

Appendix 4: Neighbour representations

* This appendix includes a letter of objection on behalf of Sage Housing Limited which was received on 17 November 2022 – that letter of objection was made prior to the amendments under consideration but has not been addressed in a report to members until now so is included here.

** Letters of objection on behalf of Related Argent and Sage Housing Limited were received on 13 February 2023 in response to an initial consultation on amendments that were subsequently withdrawn. Those letters of objection have not been addressed in this appendix given that those plans were retracted. The plans originally submitted included an error which suggested the building envelope had changed and the building was closer to the neighbouring building to the south. The building envelope has not changed, and this error has been corrected in revised drawings. The red line also remains the same.

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment (summarised)	Response
Sage Housing Limited 17/11/22	Mirror Massing - The resolution passed by Members was passed without having regard to a material consideration, namely the lack of any reasoned justification for the methodology deployed in the revised mirror massing assessment, which adopted an unjustified and different approach from the assessment originally submitted by the Applicant	Officers considered that the mirror scheme comparison should be made and described how the scheme's impact compared to the mirror scheme. The analysis in the Officer Report to Committee on 5th September 2022 (OR) was based on the latest iteration of the mirror scheme produced by the applicant's consultants. The comparison with the mirror scheme was addressed (based on the version of the mirror scheme relied upon by the applicant) in the OR and considered by members.
	Failure to Report the Extent of Sunlight/Daylight Breaches - the OR was misleading in the way that it characterised breaches of VSC. Members have reached conclusions as to the acceptability of the impact of the proposed development upon the living conditions and amenity future residents of Building 3 without regard to a material	The OR was explicit on how the BRE guidance was being applied and the approach adopted was sufficiently explained to members.

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment (summarised)	Response
	consideration namely, the true impact of the proposed development with respect to alternative baselines.	
	Failure to Report Increased Impacts - the analysis in para 6.5.47 of the OR was significantly misleading in its claim that the impact of the proposed development “provides improvements” over the Building 4 envisaged in the masterplan. The material presented in OR is not fairly summarised.	The OR has to be read as a whole and the amenity conclusions were that the impact of the proposed development “when compared with the mirror massing and the masterplan proposal show this proposal would largely provide better impacts to B3 on the whole than the mirror building and other than the upper floors the masterplan building”.
	Failure to Apply BRE Guidance to the Proposed Development - There is no reference in the OR or the Addendum Report (AR) to para C17 of the new BRE guidance. The material part of that guidance comes under the heading “Specific recommendations for daylight provision in UK dwellings”. In this context, it advises as follows: “Where a room has a shared use, the highest target should apply. For example, a bed sitting room in student accommodation, the value for a living room should be used if students would often spend time in their rooms during the day. Local authorities could use discretion here”.	<p>An assessment of the levels of sunlight/daylight within the student rooms in accordance with the methodology set out in BR209 has been carried out.</p> <p>See paras 6.8.13 & 6.8.14 of the report that this is appended to.</p> <p>6.8.13 The applicant has submitted an Internal Daylight & Sunlight Report which demonstrates that the proposal would provide high levels of compliance with BRE Guidance in terms of internal daylight amenity, with 91% of the rooms achieving their respective target illuminance value appropriate for the principal usage over at least 50% of the room area.</p> <p>6.8.14 In relation to internal sunlight amenity, 49% of rooms will have sufficient access to sunlight and would comply with BRE Guidance. The Proposed Development has been designed to allow for good</p>

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment (summarised)	Response
		<p>levels of daylight and sunlight that will distribute throughout most rooms efficiently.</p>
	<p>Not an Inclusive Design - there was insufficient consideration of inclusive design in the OR and AR. This is relevant to London Plan policy H15 and D5. There was insufficient analysis by the applicant of an inclusive design statement and there is no analysis of equality impacts.</p>	<p>The OR considers policy H15 of the London Plan in detail – see paras 6.4.1 to 6.4.29. The analysis includes discussing whether the proposal supports a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood. The analysis includes the site’s relationship with the wider area. The conclusion at para 6.4.15 is that this site (which is acknowledged as being a constrained site) “would contribute to a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood and would provide a form of accommodation that would optimise what is a constrained site”.</p> <p>Inclusive design issues are considered by reference to London Plan policy D5 in paras 6.6.60-6.6.63 of the OR. The planning judgment is reached that the site would be accessible and inclusive.</p> <p>The report that this is appended to states how equalities and the public sector equality duty under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010 have been considered when making the recommendation (in para 6.22.6).</p>
<p>Sage Housing Limited 07/04/22</p>	<p>In the context of this application, considering the principles established in case law, it remains our client’s view that the correct course of action in this case would be for the Council to ask for a withdrawal of the current application and submission of a new one so that the impact of</p>	<p>The proposed changes are largely internal alterations and respond to emerging legislation in relation to fire safety. As such, they have been consulted on in the usual way in accordance with section 5.9 of the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.</p>

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment (summarised)	Response
	the proposed development can be properly considered with the benefit of full consultation.	
	Concerns as to massing, the position and height of the proposed building and how it would affect the quality of life of residents in the neighbouring homes to the south.	These matters were all considered by members at the 5th September 2022 planning sub-committee meeting. Given that there has been no change to the massing, the position, and the height of the proposed building the assessment on the impact of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight to surrounding buildings would be the same as the scheme that members resolved to grant planning permission for last year.
Neighbour representations	Comments/objections on the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on light to windows • Impact on privacy • Impact on parking pressure 	As above, all these matters were considered by members at the 5th September 2022 planning sub-committee meeting and the amendments would not have a material impact on these factors.