

APPENDIX

1 Questions from Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee at 26.3.23 and Emails to R McN Mar 20th and emails to John McRory on 14th April

Specific questions

10. Please may we have a site visit to understand the internal relationships between the Big School and Central Hall and the corridor between the two. In addition please could you ask the School to provide sections laterally through these buildings showing relative floor levels; and photographs.

11. Please could the school provide a photomontage of the rear of the Science block and the new tunnel entrance included in the Dyne House application as seen from Southwood Lane.

17. We wish to have an understanding of how registration of pupils at different times of the day works.

19. Science block: No plant shown on the Existing Roof Plan. Is this correct?

12. We request that all ASHPs and other plant, etc. be shown on the drawings.

20. Elevation from Southwood Lane is necessary to show plant. We do not accept the School's argument that it would not be seen from the public realm.

21. Information about which windows in the Science Block will be refurbished is not shown on the drawings. We ask for details of the windows as existing and as proposed at a scale of no less than 1:5. Reason: the Science block is being treated as a curtilage building, its setting relates to a large number of listed buildings close by; the context of being in the Conservation Area needs to be addressed.

22. The plan of the new staircase at ground floor level in the Science Block shows a disabled refuge off the staff Common Room in turn off a half landing. The door to that refuge is at FFL 127.875, the Mezzanine level in the Staff Common Room (see Section AA proposed). Apart from the fact that that half landing is shown differently on plan and section, it is that door which is making the flight from that half landing up to the first floor so long. There is no plan of the Staff Common Room mezzanine level. Please could that plan be submitted.

Generic questions

1. We see the programme for the works is set out in the Formal Screening Opinion application. Any questions we may have on that document will follow.

2. We realise that programme could be subject to change. How will any change to the programme be dealt with re. CEMPs, traffic and transport issues?

3. Have you resolved with Highgate School how these planning applications will be dealt with if the works do not commence before the planning permission expiry dates?

4. The SPD gave the School the choice of either BREEAM Good or Excellent. Have you resolved which level of BREEAM should be achieved in the light of changes in higher level policies and revisions to government targets? 20.3.23 We have not looked at all the applications yet but we note that Dyne House is expected to be BREEAM Good. This is disappointing.

5. The School may have provided information about current EPC certificates but, if not, would it be reasonable to request that information? It would appear that there is no EPC for the Island site, for example.

8a We consider CEMPs should not be left to Condition because of the potential disruption to Highgate being very severe.

8b We note the consultation documents are also fuzzy.

[R McN response, 30th March: Can you clarify which consultation documents are fuzzy? Do you mean documents on the portal?]

13. Please could all Pre-apps be published with the application documents

[R McN response 30th March: The case officers will add any relevant pre-application notes to the portal shortly.]

7. The QRP reports in, for example, the Science block application are illegible. As loaded they are too small to read; when magnified they are fuzzy. This would probably apply to their other applications.

[R McN response, 30th March: Can you clarify which consultation documents are fuzzy? Do you mean documents on the portal?]

14. Please could all QRP reports be published with the application documents

[R McN response, Mar 30th: I've asked the case officer to add the relevant QRP reports so they are more legible.] This was done, with thanks.

15. Please could Highgate School provide a table showing the DfE space per pupil by age/subject requirements and the space per pupil being proposed across all these applications by age/subject.

23. Does the DfE maximum number of students include:

- Pre-Prep?
- Junior School?

24. What are the current pupil numbers in:

- Pre-Prep?
- Junior School?
- Senior School including Sixth Form?
- Sixth Form only?

25. What are the pupil numbers designed for in 2033 in:

- Pre-Prep?
- Junior School?
- Senior School including Sixth Form?
- Sixth Form only?

9. Determination levels: the Science Block and Dyne House/Island Site applications are shown on the Haringey Council portal as "Determination Level - Delegated Decision". Other applications (eg Richards Music Centre, Mallinson Sports Centre) are shown as "Determination Level - Under Review".

Can we, and they, be assured that all the applications will go to Committee simultaneously?

20.3.23 We have not checked for updates but can we assume all applications will be dealt with simultaneously and in the same way?

[R McN response 30th March: In terms of the determination level, this is automated by our digital database based on the scale of the proposals. The determination will need consultation with the Chair of planning sub committee for the application which do not exceed the relevant thresholds. We are also reviewing our committee programme at the moment to understand if we can report all of these application simultaneously. So I cannot clarify this point at the moment.]

Closing date for comments

We very much appreciate the extension you have provided but we are realising that, even with that extension, we will find it impossible to complete the work involved with these applications, especially with Easter in between. An additional two weeks may be sufficient.

(Mar 29th) Would it be reasonable to extend the deadline for comments to three weeks after we receive replies to these, and any further, comments?

[R McN response 30th March: Once we have responses from the applicant to your points we will confirm on updating the consultation date.]

2 BREEAM and BRUKL

HGY/2023/0317: SCIENCE BLOCK

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee notes the GLA and Building Regulations now require submission of a BRUKL at planning stage

From Decant - Energy and Sustainability Statement.pdf:

SP 4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey over the Local Plan's life, reducing energy use in buildings and working towards a low-carbon borough will be one of Haringey's key challenges. The Council will promote the measures outlined below to reduce carbon emissions from new and existing buildings.

1) 1. In line with the London Plan policy, the Council will promote and require all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction, and occupation by incorporating the following measures:

a) From 2011 onwards, all new residential Development will achieve a minimum 25% reduction in total (regulated) CO₂ emissions in line with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 energy standards and should aim to achieve Level 6. All new residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2016 onwards; and

b) From 2011 onwards, all new non-residential Development shall be built to at least BREEAM "very good" standard and aim to achieve BREEAM "excellent" or the current nationally agreed standard. All new non-residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2019.

BREEAM: Very Good (conditional on further appointments/information)

From Science - BREEAM Pre-assessment.pdf

3.2 Pre-Assessment estimated score and rating This assessment is based on a full refurbishment Part 1-4 scope of works. The generated Pre-assessment Stage assessment score and rating must not be used as an absolute figure, but as an indicator of the anticipated score. Assessors have no jurisdiction over the BRE nor can be responsible for the BRE changing the weightings and calculations, which may result in a possible change of the estimated assessment score. The score is tabulated below and indicates a current targeted score of 67.5% which would give a BREEAM rating of 'Very Good ($\geq 55\%$)' subject to appropriate evidence being made available by the respective stakeholders. This rating is therefore based on a conservative view of the development meeting the credit requirements, and some anticipation of works yet to be appointed including those still to be confirmed by the Client. Assumptions have been made and previous project experience has been used to determine credit scores, where insufficient information currently exists. This estimated score is a conservative indication and does not guarantee any specific score will be achieved. Some credits that are considered to currently be 'out of project scope', or unknown, have been identified in Scenario 2 indicating an increase in the scope of works, further clarification is required, external consultant appointments are needed or there is a possibility of higher credit scores being achieved based on the project team's performance etc. If all these credits in Scenario 2 were targeted and achieved, the score could increase up to 77.79%, which would give a BREEAM rating of 'Excellent ($\geq 70\%$)'. Further documentation has been requested from the team in order to confirm if these credits can be targeted based on available evidence. Please also note that some of these credits are based on requirements that need to be carried out/completed before end of RIBA stage 2. These credits may be at risk unless required appointments and activities have already been carried out. TB+A recommended that a 'buffer' of at least 4-5% is targeted over any rating threshold in order to mitigate the risk of credits being lost during the assessment, construction or withheld by the BRE as part of their Quality Assurance procedures.

BRUKL : Not provided

MISSING INFORMATION:

- BRUKL
- Full refurbishment information required