a sensitive lighting strategy in relation to bats and a long-term management plan to secure the ecological enhancements that are proposed as part of the development should be controlled by appropriately worded planning conditions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) produced within the Construction Ecological Management Plan. Incorporating the mitigation and enhancements options from Bat survey report. b) To ensure the safeguarding of the proposed net gain. Include the creation of a Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan. 	
Trees	<p>I hold no objection to the proposal providing the following conditions below are applied. The case has been supplied with arboricultural reports. The latest Arboricultural Impact Assessment is dated 22 March 2022 and has been carried out by Tyler Grange. The survey has been carried out to British Standard 5837 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction- Recommendations. I concur with findings within the report, including section 3 sub section 3.4, the conclusions, and most of the tree quality classifications.</p> <p>The following conditions should be implemented and adhered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan 2 the Tree Protection Plan • Arboricultural Method Statements will be required for any works within the root protection areas • A Landscape Plan and aftercare programme 	Comments noted. Conditions included
Waste Management	<p>This is for a 70 bedroom residential care home with supporting facilities and infrastructure. The waste generated from this location will be considered commercial and as such the collection and disposal of waste here would not fall to the council to deliver. This is acknowledged within the D&A statement (attached) on pg. 70 '<i>Waste collection will be undertaken by a private company who will serve the site using small vehicles, rather than lorries</i>'. Collections will be made via View Road with space within the curtilage of the development for collection vehicles to wait off road. From a traffic management perspective this is positive.</p> <p>Sizing of the bin store and the number of bins needed will very much depend on the businesses/services that occupy the space in operation, the waste/recycling they generate and the contract that is put in place for the collection of this. Commercial waste collection companies can provide up to twice daily collections 7 days per week. The drawings contained within the D&A statement show bin store size to be 18m². This is likely to be adequate however we would however advise against sizing the bins store based on minimum size and maximum collections. The store should be sufficient to store waste for one week.</p> <p>Comments dated 06/05/2022</p>	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Looking at this one and the reason for the resubmission/consultation I do not believe that the amendments have any impact on the waste management requirements for this development and therefore my comments previously provided (see mail attached) remain valid.</p>	
Building Control	<p>I have now been able to review the BiA for this scheme and can advise that it meets your policy requirements subject to the following points that could be pre commencement conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further details regarding the movement monitoring that will be undertaken at the adjacent properties. This should also include conditions of them before any works commence; 2. Construction Management Plan to be provided; <p>Full structural design will be provided at the Building Control stage.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Conditions included</p>
Building Control	<p>Further to the response to my initial comments, I agree that a more detailed fire strategy/fire engineered design will be required in order to satisfy Part B of the Building Regulations – Fire Safety. As noted in my previous response, this will be subject to a more detailed check by Building Control and the Fire Authority will be consulted.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Condition included</p>
Public Health	<p>Comments and applicants response dated 25/01/2022</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the room sizes take into account personal belongings space? Yes. Circa 10 years ago, the minimum bedroom size to be registered by CQC was 12m². The proposed rooms are generally 20m² + so are generously sized. 2. Which units are accommodated for long stays and outpatient? Long stay beds will be on the first floor which will provide residential care, and second floor, which will provide dementia care. Of the 70 beds proposed, circa 24 beds will provide short stay and circa 46 will provide long stay. 3. If second floor residents need to access bathroom, how easy is it for residents to travel to other floors for access? The second floor has a designated spa bathroom. It should be noted that all en-suites are sized to fit a bath or walk-in shower. It is likely that a mix will be provided. We note generally that lifts and circulation stairs are sited either end of the building and one centrally, to aid circulation. 4. Further possible improvements – garden planting space, raise bed where residents can take part in planting for foods and flowers. This provision was intended and can, therefore, be incorporated in the proposals. 5. We would like to see where the windows are on the floor plan. These are shown at all levels. 6. The Entrance door to the hydro pool is missing in the plans. This is shown on the floor plans. 	<p>Comments noted. Applicant has provided a response</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>7. Recommend a staff room in one of the upper floors This is shown at the first floor level. See the North Hill end of the building.</p> <p>8. Residents living in care homes are at greater risk of oral health problems due to many reasons such as long-term conditions causing mobility issues and medication may affect oral health. Dental Health access for residents in care homes remains a challenge. We recommend a flexible space (i.e. possibly private room within hairdressers) which can be provided for health promotion work with clinicians i.e. oral health. More information: Oral health for adults in care homes NICE guideline 5 no. consultant rooms are provided at basement level and were intended to be used flexibly. Therefore, the consultant rooms can be used for this purpose or the treatment/medical spaces on the first floor, North Hill end. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng48/chapter/recommendations#general-dental-practices-and-community-dental-services</p> <p>Comments dated 02/02/2022</p> <p>Many thanks for your email. This is fine</p>	
Supported Accommodation	<p>1. There is an extensive basement on this site and whilst there are some areas that may benefit from lightwells there are other areas that do not benefit from natural light. Whilst most of the areas in the basement are used for short visits such as to have a haircut or to watch a film there is also the main kitchen facility which means that kitchen staff will spend most of their day below ground with no access to natural light. This is a model used in many new build facilities and with modern lighting, regular breaks and being out and about servicing the homes will not be any issue. This is also not a building regulations requirement.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. Circulation (corridors)</p>	Comments and applicants response noted

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>a. It is not clear what width the corridors are across the provision but for Good accessibility 1.8m min seems to be a guide to use. It would be useful to consider if it is possible to easily accommodate an ambulance trolley into each of the rooms to ensure that leaving the building can be done with ease should the resident become clinically unwell, this would include the size of lifts. We provide a minimum 2m wide corridors which will therefore be easily accessible for emergency services.</p> <p>b. In terms of circulation the long length of corridors across the provision with no resting points would not promote people with limited mobility to be independent increasing the likelihood of dependence on wheelchairs. In our experience, Building Control / Fire Officers are usually not keen on destination seating so this will require their approval in due course, prior to illustrating.</p> <p>c. Many of the corridors across the building come have dead ends which from a dementia friendly design As mentioned earlier, only the second floor is to provide dementia care perspective are not preferable suggestion for consideration of the ends of corridors being made into destination spaces. As per above. Windows are provided in anticipation of this. Equally personal rooms at the ends of corridors may encourage someone with cognitive impairment to enter these rooms.</p> <p>3. Communal spaces</p> <p>a. The lounge and dining spaces across the home seem to accommodate large numbers of residents which is not in line with dementia friendly design Only the second floor provides dementia care principles (smaller more intimate dining rooms are easier to manage and allow staff to monitor residents more effectively. Second floor provides 20 no. dementia beds where the units are split into 2 no. 10 bed units. It has not yet been determined whether the lounges will become combined dining spaces. If this is the operational preference, this can be accommodated.</p> <p>b. There is a lack of activity spaces throughout the home for residents to undertake a variety of social, physical and cognitively stimulating activities such as Art, Writing, Games etc the lounge spaces only have arm chair/sofa seating no tables etc for these activities to take place. The definition of 'cognitively stimulating activities' can be conducted anywhere including the resident's own bedrooms. 'Activities' start from the moment a resident wakes and is, therefore, is conducted where that person wants to be, not necessarily grouping residents in a dedicated room. For this reason, the first floor will provide elderly care and includes large lounge, dining room and quiet lounge spaces. The quiet lounge will be a multi-function space that could be used for activity. The second floor provides dementia care and also has a quiet lounge which will also be a multi-function space. Ground floor provides short stay care so is a different purpose group.</p> <p>c. Residents on the third floor have no direct access to communal spaces, a communal terrace is included in the centre of the plan which will be staffed 24 hours per day there are</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>also no staff spaces on that floor therefore would be interested on how these beds would be monitored and staffed to ensure that the residents are safeguarded. A dedicated nurse station is included centrally. The home will provide state of the art monitoring linked to nurse call systems. It is not the role of staff to put everyone into day rooms. It maybe that some residents enjoy being in their own room and staff would spend time with them in there accordingly.</p> <p>4. Garden Space</p> <p>5. The garden space appears to have been carefully thought out However, there is very limited direct access to the garden spaces for the residents. For a resident population that is likely to be frail/potentially with limited mobility this Garden space is key to ensuring that residents have access to the outdoors. I do not feel that the current design allows for easy access to the essential outdoor space. Any home with more than one floor can have the same issues but with obtaining a good assessment for each resident staff will be able to meet their needs and help them get to the most relevant area to meet their needs. There will be some residents who are fully able to access the gardens from floors 2 and 3 independently and will be encouraged to do so. At ground floor, main garden access is provided by the foyer, restaurant and corridor. All GF beds will have access to outdoor space. The first floor includes a number of balconies and guests will be encouraged down stair 1 and stair 2 to the nearest garden access point. Similar comment re garden access at second floor - we also note that this floor benefits from a dedicated terrace for use by dementia residents only.</p> <p>5. General Dementia Friendly Design Principles</p> <p>As this is a provision that is being specifically designed for older people it is advisable that the building is designed in line with Dementia Design Principles, although this provision isn't being specifically designed for dementia care there is a high probability that there will be residents living/staying within the home that will either have dementia or a cognitive impairment. I have picked up a few comments earlier around key requirements that immediately spring to mind but I would recommend that the provider consider undertaking the dementia design audit which is published by Stirling University https://dementia.stir.ac.uk/design/training-dementia-design-and-riba-cpd as they are leaders in dementia friendly design. We are very aware of Stirling dementia principles and have incorporated what we can at this stage into the design. Example unit sizes, destination points, bedroom doors not directly opposite, window proportions etc. The majority of design principles are linked to fit out and interior design yet to be appointed.</p>	
EXTERNAL		

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
London Fire Brigade	<p>The Commissioner is satisfied with the proposal</p> <p>The Commissioner strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposal relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to business and housing providers and can reduce the risk to life. The Commissioner's opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupiers. Please note that it is our policy to regularly advise our elected Members about how many cases there have been where we have recommended sprinklers and what the outcomes of these recommendations were. These quarterly reports to our Members are public documents which are available on our website.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Informative included</p>
Environment Agency	<p>We do not have any detail comments to make on this planning application apart from the FRSA comments below.</p> <p>The proposed development falls within Flood Zone 2, which is land defined in the planning practice guidance as being at risk of flooding.</p> <p>We have produced a series of standard comments for local planning authorities and planning applicants to refer to on 'lower risk' development proposals. These comments replace direct case-by-case consultation with us. This proposal falls within this category.</p> <p>These standard comments are known as Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA). They can be viewed at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications#when-to-follow-standing-advice</p> <p>We recommend that you view our standing advice in full before making a decision on this application. We do not need to be consulted.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS)	<p>Recommend No Archaeological Requirement</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation dated 31 January 2022.</p> <p>The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) gives advice on archaeology and planning. Our advice follows the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the GLAAS Charter.</p> <p>NPPF section 16 and the London Plan (2021 Policy HC1) make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, I conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site lies outside the new tier 3 Archaeological Priority Area for the mediaeval Bishop's Park. However key features of the park such as the park pale are unlikely to occupy this site. A watching brief next door at 101 North Hill in 2001 found no remains earlier than Victorian cellars. Although it is a bigger site than 57 North Hill, where this office advised no archaeological requirement in 2019, I do not advise that there is a significant enough archaeological issue at this site to merit a planning condition.</p> <p>No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.</p> <p>This response relates solely to archaeological considerations. If necessary, Historic England's Development Advice Team should be consulted separately regarding statutory matters.</p>	
Historic England	<p>Thank you for your letter of 31 January 2022 regarding the above application for planning permission. We refer you to the following published advice which you may find helpful in determining the application.</p> <p>In our view, the recent amendments to the elevational design of the proposed building has done much to reduce the visual impact on the significance and setting of the neighbouring Grade II listed Georgian terrace and the surrounding Highgate Conservation Area.</p> <p>We also suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation advisors, as relevant.</p> <p>This response relates to designated heritage assets only. If the proposals meet the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service's published consultation criteria we recommend that you seek their view as specialist archaeological adviser to the local planning authority.</p> <p>The full GLAAS consultation criteria are on our webpage at the following link:</p> <p>https://www.historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/our-advice/</p> <p>It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. If you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.</p>	Comments noted.

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
Designing Out Crime Officer	<p>Section 1 - Introduction: Thank you for allowing us to comment on the above planning proposal.</p> <p>With reference to the above application we have now had an opportunity to examine the details submitted and would like to offer the following comments, observations and recommendations. These are based on relevant information to this site (Please see Appendices), including my knowledge and experience as a Designing Out Crime Officer and as a Police Officer.</p> <p>It is in our professional opinion that crime prevention and community safety are material considerations because of the mixed use, complex design, layout and the sensitive location of the development. To ensure the delivery of a safer development in line with L.B. Haringey DMM4 and DMM5 (See Appendix), we have highlighted some of the main comments we have in relation to Crime Prevention (Appendices 1).</p> <p>We have not met with the project Architects to discuss Crime Prevention and Secured by Design (SBD) for the overall site.</p> <p>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 mitigated early if the Architects and or Developers maintain an ongoing dialogue to discuss this project prior to completion, throughout its build and by following the advice given. 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.</p> <p>Section 2 - Secured by Design Conditions and Informative:</p> <p>In light of the information provided, we request the following Conditions and Informative:</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <p>(1) Prior to the commencement of above ground works to 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. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>(2) Prior to the first occupation of each building or part of a building or use, 'Secured by</p>	<p>Comments noted. Conditions/Informative included</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Design' certification shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or use.</p> <p>Informative: The applicant must seek the advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) to achieve accreditation. The services of MPS DOCOs are available free of charge and can be contacted via docomailbox.ne@met.police.uk or 0208 217 3813.</p> <p>Section 3 - Conclusion: We would ask that our department's interest in this planning application is noted and that we are advised of the final Decision Notice, with attention drawn to any changes within the development and subsequent Condition that has been implemented with crime prevention, security and community safety in mind.</p> <p>Should the Planning Authority require clarification of any of the recommendations/comments given in the appendices please do not hesitate to contact us at the above office.</p>	
Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments Thames Water would advise that with regard to FOUL WATER sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to SURFACE WATER network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p> <p>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-yourdevelopment/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</p> <p>The proposed development is located within 15 metres of our underground waste water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. "The proposed development is located within 15 metres of Thames Waters underground assets and as such, the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you</p>	Comments noted. Informative included

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>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 Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB</p> <p>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 contact Thames Water Property Searches for information relating to the wayleave or easement if they have not already done this -https://www.thameswater-propertysearches.co.uk/ To discuss the proposed development in more detail, the applicant should contact Developer Services - https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers</p> <p>Water Comments</p> <p>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-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-ourpipes</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES	<p>Land use and housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new care home should not be used for any commercial interest - Concerns with the financial viability of the development - Concerns some of the proposed facilities will be for public use - Loss of care home facility - Concerns the proposed facility is more like a sports injury treatment and rehabilitation facility rather than a care home - Some of the uses are inconsistent with the existing use class - The internal and external environment is more like a hospital and inappropriate as a care home for residents - The proposed facilities are unlikely to be used by residents, however the rents would be very high - The applicant has failed to show the need for the various services <p>Impact on Heritage assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The height is not in keeping with the Conservation Area - The scale is a concern given its close proximity to the listed building - The preservation of the character of the conservation area needs to be properly assessed, the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area - The development will harm the settings of the listed buildings - The heritage assessment is incorrect - Substantial harm to the Conservation Area 	<p><u>Land use and housing</u></p> <p>The proposed development would replace the existing care home (Use Class C2) with a new long term traditional care home with a smaller component operating as a well-being and physiotherapy centre;</p> <p>The other uses proposed are ancillary to the predominate use of the building as a care facility.</p> <p>The provision of traditional, long term senior care and well-being and physiotherapy centre is considered to meet an established local need and would provide adequate replacement accommodation</p> <p><u>Impact on Heritage assets</u></p> <p>The officers assessment on Heritage issues have been comprehensively explained in the main body of the report and addresses the objections raised by residents. Officers consider the</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="493 976 785 1003">Size, Scale and Design</p> <ul data-bbox="541 1040 1549 1398" style="list-style-type: none"> - The design is not in keeping with surrounding properties - Overbearing in relation to neighbouring buildings - Excessive height, bulk, massing and scale - The development is significantly larger in scale than the existing buildings on site - Overdevelopment of site - Poor quality design - The development should be significantly reduced in scale - The scheme should be redesigned - Excessive footprint - The development is contrary to local plan policies and the NPPF - The Quality Review Panel comments have not been adequately addressed - The Councils pre-application advise has not been adequately addressed 	<p data-bbox="1726 233 2045 412">heights and massing of the proposed care home building fronting North Hill would fully respect the setting of the listed terrace in its urban context.</p> <p data-bbox="1726 483 2045 878">Officers consider the proposed scheme is acceptable from a conservation perspective, as it will lead to a very low, less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and its assets while optimising the use of the site and its garden and while enhancing the townscape along North Hill</p> <p data-bbox="1726 915 2018 943"><u>Size, Scale and Design</u></p> <p data-bbox="1726 980 2045 1398">The conservation and design officers have assessed and considered these aspects of the proposed development comprehensively and which are covered in the main body of the report. Officers consider the proposal to be of a compatible and appropriate scale to the context, elegantly proportioned, finished in</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="499 760 911 786">Parking, Transport and Highways</p> <ul data-bbox="541 824 1703 938" style="list-style-type: none"> - Pressure on parking - The wellbeing and physiotherapy centre will be open to none residents with implications for traffic and parking - Increased traffic generated <p data-bbox="541 1386 554 1396">-</p>	<p data-bbox="1730 237 2003 350">attractive, appropriate materials and detailing and set in lush, high quality landscaping.</p> <p data-bbox="1730 423 2032 626">Officers consider all the specific concerns raised by officers and the QRP have been satisfactorily addressed and are contained within the main body of the report.</p> <p data-bbox="1730 732 2045 789"><u>Parking, Transport and Highways</u></p> <p data-bbox="1730 821 2045 1308">The Transportation Officer has assessed these points and which have been covered in the main body of the report; Officers raise no objections to the proposals subject to conditions being imposed in respect of gym restrictions and the outpatients facility to reduce the number of trips generated by the development and the resulting car parking demand on local roads.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns the access road would not be sufficient for this development - The slip-road is designed for residential access - The North Hill entrance will not be suitable for daily outpatients - The main entrance for outpatients should be on View Road - Road safety concerns - This narrow section of North Hill is the main route for children of Highgate Primary School - It is unlikely outpatients will use sustainable forms of transport to the site - Cycle racks will not be an appropriate solution <p>Residential Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of privacy/overlooking - The setback plan showing the distance between buildings is incorrect - Unacceptable overshadowing - Loss of daylight and sunlight 	<p>The Council's Transportation team are satisfied with access and parking</p> <p>The transportation team has considered highway and pedestrian safety during demolition, excavation and construction phase</p> <p>The Council's Transportation team are satisfied with cycle parking and further details can be clarified by way of a condition</p> <p><u>Residential Amenity</u></p> <p>Nearby residential properties would not be materially affected by the proposal in terms of loss of privacy/overlooking</p> <p>The set back plan was updated so to address the distance inaccuracy.</p> <p>There are no daylight/sunlight and overshadowing concerns to neighbouring</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="541 760 1394 787">- The daylight/sunlight assessment has not been carried out properly <li data-bbox="541 1287 816 1315">- Impact on amenity 	<p data-bbox="1730 235 2049 727">properties. The neighbouring gardens that are affected i.e. the rear gardens of Yeatman Road are already overshadowed by an existing tree along the rear boundary. The neighbouring property at 109 North Hill which is in closest proximity to the site is already overshadowed due to its close proximity to the existing care facility building and trees in the garden.</p> <p data-bbox="1730 760 2049 1128">The daylight/sunlight assessment was prepared in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) publication 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice' (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011).</p> <p data-bbox="1730 1255 2049 1349">The proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Impact on visual amenity - Noise and disturbance - Concerns the proposed mechanical plan will impact the amenity of neighbouring occupiers <p>Environment and Public Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant increase in pollution - Increased emissions - Impact on human health - Impact on the quality of life of local residents 	<p>local amenity – covered in the report.</p> <p>The proposed development is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on local visual amenity in this respect. Covered in the report</p> <p>The increase in noise from occupants of the proposed care home facility would not be materially different to existing residents given the current extending use will be retained and the current urbanised nature of the surroundings</p> <p>The roof plant has been relocated from the flat roof to a secluded area within the pitched roof volume. Noise levels will be controlled by condition.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Officer has assessed these potential impacts and has not raised any objections to the proposed development in respect to air quality and</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise pollution - Major disruption to the local community - Impact on trees - Damage to existing trees - Loss of trees 	<p>land contamination - subject to the imposition of conditions and informative's that highlights other legislation that addresses other issues of pollution etc.</p> <p>Any dust and noise relating to demolition and construction works would be temporary nuisances that are typically controlled by non-planning legislation. Nevertheless, the demolition and construction methodology for the development would be controlled by the imposition of a condition.</p> <p>The Councils tree officer is satisfied with the proposal subject to the relevant conditions being imposed in respect of the tree protection plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and Landscape Plan and aftercare programme</p> <p>The Council's Tree Officer considers that the 7 trees</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact upon local flora/fauna - The bat survey should be redone - Potential security issues 	<p>to be removed are of low quality and value. The proposed new landscape plan includes the planting of 8 new trees – thus no net loss of trees.</p> <p>Officers are satisfied the submitted Ecological Assessment Report and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) is acceptable in principle subject to the relevant condition in respect of proposed mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>In terms of security, secure entrance points will be provided to the entrances on View Road and North Hill. These entrance points will be managed by reception staff in order to prevent any unauthorised access. The Secure by Design Officer does not object to the proposed development subject to standard conditions requiring details of and compliance with the principles and practices of the Secured by Design Award Scheme</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="499 354 793 386">Basement development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="548 418 1633 451">- The potential impact of the basement development has not been adequately addressed <li data-bbox="548 451 905 483">- Risk of ground movement <li data-bbox="548 483 1241 516">- Impact of basement development on the listed terrace <li data-bbox="548 516 1192 548">- Impact on ground and underground water courses <li data-bbox="548 548 1010 581">- The basement is excessive in scale <li data-bbox="548 581 842 613">- Concerns of flooding <li data-bbox="548 613 995 646">- Impact on local drainage services <li data-bbox="548 646 737 678">- Subsidence <li data-bbox="548 678 1062 711">- Where will attenuation tanks be located <li data-bbox="548 711 842 743">- Impact on hydrology <li data-bbox="548 743 1377 776">- Proper monitoring arrangements should take place by the Council <li data-bbox="548 776 1297 808">- Further data is required for phase 2 of the site investigation <li data-bbox="548 808 1703 857">- The ground and groundwater conditions should be fully at adequately addressed at the planning stage <li data-bbox="548 857 1003 889">- Incomplete basement assessment <li data-bbox="548 889 1430 922">- Building Control have not taken into account Alan Baxter's submission <li data-bbox="548 922 1045 954">- The Councils basement policy is poor 	<p data-bbox="1730 233 2024 289">development above slab level</p> <p data-bbox="1730 354 2024 386"><u>Basement development</u></p> <p data-bbox="1730 418 2045 792">Officers consider that the submitted Basement Impact Assessment meets the local plan policy requirement. The councils Building Control Officer has advised that it will be the responsibility of the structural engineer and the applicant to ensure that the basement construction is sound.</p> <p data-bbox="1730 824 2045 1344">The basement development is considered acceptable subject to a detailed construction management plan condition to ensure there would be no increased flood risk resulting from the development and no impact and a detailed movement monitoring condition that will need to be undertaken of the adjacent properties prior to the commencement of works on site</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An archaeology impact assessment is required as the site is located within the Highgate Archaeological Priority Area <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The air source heat pump and other handling plant should be dealt with in detail as part of this application - Concerns with the potential impact of the plant - The plant will be highly visible from the public realm - Details of gas boiler flues, basement parking ventilation, kitchen extract and other plant are missing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A zero carbon building should be achieved 	<p>The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) is satisfied that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest</p> <p>The roof plant has been relocated from the flat roof to a secluded area within the pitched roof volume. Further details of the air source heat pump and other handling plant will be secured by way of a condition prior to above ground construction. The plant will not be highly visible from the public areas.</p> <p>The Council's Carbon Management Team supports the scheme based on its carbon reductions. The shortfall of the care home will need to be offset to achieve a zero-carbon target, in line with Policy. This figure would</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="499 293 569 321">Other</p> <p data-bbox="499 358 1633 415">-The proposed part M Building Regulations which provides information on access to and use of buildings needs to be stated</p> <p data-bbox="499 573 1583 600"><u>Issues raised that are not material planning considerations including Officers comments</u></p> <ul data-bbox="541 638 1703 1372" style="list-style-type: none"> - No site notice placed outside the development (Officer comments: A site notice was placed outside the development); - Consultation period was not long enough (Officer Comments: Consultation period was extended at least twice and further notification carried out on the amended plans); - Developer’s drawings are misleading (Officer comments: Drawings have been updated to address specific points); - The consultation was not wide enough (Officers comments: The consultation was undertaken in accordance with The Council’s Statement of Community Involvement); - Consultation process not adequate (Officers comments: The consultation process was adequate consisting of a DM Forum where residents were invited and which was well attended before submission of the planning application; the scheme was presented to members in a public forum at pre-application stage. Once the application was submitted, the Council consulted residents twice by letter, extended the consultation period at least twice. The application was able to be viewed on the councils website); - Feedback from Statement of Community engagement is not correct (Officers comments: The Statement of Community involvement (SCI) is the applicant’s reporting of the feedback as they understand it to be. Officers have assessed the SCI alongside the comments from objectors and then made a balanced assessment of how the feedback has been summarised in the document) - Inaccurate and misleading CGIs and graphic (Officers comments: CGIs and graphics have been updated so to remove any inaccuracies or misunderstanding of the plans) - The comparative drawings are misleading (Officers comments: as above) - Inaccurate, missing and conflicting submission (Officers comments: As above. The Applicant submitted a number of further drawings when requested following consultation feedback) 	<p data-bbox="1732 233 2047 290">be secured by legal agreement.</p> <p data-bbox="1732 326 2047 537">Paragraph 5.2.11 of the report provides information on access A formal detailed assessment will be undertaken at the building control stage</p> <p data-bbox="1732 667 2047 756">ALL RESPONSES IN BRACKETS NEXT TO THE OBJECTION.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	- Existing plans should be submitted (Officers comments: existing plans and elevations have been submitted)	

Appendix 2 Plans and Images

Site location plan



Site photographs – existing building



Existing pedestrian access, View Road.



Original building, Kekewich House as seen from front garden.



Unsympathetic extension to Kekewich House.



Unsympathetic extension to Kekewich House.



View across existing garden towards 3 View Road.



Existing front garden, View Road.



Rear of Kekewich House and linked extension building.



Rear of Kekewich House.

Proposed second floor plan



Proposed elevations with existing building outline



Elevation A-A - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Elevation B-B - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Elevation C-C - Colour - Existing Building Outline



Proposed North Hill Frontage



Proposed View Road frontage



Appendix 3 Quality Review Panel (QRP) Reports

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

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

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Video conference

Panel

David Ubaka (chair)

Louise Goodison

Tim Pitman

Andy Puncher

Ann Sawyer

Attendees

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Neil McClellan

London Borough of Haringey

Elisabetta Tonazzi

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Kiki Ageridou

Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Dean Hermitage

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

Deborah Denner

Frame Projects

Confidentiality

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

1. Project name and site address

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

2. Presenting team.

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

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

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

4. Planning authority briefing

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

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



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

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

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

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

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

Massing and development density

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



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

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

Relationship to local context

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



Landscape design

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

Scheme layout and quality of accommodation

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



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

Architectural expression

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



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

Local community engagement

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

Low carbon design and environmental sustainability

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



CONFIDENTIAL

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

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

Next steps

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

Haringey Quality Review Panel

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

Wednesday 25 August 2021

Video conference

Panel

David Ubaka (chair)

Louise Goodison

Attendees

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

Apologies / report copied to

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

Confidentiality

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

1. Project name and site address

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

2. Presenting team.

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

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

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

4. Planning authority briefing

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

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



5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

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

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

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

Massing and roofscape

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



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

Landscape design

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

Scheme layout and quality of accommodation

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



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

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

Architectural expression

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



CONFIDENTIAL

Low carbon design and environmental sustainability

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

Next steps

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



Appendix 4 Planning Committee Pre-Application Briefing Notes

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

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

Minutes:

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

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

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

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

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

benefit or detriment and it was requested that as much detail as possible was provided in the application. The applicant team explained that they had appointed a sustainability and renewable energy consultant who had already been in contact with the council's climate officer and agreed a scope of works and information requirements to support the application.

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

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

Appendix 5 DM Forum Summary

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

Planning Sub Committee 06 June 2022

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No.

Reference No: HGY/2021/3481	Ward: Highgate
Address: 103-107 North Hill N6 4DP	
Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home (Class C2 - Residential Institution), together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre. The proposed care home includes up to 70 bedrooms, with ancillary hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, cafe, lounge, bar, well-being shop, general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.	

[To note: the numbering as set out in this addendum corresponds with the numbering of each section within the Officers committee report]

1.2. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION and paragraph 6.15 Conclusion

[correction]

The proposed development will lead to a very low, less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation area and its assets while optimising the use of the site and its garden and while enhancing the townscape along North Hill and partly by other benefits such as the improved care home services and the optimum use of the site and its garden

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2 (two) further objections and 1 (one) other comment has been received since publishing of the main report which have raised a number of points that have already been considered with the additional points raised below;

- Based on Conditions 34 (Restriction to Use Class) and 31 (Outpatients facility) Class E should apply if the consultant rooms will presumably be let on Business leases. Therefore the officers report is unsound;
- The single brick treatment of the North Hill frontage is bland; and
- The amendment does not address the scale of the development which would still result in overdevelopment of the site

These points are addressed in Appendix 1 below.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Clarification Points

'Impact on Neighbouring Amenity'

[Paragraph 6.6.3 is altered to correct the daylight and sunlight impact section]

The assessment finds that the impact of the development on existing neighbouring windows is exceptionally favourable for both daylight and sunlight as 98% of the neighbouring windows pass the BRE's Vertical Sky Component guidelines and 99% of neighbouring rooms pass the BRE's No Skyline guidelines.

‘Water Management‘

[Paragraph 6.11.2 is altered to include the correct flood zone]

The site is within Flood Zone 1, which is land defined at low risk of flooding.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION INCLUDED

[Condition 38 is included to celebrate the history and legacy of Lady Mary Feilding in the proposed redevelopment of the site]

38. Prior to the commencement of development, options for honouring the history and legacy of Lady Mary Feilding as part of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and these works shall thereafter be carried out as approved

Reason: To preserve the local history of the site in the interest of local heritage in compliance with London Plan Policy HC1, Policies SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan and Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD 2017

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses received from internal and external agencies (received since publish of main report)

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
EXTRENAL		
Designing out Crime	<p>Designing out Crime Response to amendments (02/06/2022)</p> <p>As there appears to be no changes to the layout/design other than the façade of the proposed North Hill frontage, we have no further comments. Our original comments still apply.</p>	Comments noted.
Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES		
3 FURTHER LETTERS RECEIVED FROM LOCAL RESIDENT.	<p>Land use and housing</p> <p>Based on Conditions 34 (Restriction to Use Class) and 31 (Outpatients facility) Class E should apply if the consultant rooms will presumably be let on Business leases. Therefore the officers report is unsound</p>	<p>The consultant rooms are ancillary to the main use of the building as a care home. Condition 34 restricts the use of the building (and all ancillary uses to the care home) to Use Class C2 only with a smaller component accounting for a well-being and physiotherapy centre and therefore not allowing the building to operate as another use under Class C2 without a further planning permission.</p> <p>Condition 31 has been imposed in order to ensure vehicular trip generations are kept within acceptable limits. No separate businesses can be carried out from the building.</p>
	<p>Size, Scale and Design</p> <p>The single brick treatment of the North Hill frontage is bland</p> <p>The amendment does not address the scale of the development which would still result in overdevelopment of the site</p>	Issue already addressed in the officers committee report.