

HIGHGATE CARE LTD.

Planning Statement

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

December 2022



CONTENTS

2.0	Introduction	3
3.0	Description of the site and its surroundings.....	4
4.0	Planning history	6
5.0	Planning policy context	9
6.0	The Proposed Development	19
7.0	Pre-application advice and public consultation.....	22
8.0	Planning Analysis	27
9.0	Summary and Conclusions.....	39
	Appendix 1 – Site Location Plan.....	41

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Planning Statement has been produced by ND Planning Ltd on behalf of Highgate Care Ltd (“the applicant”) to accompany a planning application seeking full planning permission for the redevelopment of the former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, Highgate, London N6 4DP (“the site”). The site is located within the administrative area of the London Borough of Haringey (LBH).

1.2 The description of the proposed development is as follows:

“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, a hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, café, lounge, bar, well-being shop, general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.”

1.3 A care use (Class C2) has been established on this site for a very long time and forms part of the character of this area. The applicant is committed to retaining a care use on this site, which is in keeping with the character of the area and supported by development plan policy.

1.4 The submission of this planning application follows an extensive and intensive pre-application process with Officers of the Local Planning Authority, together with local residents, amenity groups, local Ward and Planning Sub-Committee Members, the Council’s independent and impartial Quality Review Panel and other stakeholders. The current proposals have been shaped, informed and developed during this period of pre-application discussion, consultation and engagement, which also included the Council’s own Development Management Forum.

1.5 This Planning Statement is structured in the following manner:

- Section 2.0 describes the site and its surroundings;
- Section 3.0 sets out the relevant planning history related to the site;
- Section 4.0 outlines the planning policy context, including development plan policy, relevant site designations and other material considerations;
- Section 5.0 describes the proposed development in detail;
- Section 6.0 provides an overview of the pre-application discussion, consultation and engagement process;
- Section 7.0 assesses the proposed development in the light of relevant planning policies and other material planning considerations and
- Section 8.0 concludes and reflects on the current proposals.

2.0 Description of the site and its surroundings

- 2.1 The former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home is a care home for the elderly registered with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) for 43 bedrooms. It was originally established in 1877. It is a registered charity, and we understand has been in Highgate for at least 85 years. The site is in an attractive, verdant and mainly residential part of Highgate, in the Highgate Ward of the LBH. The site measures circa. 0.374 hectares (0.924 acres) and is occupied by a series of five buildings on a broadly L-shaped plot. These buildings, which have developed incrementally over time, are Truscott House (fronting onto North Hill), The Dean, Plowden Wing, The Garden Wing and Kekewich House (fronting onto View Road). All five of the buildings are interconnected. The property has an established Class C2 (Residential Institution) Use. The care home closed in May 2021 and is currently vacant.
- 2.2 The current main pedestrian entrance to the property is to Truscott House. This is a red brick, four-storey property set back from a one-way road parallel to North Hill (B519), which runs north-west to south-east and at a lower level to Truscott House and the one-way road. The top floor of Truscott House is set back and there are taller elements to the south-eastern and north-western parts of the building, which is a protruding lift shaft. There is a single, large disabled persons parking space and two visitor parking spaces on this frontage.
- 2.3 The site also has frontage on to View Road to the south-west which provides a gated vehicular in/out access and a car parking area for about four cars to the rear. Kekewich House, which appears to have previously been one of two large family homes of traditional construction, fronts this boundary.
- 2.4 There are a number of trees and shrub planting to the perimeter of the site and to the rear of the buildings is a large lawn. To the north of the site is a narrow strip of land owned by LBH and outside the application site. This is overgrown and the subject of some fly-tipping in parts. However, it does accommodate an attractive, mature belt of London Plane trees. Beyond these trees are the rear gardens to residential properties which front on to Yeatman Road, which are predominantly two-storey terrace properties.
- 2.5 Adjacent to the site to the south-east at the junction of North Hill and View Road is Wetherley Court, a small, modern development of 4 storey houses. To the rear of Wetherley Court and adjacent to the subject site is 1a View Road, which appears to be a large family dwelling house on a large plot.
- 2.6 Immediately to the north of the subject site is 109 North Hill, which is a Grade II listed cottage (and forms part of a terrace of listed Georgian cottages known as "Prospect Terrace").
- 2.7 To the west of the site is 3 View Road, a large, three-storey residence on a substantial plot which is the residence of the Tanzanian Ambassador. The

property is a Locally Listed building. In the rear garden, along its eastern boundary abutting the application site is a belt of tall and mature Lime trees.

- 2.8 Virtually opposite the subject site, on the other side of North Hill is a red brick, four-storey block of 37 flats called “Highcroft”, located at the corner of North Hill and Church Road.
- 2.9 The surrounding area is predominantly residential and exhibits a very diverse range of different architectural styles and eras. There are also a mix of other land uses and a wide range of community facilities and services, many of which are clustered around the centre of Highgate, less than one mile to the south.
- 2.10 The site also has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3, which is “good” by virtue of good public transport links with Highgate Underground Station (on the Northern Line) a short walking distance to the east and a range of bus routes within even closer walking distance.
- 2.11 As mentioned earlier, there are a number of trees on the perimeter of the site, particularly on the northern boundary and the western boundary. However, according to LBH’s planning website, there are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO’s) on the site, but there is a TPO on Wetherley Court, which is adjacent to the south-east of the subject site and covers a number of tall, mature horse chestnut trees, some of which are located on the pavement to the North Hill slip road.

3.0 Planning history

- 3.1 A review has been carried out of the London Borough of Haringey's online planning history register. This has revealed that the former Mary Feilding Guild has been in Highgate for 85 years. The Council's online planning register only has details of planning applications submitted and determined in recent years. However, it shows that various applications have been submitted and determined on the site. Some of these are minor and others relate to upgrading, improving and extending the accommodation. For example, an infill extension to the Dean Unit.
- 3.2 The following applications are those submitted and determined most recently on the site.

The Site

- 3.3 **LPA Ref. HGY/2006/1313** – In June 2006, an application was submitted for the replacement of existing windows with new double-glazed windows. This application was granted permission on 18 August 2006.
- 3.4 **LPA Ref. HGY/2013/0552** – In March 2013, an application was submitted for the replacement of the outdated mechanical extract canopy with a new mechanical extract canopy for the commercial kitchen between Truscott House and the Plowden Wing, which serves the dining room to the care home. This was granted permission on 20 May 2013.
- 3.5 **LPA Ref. HGY/2015/1260** – In April 2015, an application was submitted for an extension to the existing dining room to the rear of Truscott House. This was granted permission on 22 June 2015.
- 3.6 **LPA Ref. HGY/2021/3481** – Most recently, on 7 October 2022, a full planning application for the demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home, together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre on the site was granted planning permission. The current planning application seeks permission for exactly the same development.
- 3.7 The surrounding area has an extensive planning history with most applications relating to minor residential development, although some significant new residential properties have been granted nearby (such as on View Road). Applications within the vicinity of relevance are as follows:

Surrounding Sites

- 3.8 **LPA Ref. HGY/2020/1745** – On 30 June 2020, a planning application was submitted for "Highcroft" - a red brick, four storey block of flats virtually opposite the site on the eastern side of North Hill at its junction with Church Road. It sought permission for the removal of the existing building components (including the lift motor room tower) and telecommunications structures at the existing roof level and its replacement with a storey of 6 additional residential units, together

with external amenity space, cycle storage and associated works. Conditional permission was granted on 21 September 2020.

- 3.9 **LPA Ref. HGY/2021/0453** – On 1 February 2021, a planning application was submitted for Davere House, 1A View Road. It sought permission for the construction of a single storey rear extension, rear glazed canopy, garage conversion, external link replacement, front entrance canopy, window replacement and front porch alternations. Permission was granted on 17 March 2021. This permission followed a similar earlier permission (LPA Ref. HGY/2011/0331) which was granted permission on 27 May 2011.
- 3.10 **LPA Ref. HGY/2008/1065** – On 13 May 2008, a planning application was submitted for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part four/part single storey building to accommodate 40 extra care units and the provision of eight off street parking spaces at 2-4 Broadlands Road, Highgate N6 4AS. The application was granted on 11 August 2008. The application followed a similar earlier planning application (**LPA Ref. HGY/2007/2191 & 2192**) which was refused on 21 January 2008.
- 3.11 The site measures about 0.5 hectares, is an L-shaped plot and has been a care home since the 1940's. It is also located in the Highgate Conservation Area and accommodated 39 trees, some of which were protected by a TPO. Two properties occupied the site - 2 Broadlands Road (known as The Trees). This was a building with substantial unsympathetic extensions and additions and 4 Broadlands Road (Homfray House) which retained many of its architectural features and was an important focal viewpoint. Together, the properties provided up to 68 bed spaces.
- 3.12 In the Officer's report to Committee, the Council's Conservation Officer stated that "4 Broadlands Road remained largely unaltered from its original state and is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. 2 Broadlands Road, however, has been severely compromised by the unsympathetic extensions and additions. Therefore, it is considered to have a neutral impact on the character and appearance on the Conservation Area'. The Officer continued by saying the "Council would normally seek the retention of 4 Broadlands Road.... the applicants have explored the option of retaining the building as existing and incorporating a new extension. This scheme has proven to be unsatisfactory: to provide the levels of accommodation required, the bulk, height and massing would further compromise both the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and 4 Broadlands Road, whilst failing to provide the standard of accommodation required". The Conservation Officer also recognised that a well-designed care home would be a social asset for the local community.
- 3.13 The Highgate Society concluded that while it has concerns about the proposed development, it accepted that it cannot contain fewer units, and its concerns

about the alternatives – both the loss of Hill Homes, and a much larger development which would almost certainly still result in the loss of the Edwardian buildings – should permission be refused – are significantly greater. Therefore, it concluded not to oppose the development.

- 3.14 The Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (HCAAC) stated it had no adverse comments. It noted that it involves the demolition of two existing Edwardian houses, but they are not listed, and it was felt that the proposal would be an appropriate addition to the Conservation Area and serve local need.

4.0 Planning policy context

- 4.1 The site is located within the London Borough of Haringey (LBH). Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2 The statutory development plan for the LBH comprises:
- The London Plan, which was adopted in March 2021, and which covers the period until 2036;
 - The London Borough of Haringey Strategic Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), which was adopted by the Council in March 2013 with subsequent alterations adopted on 24 July 2017. It covers the period up to 2026;
 - The London Borough of Haringey Development Management DPD, which was adopted by the Council on 24 July 2017 and
 - The London Borough of Haringey Site Allocations DPD, which was adopted on 24 July 2017 and
 - The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, which was adopted on 20 July 2017. The Neighbourhood Plan contains policies similar to those in the adopted Local Plan. So, to avoid repetition, the Local Plan policies are focussed on in this Planning Statement.
- 4.3 Material considerations in the LBH include:
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), revised and updated on 20 July 2021 and
 - The Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan adopted December 2013.

LBH Site Allocations DPD

- 4.4 The site is not the subject of any specific designation in this DPD.

LBH Strategic Policies DPD

- 4.5 In line with the NPPF (addressed later in this section of the Planning Statement), the Local Plan follows the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy SP0 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) states when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. The policy continues by saying the Council will always work positively with applicants to find solutions, which means that proposals can

be approved wherever possible and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in Haringey.

- 4.6 Policy SP2 (Housing) states that the Council will aim to provide homes to meet Haringey's housing needs, in part, by maximising housing for people whose circumstances make them vulnerable and/or people with specific needs.
- 4.7 Policy SP4 (Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey) states that the Council will promote and require all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions. Measures include seeking all new non-residential development to be zero-carbon, to be built to at least BREEAM "Very Good" standard and, where viable, to achieve a reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions of 20% from on-site renewable energy regeneration.
- 4.8 Policy SP5 (Water Management and Flooding) points out that the Council will require all new development to be water efficient and to reduce all forms of flood risk, including to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity.
- 4.9 Policies SP11 (Design) and SP12 (Conservation) seeks to manage growth in Haringey in a way that conserves and enhances the features that make the borough a special and attractive place.
- 4.10 Policy SP11 says all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create buildings and places that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. To achieve this all development shall:
 - Be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity;
 - Adopting and improving sustainable design and construction techniques;
 - Promoting high quality landscaping on and off site;
 - Seek the highest standards of access in all buildings and places; and
 - Ensure buildings are designed to be flexible and adaptable.
- 4.11 Policy SP12 (Conservation) points out that the Council shall ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment. The boroughs heritage assets include Statutory Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. The policy continues by saying the historic environment should be the basis for heritage-led regeneration and on the basis for good design and positive change.
- 4.12 Paragraph 6.2.6 of the Local Plan also notes that the borough has some fine examples of 20th Century modernist apartment buildings. However, it is recognised that post war development in the borough has not always been of the highest quality design or sensitive to its setting. As such, the Council will seek to

ensure future development will be of the highest possible quality of design as well as meeting the Council's green agenda.

LBH Development Management DPD

- 4.13 Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) sets out Haringey's Development Charter and states:

A All new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will support design-led development proposals which meet the following criteria:

- a. Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
- b. Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
- c. Confidently address feedback from local consultation;
- d. Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
- e. Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

Design Standards

Character of development

B Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:

- a. Building heights;
- b. Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;
- c. Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;
- d. Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;
- e. Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;
- f. Active, lively frontages to the public realm; and
- g. Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

Landscaping

C Development proposals shall demonstrate how the landscaping and planting are integrated into the development as a whole. The Council will expect development proposals to respond to:

- a. Landform;
- b. Levels, slopes and the fall of the ground;
- c. Trees on and close to the site;
- d. Landscaped boundary and treatments; and
- e. Any other significant biodiversity (including prioritising native over invasive species) on or close to the site.

Privacy and amenity

D Development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development's users and neighbours. The Council will support proposals that:

- a. Provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity space where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land;
- b. Provide an appropriate amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and the residents of the development; and
- c. Address issues of vibration, noise, fumes, odour, light pollution and microclimatic conditions likely to arise from the use and activities of the development.

- 4.14 Regarding proposals for tall buildings, the Development Management DPD helpfully states that taller buildings are defined as those that are two to three storeys higher than the prevailing building heights. Tall buildings are defined in strategic local plan policies as being ten storeys or over and taller buildings are not tall buildings. Policy DM6 (Building Heights) states:

A For all development proposals, the Council expects building heights to be of an appropriate scale which respond positively to the site's surroundings, the local context and the need to achieve a high standard of design in accordance with Policy DM1 (addressed earlier).

- 4.15 Policy DM9 is a key policy as it set out the approach of LBH to the Management of the Historic Environment. It addresses Conservation Areas and Archaeology but only the policy relating to Conservation Areas is relevant in the current context. The Policy states:

Haringey's Heritage Assets

A Development that conserves and enhances the significance of a heritage asset and its setting will be supported.

B Proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance. Applicants are required to submit with their planning application a statement describing the significance of the heritage asset(s) concerned, including any contribution made by its setting, along with an assessment and justification of the impact of the new development on the asset and its setting.

C When considering the impact of proposals on the historic environment, the Council will have regard to:

- a. The priority given to sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and its setting;
- b. Character appraisals and management plans or other guidance, where they are available;
- c. The preservation or reinstatement of original or historic form, fabric, function or character of the asset and its setting;
- d. The relationship with adjoining and neighbouring uses, particularly where these are heritage assets of significance in their own right;
- e. The desirability of securing a viable use for a heritage asset consistent with its conservation;
- f. An understanding of and respect for significance of heritage assets as parts of measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change; and
- g. The contribution that the sensitive utilisation of heritage assets can make to sustainable regeneration.

Conservation Areas

D Subject to (A-C) above the Council will give consideration to, and support where appropriate, proposals for the sensitive redevelopment of sites and buildings where these detract from the character and appearance of a

Conservation Area and its setting, provided that they are compatible with and/or complement the special characteristics and significance of the area.

E Proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.

- 4.16 Paragraph 2.66 of the supporting text is noteworthy as it acknowledges that Conservation Areas can be enhanced through the sensitive redevelopment of sites. It also recognises that opportunities include the removal of buildings or features which detract from the character and appearance of the area. It goes on to make it clear that Policy DM9 provides support for such redevelopment where it contributes to the objectives of conserving and enhancing Haringey's historic environment. It urges proposals to improve the site to make it more sympathetic to the Conservation Area.

- 4.17 Policy DM15 addresses Specialist Housing. It points out:

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 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.

- 4.18 Policy DM 21 (Sustainability, Design, Layout and Construction) states proposals should:

- apply the energy hierarchy to minimise energy use in order to meet, and if possible, exceed minimum carbon dioxide reduction requirements;

- apply the cooling hierarchy to reduce the potential for overheating and limit reliance on mechanical air conditioning systems;
- maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity on-site, including through appropriate landscaping, SuDS, living roofs and green walls;
- wherever possible use building materials with high environmental performance ratings;
- seek opportunities for locally sourced labour and
- consideration of carbon offset payments where it can be demonstrated that the proposals are unable to meet carbon dioxide emission reduction targets on site.

New Local Plan, First Steps

- 4.19 The Council is preparing a new Local Plan. It published a version for public consultation on 16 November 2020 until 1 March 2021. Representations are currently being considered, but a timescale for the publication of a revised draft Local Plan has not yet been determined. Therefore, the draft new Local Plan is at an early stage in the process towards adoption.

Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan

- 4.20 As mentioned earlier in this Planning Statement, the subject site is in the Highgate Conservation Area. In December 2013, LBH adopted a Character Appraisal and Management Plan for the Conservation Area. The site, fronting North Hill, is in Sub Area 1 (Village Core). It refers to the site specifically and states “The (adjacent) post war Mary Feilding Guild is considered negative to the character of the road”.
- 4.21 The Character Appraisal and Management Plan highlights that immediately to the north of the subject site are 109-119 North Hill, which is a little altered three-storey Grade II listed terrace of late Georgian town houses and Numbers 9, and 15 View Road are also Grade II listed.
- 4.22 Immediately to the south of the site is Wetherley Court, built circa. 1990 in pastiche Queen Anne style. This is considered a neutral contributor to the character of the area.
- 4.23 “Highcroft”, a four-storey block of flats opposite the site on the eastern side of North Hill is referred to at paragraph 4.4.63 as “The placing of intrusive cell phone aerial boxes on its roof is a negative feature”. In Section 3.0 of this Planning Statement, it was highlighted that a permission was recently granted in September 2020 to remove the negative features from the roof and to replace them with a new storey of residential accommodation consisting of six residential units.

London Plan

- 4.24 Whilst the planning application is not an application of potential strategic importance and, therefore, not referable to the Mayor of London under The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the London Plan does form part of the development plan. So, relevant policies are summarised here.
- 4.25 Policy H12 (Supported and specialist accommodation) says that the delivery, retention and refurbishment of supported and specialist housing which meets an identified need should be supported.
- 4.26 Policy H13 (Specialist older persons housing) urges boroughs to work positively and collaboratively with providers to identify sites which may be suitable for specialist older persons housing. The policy states that account should be taken of, inter alia, the need for sites to be well-connected in terms of contributing to an inclusive neighbourhood, access to relevant facilities, social infrastructure, health care and are well served by public transport. Paragraph 4.13.14 of the supporting text goes on to say that care home accommodation (C2) is an important element of the suite of accommodation options for older Londoners and this should be recognised by boroughs and applicants. To meet the predicted increase in demand for care beds to 2029, London needs to provide an average of 867 care beds a year.
- 4.27 Policy SI 2 (Minimising greenhouse gas emissions) states:
- A. Major development should be net-zero carbon. This means reducing greenhouse gas emissions in operation and minimising both annual and peak energy demand in accordance with the energy hierarchy of “be lean, be clean, be green and be seen”;
 - B. Major development proposals should include a detailed energy strategy to demonstrate how the zero-carbon target will be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy;
 - C. A minimum on-site reduction of at least 35% beyond Building Regulations is required for major development and non-residential development should achieve 15% through energy efficiency measures. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either through a cash-in-lieu contribution to the borough’s carbon offset fund or off-site provided that alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain;
 - D. Boroughs must establish and administer a carbon offset fund;
 - E. Major development proposals should calculate and minimise carbon emissions from any other part of the development that is not covered by Building Regulations and

F. Development proposals referred to the Mayor should calculate whole-life carbon emissions through Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions to reduce life-cycle emissions.

- 4.28 Policy SI 4 (Managing heat risk) points out that major developments should demonstrate through an energy strategy how they will reduce the potential for internal overheating and reliance on air condition systems in accordance with the colling hierarchy set out in the policy.
- 4.29 Policy SI 13 (Sustainable Drainage) urges major development proposals to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible and in accordance with the drainage hierarchy set out in the policy. This includes rainwater attenuation in green infrastructure features and resisting impermeable surfacing.
- 4.30 Policy G5 (Urban Greening) emphasises major development proposals should contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of the site and building design, and by incorporating measures such as high-quality landscaping (including trees), green roofs, green walls and nature based sustainable drainage. The policy goes on to say that boroughs should develop an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) to identify the appropriate amount of urban greening in new developments. The UGF should be based on the factors set out in Table 8.2 but tailored to local circumstances. In the interim, the Mayor recommends a target score of 0.4 for predominantly residential developments and a target score of 0.3 for predominantly commercial developments.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 4.31 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a financial payment applicable to both the Mayor of London and the LBH for additional net development over 100 sq. m. (Gross Internal Area). The financial payment, which is normally payable on implementation, is subject to indexation and credits are available for charitable purposes.
- 4.32 The London Mayoral CIL 2, which took effect from 1 April 2019, is £60 per sq. m. on all development uses in the Band 2 area, which the LBH is located in.
- 4.33 In respect of LBH's own CIL Charging Schedule, this was approved on 21 July, and it took effect on 1 November 2014. The borough is divided into three CIL Charging Areas – Western, Central and Eastern. Highgate and the site are in the Western Charging Area and the rate for residential (and student accommodation) use is £265 per sq. m. (estimated by LBH to be £370.33 sq. m. with indexation as at 2020). However, all other land uses (except supermarkets and retail warehousing) are subject to a nil rate.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4.34 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. The revised NPPF was updated on 20 July 2021.

4.35 Paragraph 10 states:

So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.... For decision-taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.

5.0 The Proposed Development

5.1 The proposed development comprises:

“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 70 bedrooms, a hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, café, lounge, bar, well-being shop, general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.”

5.2 The current care home comprises a number of buildings which have developed incrementally over time and form a broad L-shape on the site linking Truscott House, fronting North Hill in the north-east, with Kekewich House, which fronts View Road in the south-west. The total floorspace of the existing buildings is 2,367 sq. m. (GIA).

5.3 The proposal is to replace the existing buildings, which are no longer fit-for-purpose and comprise an ad hoc mix of architectural styles, with modern, fit-for-purpose, sustainable buildings of high quality, with a coherent architectural style appropriate to the site and its setting. The buildings deliberately seek to follow the broad L-shape of the existing buildings. In order to achieve a viable level of accommodation, the proposed development does encroach slightly into the existing rear garden. However, the proposed building footprint has been set back slightly from sensitive boundaries to neighbouring properties wherever possible. The total floorspace of the proposed buildings is 6,443.5 sq. m. (GIA).

5.4 The proposal is predominantly for traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia and palliative care). This will account for approximately 62% of the bedrooms. The well-being and physiotherapy centre will account for approximately 38% of the bedrooms and will provide an attractive and relaxing environment in which residents can recuperate from operations (such as knee, hip and shoulder procedures) with specialist staff and tailored care to increase their health span.

5.5 The existing main entrance to the care home is via Truscott House on North Hill. This is an unattractive and not particularly welcoming entrance. In contrast to the attractive and well-maintained front gardens to residential properties along North Hill, the forecourt to the care home is unappealing and dominated by car parking and hardstanding. Therefore, an integral part of the proposals is to create a new, attractive and more welcoming main entrance including block paving and soft landscaping to the care home on View Road. This is intended to be the communal hub of the property and the focus of the proposed View Road elevation. The new entrance utilises the existing entrance and egress in the existing perimeter wall,

but it is proposed to remove the existing unsightly wooden trellis on top of the wall and the two sets of gates.

- 5.6 A new entrance plaza to the well-being and physiotherapy centre on North Hill is proposed. This has been designed to be in-keeping with the front gardens of residential properties on North Hill. It includes a garden enclosed by low walls with tree and shrub planting and high-quality natural sandstone paving.
- 5.7 There is an existing basement to Truscott House, which fronts on to North Hill. In order to achieve a viable level of accommodation and, at the same time, seeking to minimise the height of the proposed buildings, a new, extended basement to the buildings is proposed. This takes advantage of the steep slope of the site away from the View Road frontage. The basement includes 17 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled access bays), 8 cycle spaces (13 cycle spaces in total are provided) and electric vehicle charging points. The basement parking spaces are accessed via a ramp from View Road. The basement also includes some resident facilities including a gym, hydro pool, sauna, cinema, hairdressers/barbers and beauty salon, well-being shop and consulting rooms. Some staff facilities are also provided such as a kitchen, laundry, offices and reception rooms. A delivery bay is also provided in the basement.
- 5.8 The focus of the ground floor is a spacious, light and welcoming foyer and central hub accessed via View Road. It also includes a reception area, restaurant (with attractive views overlooking the garden area) and bedrooms. The ground floor to the well-being and physiotherapy centre will also benefit from a new, improved entrance on to North Hill with a foyer and hub area with a reception and meeting room area with a café and outdoor seating.
- 5.9 The first floor is a residential care floor. It provides bedrooms (some with terraces or Juliette balconies), a lounge, quiet lounge and dining area. Staff facilities included at this level include a staff room and treatment/medical rooms.
- 5.10 The second floor comprises a dementia care floor with bedrooms (but no kitchenettes or Juliette balconies), a terrace, dining area and spa. A flat roof area separates the new building fronting North Hill with the new building to the rear along the northern boundary. Mechanical and electrical plant is situated in this location, including air source heat pumps and condensers.
- 5.11 A third-floor level is provided to the new building fronting North Hill only. It accommodates bedrooms and suites with a terrace. Above this space is a flat roof which accommodates PV panels on a green, biodiverse roof.
- 5.12 The care home on View Road has been designed in a contemporary style but taking design cues from the surrounding area. The proposed materials are primarily red brick for the elevations and slate for the roof, but variety and interest provided by, for example, zinc dormer faces and grey aluminium windows and doors.

- 5.13 The well-being and physiotherapy centre on North Hill is also designed in a contemporary style. The building takes the form of three stepped back bays in similar elevational materials. This approach is intended to reflect the width and architectural rhythm of the adjacent Grade II listed terrace, to remain subservient to it and to minimise impact in important local views.
- 5.14 More detailed information on the accommodation, facilities and design is provided in the submitted Design & Access Statement.

6.0 Pre-application advice and public consultation

- 6.1 The current proposals have been developed following an extensive and comprehensive pre-application process by a very experienced and capable advisory team. The proposals have also been developed and refined through lengthy and extensive engagement with stakeholders, including LBH Officers, local Ward Members, Member of the Planning Sub-Committee, LBH Quality Review Panel, local residents, amenity groups, the NHS, local care organisations and other interested parties.
- 6.2 The planning application is supported by a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) produced by Forty Shillings, which primarily summarises the public consultation and engagement exercise carried out, the comments made and how the scheme has been adapted to address some of these comments. This process accords with policy and guidance in the 2011 Localism Act, the NPPF (paragraph 132) and LBH's SCI adopted in March 2013 which all emphasise the importance of engaging with the LPA and the local community about issues such as the design and style of emerging schemes before submitting planning applications.

Pre-application discussions with LBH

- 6.3 The applicant appreciates that pre-application engagement offers significant potential to improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system and improve the quality of a planning application and its likelihood of success. Therefore, the applicant entered into pre-application discussions with LBH Officers at a very early stage and then under the framework of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) agreed with LBH.
- 6.4 The first pre-app meeting was in August 2020 and was attended by Planning, Conservation, Design, Climate Change and Health and Social Care Officers. Transport and Highway Officers did not attend the meeting but provided their comments in writing. In advance of the meeting, Officers were provided with a site location plan, photos of the site and the surrounding area, a Planning Statement, a draft Design & Access Statement and an Initial Heritage Assessment. The principal purpose of the meeting was to establish the acceptability of the principle of the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and their replacement with a high quality, fit for purpose care home with a minimum of 72 bedrooms.
- 6.5 LBH provided its written response on 9 October 2020. In summary, the response stated that:
 - The principle of retaining a C2 care home use on the site is supported and welcomed;
 - The demolition of most of the site's existing buildings would be supported, but in order for the complete demolition of the site to be acceptable, it

would need to be demonstrated that the retention of the original structure would not be viable;

- The Council would be supportive of an increase in development on this site if it secures the long-term future of a Class C2 care home, but some reduction or re-organisation of the massing may be required in order to minimise any impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties;
- The Council is not wedded to a particular design approach, but any selected approach would need to display the necessary quality and that the massing and design respects the special historic and architectural context of the Conservation Area

- 6.6 The written response also stated that the proposals would need to be presented to the Council's QRP, Pre-App Planning Sub-Committee and DM Forum and it set out the likely planning application requirements.
- 6.7 At the first pre-app meeting, the broad design approach was a traditional, Arts & Craft style. Officers did not like the design approach taken and said Officers would prefer an authentic contemporary design. Therefore, further pre-app meetings were held with a number of options for a more contemporary form of design but taking some design cues from the surrounding area. Officers also stated that as the site has two distinctively different frontages, they felt the best approach would be for a slightly different design approach to reflect these two different frontages, rather than a more uniform approach across the whole site.
- 6.8 At further pre-app meetings with Officers, we focussed on providing a comprehensive contextual analysis of the site and the surrounding area and to make a clear and convincing case for the demolition of Kekewich House fronting View Road. DWA Architects highlighted they had looked at various options to retain, remodel and refurbish Kekewich House as part of a new scheme. However, the scheme would not be viable if Kekewich House was required to be retained. The accommodation and facilities would be severely compromised and a new, extended basement to provide a new entrance and hub on View Road, which is an integral part of the proposed scheme could not be achieved with the retention of Kekewich House.
- 6.9 As part of this exercise, KM Heritage questioned the contribution of Kekewich House to the area and felt that the modern extensions compromise any contribution. Overall, KM Heritage felt the benefits outweigh the loss of the building. Officers stated that the applicant had presented a very carefully balanced analysis of practical issues with a clear and thorough understanding of the of the conservation area opportunities and constraints. Accordingly, Officers confirmed they were satisfied that the analysis demonstrated the proposals would not be viable if Kekewich House was to be retained as part of the redevelopment scheme.

- 6.10 Numerous further pre-application discussions took place with LBH Officers. These included investigating different design options and styles. One of the options we proposed was to add an additional storey to the proposed scheme. We felt this would not be out of context with the site and its surroundings and was required to achieve a viable number of beds, provide the residents facilities required and to reduce the size of the proposed basement. Officers were not convinced of this option but felt it was sufficiently developed for it to be reported to the LBH QRP for consideration and feedback. It was felt that the timing of the first presentation of the scheme to QRP was right. It was not too early in the planning process as broad principles and parameters had been discussed, but certain detailed technical matters had not been progressed, yet the scheme was not so advanced that the QRP would not be given a sufficient opportunity to influence and improve the quality of the design.
- 6.11 Therefore, the scheme was presented to LBH's QRP on 18 May 2021. It comprised a 4-storey building fronting View Road with a mansard roof and a 5-storey building fronting North Hill with a uniform height and frontage. In summary, the QRP's written response was that the overall principle was accepted. However, they were not wholly convinced by the proposals and said that further strategic and detailed work was required. This included the need for further work to reduce the scale, massing and building footprint. The QRP also said that it was important for the scheme to show the proposals within contextual sections and elevations. The QRP encouraged a calmer, more coherent approach to the architecture and further technical work was required on matters such as daylight, sunlight and shadowing, transport, servicing, waste management, deliveries, sustainability and renewable energy and landscaping. The QRP also said greater engagement was needed with the local community and interested groups.
- 6.12 A number of further pre-app meetings with Officers took place to discuss our design response to QRP's feedback and we continued to work as collaboratively and co-operatively with Officers wherever possible. This included a visit of the site itself and a walk around the surrounding area with Officers to discuss and agree important views, opportunities, constraints and features that were liked and those felt less appropriate. As a result, building height across the scheme was reduced by a storey, the building footprint was reduced allowing the retention of more of the existing garden area, a calmer, more coherent architectural expression was adopted, a landscaping masterplan and concepts were prepared and technical aspects such as sustainability and renewable energy, waste management, deliveries and servicing were all progressed.
- 6.13 In particular, the mansard roof of the building fronting View Road was replaced with gables and dormer roof accommodation and the building fronting North Hill revised to effectively form three bays with varying heights and stepped back from

North Hill to be more in keeping with the proportions and rhythm of the adjacent listed Georgian terrace.

- 6.14 Officers felt that the design response was comprehensive, constructive and positive. They felt it was an appropriate stage at which to report the revised proposals back to QRP. However, it was felt that, subject to the agreement of the Chair of the QRP, that another full QRP review would not be necessary, but a QRP Chair's Review with one of the original QRP members would be appropriate and sufficient. The QRP Chair agreed, and this took place on 25 August 2021. The QRP's written response stated that the work done in response to the previous review has been very positive. It commended the tenacity of the project team working with Officers and consulting the local community. The QRP accepts the massing and development density of the proposals but encouraged the refining of the massing of part of the roofscape. The Panel feels the reduction of garden space is acceptable as the building footprint has been pulled away from the boundary in some locations providing a more generous distance to adjacent buildings and it liked the concept of a "healing garden". The QRP recommended the relocation of some uses in the basement to other locations (such as the restaurant from the basement to the ground floor overlooking the garden area). The Panel also said sections through the accommodation will be critically important and the introduction of fenestration or opening in the North Hill flank elevation would be beneficial. The QRP said it was confident that the project team will be able to satisfactorily address the points with Officers and confirmed it did not need to see the proposals again prior to submission.
- 6.15 The applicant's design response has, once again, been to address all the QRP's points and to incorporate as many as possible. For example, alternations have been made to the roof form (for example, by incorporating half hipped roofs to both wings of the building fronting View Road), the restaurant has been relocated from the basement to the ground floor overlooking the garden, the staff accommodation has also been moved out of the basement to the upper floors and fenestration and openings have been included in the flank elevation of the North Hill building.
- 6.16 Further pre-application meetings and discussions have taken place with Planning, Design and Conservation Officers to refine the proposals. The proposals were then presented to a meeting of LBH's Pre-App Sub Committee on 14 September 2021 and thereafter to LBH's Development Management Forum meeting on 27 September 2021. The proposals have also been informed by meetings and discussions with Transport, Ecology, Arboricultural, Climate Change and Drainage Officers.

Public consultation

- 6.17 The current proposals have been developed and refined through a public consultation and engagement process broadly between April 2021 and October 2021. This has centred around a series of meetings with local residents, local amenity groups, Councillors, the NHS and local care organisations. A dedicated project website was set up to provide detailed information about the proposals and to invite comments. This was publicised by the distribution of over 2,000 flyers in the local area.
- 6.18 The feedback received and how we have responded to this is summarised in the submitted SCI. However, the main issues raised can be summarised as follows:
- Land use
 - Height, scale and massing
 - Design
 - Daylight, sunlight, shadowing and potential overlooking
 - Landscaping
 - Transport/traffic
 - Basement Impact Assessment and
 - Environmental performance
- 6.19 It is deliberately not intended to address each of these individual issues here, but they will be addressed in the next “Planning Analysis” section of this Planning Statement to avoid repetition.

7.0 Planning Analysis

Land use and need for additional bed spaces

- 7.1 A care use (Class C2 – Residential Institution) has been long established on the site for at least 85 years and forms part of the character of the area. The applicant is committed to retaining a care use on the site and strategic and local planning policies support the principle of the provision of new specialist accommodation such as care homes. For example, development plan policy set out in Development Management DPD Policy DM15 states that the Council will support proposals for new specialist needs housing. The current proposals would not result in the loss of a care home use, nor would it result in a reduction in the number of care bedrooms and the Council's written pre-application advice confirms that the principle of retaining a Class C2 care home is supported and welcomed.
- 7.2 The former Mary Feilding Guild care home was registered with the CQC for 43 bedrooms, although at the time it closed in May 2021, there were only 16 residents i.e., an occupancy of only 37%. This was a significant under-utilisation of an attractive site. By the Mary Feilding Guild's own admission, the care home had been financially unsustainable for several years. It was unable to attract new residents, and this indicated the home could not continue to operate and function as previously operated or provide modern care and nursing facilities in its previous form.
- 7.3 The proposal is for up to 70 bedrooms predominantly for traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia and palliative care). This will account for approximately 62% of the bedrooms. The well-being and physiotherapy centre will account for approximately 38% of the bedrooms and will provide an attractive and relaxing environment in which residents can recuperate from operations with specialist staff and tailored care. Therefore, the proposed provision of traditional, long term senior care bedrooms would be about 43 bedrooms i.e., the same number that the former Mary Feilding Guild is registered for with the CQC.
- 7.4 Until relatively recently, the applicant was proposing a new nursing and convalescence home and a well-being and physiotherapy centre including 70 bedrooms and a wide range of supporting facilities focussed on short term stay accommodation for older residents to recuperate following surgery. At that time, the applicant had commissioned experts to assess the demand for care 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 also identified there is a good provision of sheltered accommodation in the area. However, the experts did identify a strong demand for a nursing and convalescence home to assist older people to recuperate from operations and increase their health span. Some people consulted at this stage queried whether

the proposal was a Class C2 care home use and others said that they greatly regretted the loss of long-term care for the elderly and whilst the proposals for short term recuperative care may be a sounder business model, they were not convinced this meets the needs of Highgate.

- 7.5 Officers of the Local Planning Authority have confirmed that the proposed use is a Class C2 care home use and the applicant has provided a legal opinion to Council Officers and Members confirming this. However, partly as a response to these comments and partly as a result of the preference of a very credible potential partner, the applicant has decided to seek permission for mainly traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care, but with a smaller component accounting for a well-being and physiotherapy centre. On this basis, we do not consider that any documentation is required as part of the application submission to support the case for this type of provision and Officers have confirmed this.

Justification of the replacement of the existing buildings including Kekewich House

- 7.6 At an early stage in the pre-application discussions, the Council's written pre-application response said that the demolition of most of the site's existing buildings would be supported. However, for the complete demolition of the site to be acceptable, it would need to be demonstrated that the retention of the original house on View Road (Kekewich House) would not be viable. Therefore, the applicant discussed and agreed with Officers a scope of works to demonstrate the retention of Kekewich House in the redevelopment scheme would not be viable. This was carried out and submitted to Officers.
- 7.7 DWA Architects highlighted they had looked at various options to retain, remodel and refurbish Kekewich House as part of a new scheme. However, the scheme would not be viable if Kekewich House was required to be retained. The accommodation and facilities would be severely compromised and a new, extended basement to provide a new entrance and hub on View Road, which is an integral part of the proposed scheme could not be achieved with the retention of Kekewich House.
- 7.8 As part of this exercise, KM Heritage noted that the property is not statutorily or locally listed but was originally a large family dwelling designed in a style and materials similar to other family dwellings of its age in View Road. However, KM Heritage questioned the contribution of Kekewich House to the area and felt that the modern unsympathetic extensions to the side and rear compromise any contribution. Overall, KM Heritage felt the benefits outweigh the loss of the building. Officers stated that the applicant had presented a very carefully balanced analysis of practical issues with a clear and thorough understanding of the of the conservation area opportunities and constraints. Full information on the assessment of heritage considerations is set out in KM Heritage's submitted Heritage Assessment. Accordingly, Officers confirmed they were satisfied that

the analysis demonstrated the proposals would not be viable if Kekewich House was to be retained as part of the redevelopment scheme.

- 7.9 In addition, the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, adopted in December 2013 states at paragraph 4.4.79 that “The (adjacent) post war Mary Feilding Guild is considered negative to the character of the road”. We consider that the current proposal for a replacement building replacing Truscott House removes this negative feature in the Conservation Area and provides a building that is more in keeping with the Conservation Area and the adjacent Grade II Listed 109 North Hill and the terrace of Grade II Listed Georgian town houses in the terrace to the north.

Design, height, scale, massing and layout

- 7.10 The applicant has from the outset assessed the site and its context carefully and rigorously, including in planning, heritage and design terms. This process has included extensive pre-application discussions with Planning, Design and Heritage Officers and an inspection of the site and a walk around the site and the surrounding area with Officers. Important views were discussed and agreed, opportunities and constraints and features that were liked and felt to be appropriate in this context and those which were felt to be less appropriate.
- 7.11 The ethos underpinning the design of the proposals has been Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) and Policy DM9 (Haringey’s Heritage Assets). Change on this site is inevitable and any new development involving change will have an impact on its surroundings, but the applicant has sought to minimise these impacts. Further information on the design approach is set out in the submitted Design & Access Statement.
- 7.12 The site is in the Highgate Conservation Area. It has frontages on to both North Hill and View Road. The two frontages have very different streetscapes, and it is felt provided an opportunity to provide two distinct design approaches reflecting their context. Indeed, this approach was supported and endorsed by Officers at the pre-application stage rather than an option to provide a uniform design approach across the whole site. Following the detailed analysis of the nature and qualities of the local context, a contemporary style of design has been adopted but taking some cues from more traditional design features in the locality.
- 7.13 North Hill is characterised by varied topography and a very diverse range of architectural ages and styles. The western side of North Hill is wide and spacious and properties of generally three to four storeys front on to it, but behind verdant and well-maintained front gardens. These properties include a terrace of Grade II listed Georgian townhouses, which immediately abut the north of Truscott House on the site. Truscott House is a four-storey building but has a lift shaft that protrudes higher and is visually prominent. The building also has an unsightly frontage onto North Hill dominated by hardstanding and car parking and an

unclear and unsatisfactory entrance. It is identified in the Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal as negative to the character of the road.

- 7.14 Therefore, the proposals for North Hill comprise a new four storey building of a lower height than the existing Truscott House with a contemporary design, but deliberately reflecting the rhythm and proportions of the adjacent listed terrace. The building has varying heights and three bays to follow the width of the adjacent listed residential properties. This is intended to be in keeping with, but subservient to the adjacent Grade II listed terrace and to minimise impact in important local views. The building height to the parapet has also been aligned to meet the ridge height of the adjacent listed terrace.
- 7.15 Juliette balconies have been incorporated to the upper-level windows, again, to reflect the Georgian character of the adjacent terrace. A new, improved entrance is also provided with a garden enclosed by low brick walls, tree and shrub planting and high-quality natural sandstone paving.
- 7.16 View Road is a quieter residential street with a more suburban character with lots of examples of traditional Georgian and Queen Anne styles. The design approach has also been to adopt a contemporary style of architecture with a three-storey red brick building with a pitched roof and dormer accommodation and secondary materials of grey slate for the roof, zinc dormer faces and grey aluminium windows and doors. The western part of the new building has been stepped down to be subservient to the closest to the adjacent 3 View Road, which is a Locally Listed Building. The proposed building height is very similar to the existing building heights of 1A View Road and 3 View Road either side. A new and improved entrance will also be provided via View Road, retaining the existing access and egress arrangements and perimeter wall, but removing the trellis on top of the wall and the gates.
- 7.17 The proposals have sought to retain the broad L-shape of the existing buildings on the site. The proposed new building fronting North Hill has been set back slightly to provide the adjacent 109 North Hill with a more attractive and spacious entrance. Elsewhere across the site, the proposals have, wherever possible, pulled the existing building line back from sensitive pinch points to some surrounding properties. The proposed development does encroach slightly into the existing garden area, but this has been necessary to achieve a viable number of bedrooms and facilities.
- 7.18 In this respect, a new basement is proposed to provide a viable level of accommodation and utilising the steep slope of the site away from View Road, whilst minimising any increase in the height of the new buildings on the site.
- 7.19 Whilst we fully appreciate that a good case can be made for a sensitively designed new build scheme representing an overall improvement to the site and the character of the area and the new build scheme needs to be viable in terms of the

number of bed spaces, this also needs to be balanced against the new buildings not being or perceived to be overbearing and excessive and display symptoms of over-development.

- 7.20 Earlier iterations of proposals for the site included an additional storey across the site. However, the applicant agreed to reduce the height across the site by one storey when this was assessed in important local views. Also, whilst a mansard roof to the View Road building was favoured by the applicant earlier in the pre-application discussions and there are examples of mansard roofs to properties in View Road, it was agreed that a pitched roof with dormer would be a more appropriate solution.
- 7.21 Therefore, we consider that the design, height, scale, massing and layout of the proposals are of a high standard of design, contribute positively to the site itself and the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. This is a view shared by Officers in pre-application discussions and by the LBH QRP. One indication of whether proposal represent inappropriate overdevelopment of a site are adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties. This is not the case in this instance and is addressed next.

Impact on neighbouring properties and residential amenities

- 7.22 The applicant acknowledges that the impact of a redevelopment scheme on neighbouring properties and residential amenity is an important factor. Therefore, the applicant has assessed the height, scale, massing and layout of the proposed scheme in relation to neighbouring properties very carefully.
- 7.23 The proposal incorporates a new basement to provide a viable number of bedroom and facilities whilst minimising the height of the proposed buildings. The footprint of the proposed buildings broadly follows the footprint of the existing buildings. However, wherever possible, we have pulled the building line back from several sensitive boundaries to adjacent properties.
- 7.24 On behalf of the applicant, DelvaPatmanRedler have carried out daylight and sunlight tests in the existing baseline and proposed development scenarios. They have also carried out supplementary tests which are all set out in their submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report. The effects of the proposed development on neighbouring properties are summarised below.
- 7.25 DelvaPatmanRedler assessed the effects of the proposed development on 23 neighbouring properties adjacent to the site. With regards to daylight, of the 237 habitable windows assessed in the 23 neighbouring properties, 232 (98%) would satisfy the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) guidelines and of the 155 habitable rooms assessed, 153 (99%) would satisfy the No Sky Line (NSL) guidelines. The impacts on VSC and NSL would fully satisfy the BRE guidelines for 20 of the 23 neighbouring properties assessed. The impacts on the three properties (1A View

Road, 34 Yeatman Road and 46 Yeatman Road) which do not fully satisfy the BRE guidelines were examined in further detail.

- 7.26 All the VSC infringements occur to windows which have a canopy or overhang directly above them. An additional alternative baseline assessment was undertaken removing the effects of these overhangs from the assessments in both the existing and proposed conditions. The alternative assessment demonstrates that all 5 windows will comfortably comply with the assessment criteria illustrating that the effects in the primary assessment are more because of the presence of the canopies or overhangs themselves rather than as a result of the overdevelopment of the proposed buildings.
- 7.27 The NSL infringement to 1A View Road occurs to a space where the window will comply with the VSC assessment criteria, the retained VSC will be 22.5% and the retained NSL figure will be 70%. This illustrates that, despite the reduction, the retained light levels will remain very good for this urban location.
- 7.28 In respect of sunlight, of the 117 windows assessed in 19 neighbouring properties, all 117 (100%) would satisfy the BRE guidelines for APSH and 116 (99%) would comply with the winter Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH).
- 7.29 Addressing shadowing and the two-hour sun on the ground analyses, a total of 12 neighbouring gardens and amenity spaces have been considered. 9 garden/amenity spaces would satisfy the BRE guidelines for sun on the ground. The remaining infringement is to 109 North Hill which, because it is in closest proximity to the site, any small addition to the massing could potentially cause an adverse reduction due to this proximity.
- 7.30 Therefore, we consider that whilst any impact on neighbouring property is regrettable, the analyses demonstrates that the proposed development performs very well in terms of daylight, sunlight and shadowing in this urban context and is consistent with the Council's policy.
- 7.31 In terms of potential overlooking, the applicant has also sought to minimise any potential. The proposed elevations are sufficiently distanced from the elevations of existing neighbouring properties to minimise any adverse effect. There is also a belt of tall, mature London Plan trees along the northern boundary of the site adjacent to the rear gardens of properties on Yeatman Road. Whilst these trees are located on a narrow strip of Council owned land immediately to the north of the site, the applicant supports the retention of these trees and will look to provide appropriate supplementary planting along this boundary if required to further help alleviate any concerns about potential overlooking.

Transport and highways

- 7.32 The site has a PTAL score of 3 "moderate". It is close to public transport facilities (including Highgate Underground Station and bus routes) and the Strategic Cycle

Network and is not reliant on the use of the private car. A PTAL score of 4 or above is required to allow for car-light or car-free development. So, on the pre-application advice of the Council's Highways Team, the applicant's transport consultant has sought to provide on-site parking commensurate with the expected demand and no more than that, alongside a Travel Plan which seeks to minimise private car use wherever possible. At an early point in pre-application discussions, the applicant's transport consultant also discussed and agreed the scope for parking beat surveys with Council Highways Officers. The surveys were carried out and demonstrated that there is ample parking capacity within the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). A site Travel Plan will be implemented, which will allow for post occupational parking beat surveys. The site will also support the consultation for the extension of CPZ hours of operation.

- 7.33 The applicant's transport consultant carried out a robust trip generation on a worst-case scenario basis. This demonstrates that the proposed development would generate a total of 11-13 two-way trip movements in each highway peak. This is not considered significant. Movements and parking demand in some streets close to the site were shown to be high between 15:00 and 16:00 coinciding with school pick up. Therefore, the site will be managed to limit peak hour trips and limit trips between 15:00 and 16:00 where feasible.
- 7.34 The proposal will replace the unattractive hardstanding and vehicle parking spaces on North Hill with an attractive new garden with quality natural sandstone paving and soft landscaping. The proposals will also provide a new and improved entrance on View Road utilising the existing access and egress arrangements in the existing perimeter wall. This entrance will provide a drop-off space suitable for 2 vehicles including delivery, servicing and ambulances. Waste will be consolidated into a single store and servicing will be removed from the existing kerbside arrangement and carried out on-site. Swept path vehicle analyses have been carried out for ambulance and waste collection vehicles and these demonstrate the arrangements are satisfactory. HGV service trips and site parking will be removed from the sensitive North Hill Slip.
- 7.35 The View Road entrance will provide vehicular access to a basement car park which will provide 17 car parking spaces, including 2 disabled spaces and 2 enlarged bays suitable for conversion if required. 13 cycle spaces will also be provided for staff and visitors at basement and ground floor level, but this is scope to increase this if required.
- 7.36 The parking provision, access and egress arrangements and provision for deliveries, servicing and for emergency vehicles is sufficient to accommodate the total parking demand generated by the site. A detailed Transport Statement is submitted with this application and this concludes that the proposals would not result in a significant impact on the operation of the public highway or result in any increase in risk in highway safety terms. The provision of cycle parking and a

Travel Plan, as well as improved vehicle crossovers, the removal of HGV trips from sensitive highways and new soft landscaping to the North Hill frontage are all in line with the adopted London Plan and Healthy Streets policy. Therefore, we consider that the proposals should be regarded as acceptable in highways terms.

Sustainability and renewable energy

- 7.37 The proposed scheme will be very much more sustainable and energy efficient than the existing buildings. Sustainability and renewable energy principles and best practise methods are important and have been and are continuing to be included as integral elements of the design of the scheme. An Energy Statement, Dynamic Overheating Report, Sustainability Statement (including a BREEAM Pre-Assessment), Whole Life Cycle Carbon Emissions Assessment and Circular Economy report have been prepared by Hodkinson Consultancy and are submitted with this application. Full details of sustainability and renewable energy issues are set out in these documents.
- 7.38 The proposed development has been assessed under Part L 2013, utilising the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) 10 carbon factors. The development has achieved a 29.4% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions through energy efficiency measures at the “Be Lean” stage.
- 7.39 In accordance with development plan policies in the London Plan and Haringey’s Strategic and Development Management DPD Policies, the feasibility of decentralised energy production as a “Be Clean” measure has been assessed. There are no existing or proposed heat networks for the proposed development to connect to. A heat network has been proposed for the development, supplying heat from air source heat pumps and gas boilers. The use of a communal air source heat pump-led heating system was agreed in principle in pre-applications discussions between Hodkinson Consultancy and the Council’s Climate Change Officer.
- 7.40 The full spectrum of “Be Green” renewable energy generating technologies to reduce carbon emissions has been considered. Solar photovoltaics and air source heat pumps are considered to be the most appropriate technologies. Due to the sensitive location of the site and the roof profile of some of the proposed buildings, the air source heat pumps and PVs are located on flat sections of roof of buildings on the northern part of the site. The development achieves a further 32.8% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions through the use of air source heat pumps and PVs at the “Be Clean” and “Be Green” stages.
- 7.41 The proposed development is predicted to achieve an overall reduction of on-site regulated carbon dioxide emissions of 62.2%. This considerably exceeds the 35% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions required by strategic and local development plan policies. The remaining emissions to achieve Zero Carbon will

be offset through a cash in lieu payment to the Council. This represents a very high level of sustainable design and construction.

- 7.42 The proposed development also achieves a BREEAM Pre-Assessment of 66.94%, which is “Very Good”.

Landscaping

- 7.43 A high quality re-purposed landscaping scheme is proposed. This comprises several important components. One of these is a new and improved entrance on to North Hill. At present, this entrance is unclear, unwelcoming and dominated by hardstanding and car parking. The proposal is for a new garden, more in keeping with the verdant and well-maintained front gardens to the adjacent listed Georgian terrace properties welcoming users of the well-being and physiotherapy centre. This area will be enclosed with low brick walls, trees planted in high quality natural sandstone paving and soft landscaping.
- 7.44 A new, improved and more welcoming entrance to the care home will be provided to View Road. This utilises the existing access and egress arrangements in the current perimeter wall. The wall will be cleaned and re-vitalised, but the existing unsightly trellis on top of the wall will be removed as will the existing gates to provide greater openness on to the streetscape. Existing trees will be retained, and new tree and ornamental planting provided to create a more welcoming space.
- 7.45 An important element of the landscaping proposals is a healing and sensory garden. Level access to this garden space is provided from the foyer/central hub and restaurant (which does not exist at 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. The garden is a calm space with sensory features such as a water rill and bubbling bowl alongside ornamental trees and planting with a variety of textures, colours and scents across the seasons. Opportunities for art features and sculptures throughout the garden could provide further interest and reflect the historic legacy of the site and the affection and association held for it by the local community. The applicant is happy to consider ideas and suggestions further in discussions with Officers and local stakeholders. One of these possibilities may be to celebrate the historic association of the site with the renowned botanist, Mary Feilding and her contribution to the site and its legacy.
- 7.46 There are numerous trees within the site. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been carried out and this is submitted with the planning application. The current proposals seek to retain as many of the existing trees within the site as possible. Some trees of low quality and amenity may need to be removed but supplemental tree planning will be made where this is required. There are two

belts of mature trees along the northern and western boundaries of the site. These provide screening and enclosure to the garden. The tree belt to the west comprises Lime trees and are within the rear garden of 3 View Road. The trees to the north of the site are London Planes and are on a narrow strip of Council owned land. The applicant supports the retention of these trees, and they will be protected during construction. The applicant has also committed to maintaining these trees to provide adequate screening to properties on Yeatman Road and has offered to provide supplemental tree planting where appropriate. Green walls are proposed to the eastern boundary.

- 7.47 No trees on the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), but there is a TPO covering a number of tall and mature horse chestnut trees adjacent to but not in the site. Three are located in the pavement of North Hill just to the south of Truscott House and another is located in the grounds of Wetherley Court to the south of the site. The proposed development will not have any impact on these trees and the closest tree's roots will have been restricted by the 3 metre tall double skin wall that is on this boundary.
- 7.48 Ground floor residents will have access to semi-private terraces for outdoor amenity, defined and enclosed with planting. These areas link to seating areas and short walks. Terraces to the north connect to a board walk, which is raised above ground level so as not to impact on the root protection areas of existing trees. Green walls on the eastern boundary and planting on the northern boundary ensure a green outlook for residents which is intended to assist well-being and facilitate recuperation. A green biodiverse roof is also provided on the top floor of the proposed new building fronting North Hill.
- 7.49 The proposals provide an Urban Greening Factor (UGF) of 0.42, which is in keeping with the Mayor of London's target score of 0.4 for predominantly residential development and exceeds the recommended level of 0.3 for predominantly commercial development.
- 7.50 Full details of the landscaping proposals are provided in Guarda Landscape's Illustrative Masterplan, Landscape General Arrangement, Planting Schedules and Urban Greening Factor Plan.

Basement impact assessment

- 7.51 There is an existing basement under Truscott House. However, to provide a viable number of bedrooms and facilities and to minimise any increase in building height on the site, the proposals include a new basement under all new buildings. Therefore, a Basement Impact Assessment has been prepared by Elite Designers Chartered Structural Engineers and is submitted with this application. It provides the information requested in Policy DM18 (Residential Basement Development and Light Wells).

- 7.52 The report points out that it does not anticipate any significant damage to the existing structure, adjoining structures or public road because of the proposed development. It also concludes that there should not be any impact on the integrity of the adjoining structures. Due to the soil conditions and the suggested foundation solution, the assessment does not anticipate any significant settlement following the excavation.
- 7.53 The proposed structure is a traditional underpinning solution. The assessment states this will provide adequate support to the existing structure, and it is not anticipated there will be any adverse effect on surrounding properties. Therefore, the assessment concludes that the proposed works can be carried out in a safe and cost-effective manner by a suitable contractor.
- 7.54 Although not a requirement of validation of the planning application, the applicant has brought forward site investigation works, and soil samples taken from recent site investigation works by a specialist contractor are currently being tested in the laboratory. When this analysis has been completed, they will be submitted to accompany the submitted assessment.

Biodiversity

- 7.55 The site has no ecological designation and is some distance from any nearby ecological designation. Therefore, in pre-application discussions, Officers have confirmed that a biodiversity survey and report is not required. However, due to the proposed demolition of the existing buildings and the presence of tall and mature trees in the vicinity, it was agreed that an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) would be carried out. These were carried out in accordance with a scope of works agreed with the Council's Ecological Officer in advance.
- 7.56 An Ecological Impact Assessment Report has been prepared by Tyler Grange and is submitted with this application. This concludes that no impacts on statutory or non-statutory designated sites are considered likely as a result of the proposed development. The habitats that are being lost to the development are predominantly of negligible ecological importance such as buildings and hardstanding and require no specific mitigation. Those habitats of ecological importance within the site that are proposed to be the subject of habitat loss such as scattered trees will be more than mitigated for through habitat creation. These enhancements will achieve a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of +5.17 habitat units. It is considered that these habitats will provide a range of nesting, foraging, and commuting opportunities for protected and priority species such as bats, birds, reptiles and hedgehogs.
- 7.57 Therefore, it is considered that the proposals for the site accord with relevant planning policy.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and draft Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms

- 7.58 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a financial payment applicable to both the Mayor of London and LBH for additional net development over 100 sq. m. (Gross Internal Area). The financial payment, which is normally payable on implementation, is subject to indexation and credits are available for charitable purposes.
- 7.59 The London Mayoral CIL 2, which took effect from 1 April 2019, is £60 per sq. m. on all development uses in the Band 2 area, which the LBH is located in.
- 7.60 LBH's CIL Charging Schedule was approved on 21 July, and it took effect on 1 November 2014. The borough is divided into three CIL Charging Areas – Western, Central and Eastern. Highgate and the site are in the Western Charging Area. Apart from residential, student accommodation, supermarkets and retail warehousing, all land uses have a nil rate. The rate for residential use is £265 per sq. m. (estimated by LBH to be £370.33 sq. m. with indexation as at 2020).
- 7.61 With regards to potential Section 106 Heads of Terms, pre-application discussions with Officers and the written response of 9 October 2020 have indicated that these may include employment and training provision initiatives, sustainable transport measures (such as the provision of car club spaces if required and the provision of a Travel Plan), carbon offsetting contribution and Considerate Contractors Scheme registrations. Other issues may arise because of the consultation process once the planning application has been submitted. We are happy to continue these discussions with Officers and stakeholders.

8.0 Summary and Conclusions

- 8.1 This planning application seeks full permission for the redevelopment of the existing site to provide a new care home (Class C2 – Residential Institution), together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre, including up to 70 bedrooms and a wide range of associated facilities and services. The proposal is to replace all of the existing buildings, which are no longer fit-for-purpose and comprise an ad hoc mix of architectural styles and age with modern, future-proofed, sustainable and energy efficient buildings of high quality with a coherent architectural style appropriate to and in keeping with the site and its context.
- 8.2 The proposal is predominantly for traditional, long-term accommodation for senior care (including dementia and palliative care). This will account for approximately 62% of the bedrooms (i.e. about 43 bedrooms). The well-being and physiotherapy centre will account for approximately 38% of the bedrooms (i.e. about 27 bedrooms) and will provide an attractive and relaxing environment in which residents can recuperate from operations with specialist staff and tailored care to increase their healthspan.
- 8.3 A care use (Class C2 – Residential Institution) has been established on the site for at least 85 years and forms part of the character of the area. This application retains a care use on the site and strategic and local development plan policies (such as Policy DM15) support the principle of new specialist accommodation such as care homes. The proposal would not result in the loss of a care home, nor would it result in a reduction in the number of care bedrooms provided and the Council's written pre-application advice confirms the principle of retaining a Class C2 care home on the site is supported and welcomed.
- 8.4 The applicant has assessed the site and its context carefully and rigorously, including in planning, heritage and design terms. This process has included extensive pre-application discussions with various Council Officers. The ethos underpinning the design of the proposals has been Policies DM1 and DM9. It is acknowledged that any new development involving change will have an impact in its surroundings, but the applicant and the advisory team have sought to minimise these impacts.
- 8.5 The current proposals have been developed following an extensive and comprehensive pre-application process by a very experienced and capable advisory team. The proposals have also been developed and refined through lengthy and extensive engagement with stakeholders including LBH Officers, local Ward Members, Members of the Pre-App Planning Sub Committee, LBH QRP, local residents, amenity groups, the NHs, local care organisations and other interested parties.
- 8.6 We consider that the design, height, scale, massing and layout of the proposals are of a high standard, contribute positively to the site itself and the distinctive

character and amenity of the local area. This is a view shared by LBH Officers in pre-application discussions and by LBH's independent and impartial QRP.

- 8.7 In summary, we consider that the proposed development fulfils the requirements of sustainable development set out in the NPPF and there should, therefore, be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The proposal is also in accordance with strategic and local development plan policy and, as a result, we would respectfully request that the planning application is supported and planning permission granted.
- 8.8 This Planning Statement should be read and considered alongside the comprehensive suite of drawings, reports and assessments submitted with this planning application.

DRAWING NO. 20/0002		DATE	BY
NO.	DESCRIPTION		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			
52			
53			
54			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59			
60			
61			
62			
63			
64			
65			
66			
67			
68			
69			
70			
71			
72			
73			
74			
75			
76			
77			
78			
79			
80			
81			
82			
83			
84			
85			
86			
87			
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			
94			
95			
96			
97			
98			
99			
100			

NOTES:

1. EXISTING FLOOR AND FINISHES SHOWN ONLY.

2. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

3. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

4. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

5. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

6. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

7. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

8. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

9. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.

10. ALL WORK TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUILDING REGULATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY.



DWA
ARCHITECTS

200, Ainslie Street, London, E1 1AA
020 7253 1234
info@dwa-architects.co.uk
www.dwa-architects.co.uk

CLIENT:

Highgate Care Ltd

PROJECT:

New Build Care Home With Well Being and Physiotherapy Centre at 1 View Road / 103 - 107 North Hill, Highgate N6 4DP

DRAWING TITLE:

Location Plan

DRAWING STATUS:

PLANNING

SCALE: 1:1250 @ A4

DRAWN BY: NAAJ

CHECKED BY: NAAJ

DATE: 30.07.20

NO. OF SHEETS: 92

REV: *



Ordnance Survey. (c) Crown Copyright 2020. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432