

Richards Music Centre - [HGY/2023/0315](#)

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

I noticed in the link James Argles sent to me that there was an image on page 46 showing the combined sites of Richards and Mallinson with the MOL between. I haven't found in the applications site plans of these two sites ,as existing and as proposed. Elevations to Bishopswood showing both sites would also be essential.

Please could you ask the applicant to submit these drawings as soon as possible."

[J McR response, 14th April: I will send on to the applicants for their comments / action. Tania and James copied in, Robbie for info.]

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?

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

18. Is there an application for an artificial pitch on Tatham's Field ?

9. A neighbour has approached us about determination levels: -One point (among others) that concerns me deeply is that 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 HGY/2023/0315: RICHARDS BUILDING: BREEAM/BRUKL

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: Not mentioned

BRUKL :

- (1) Appendix A - 2022-10-03 RMC GLA 2022 emissions spreadsheet

Address of project and Certifier not provided.

Achieves target

- (2) Appendix B.2 - RMC lean 2021_brukpdf

Address of project and Certifier not provided.

Fails to achieve target

- (3) Appendix C-2022 0826RMC Part L202021report-issue.pdf

This Appendix only encloses Appendix A

MISSING INFORMATION:

DAS Part 8 (p 37); Appendix B: empty/ information missing
Appendix C: L2A report - sections empty/missing?
Appendix D: Correspondence with heat pump manufacturer
empty/missing?
Appendix E: Overheating Risk Analysis: empty/missing?
Appendix F: Planning policy review: BRUKL not mentioned
- BREEAM
- BRUKL B2 missing from Appendix C
- Redesign required.