

ESTATE PROJECT, MALLINSON SPORTS CENTRE REVISED PLANNING STATEMENT

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	The School and Estate Project	2
3.0	The Site	5
4.0	Proposed Development	7
5.0	Policy Overview	8
6.0	Statement of Consultation	14
7.0	Planning Assessment	16
8.0	Conclusions	39

Appendix 1

SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS

Appendix 2

SITE ALLOCATION

Quality Assurance

Site name:	Mallinson Sports Centre, Highgate School
Client name:	Highgate School
Type of report:	Planning Statement
Prepared by:	Christian Milner, Principal Planner
Date	10/2025
Reviewed by:	Jonathan Bainbridge, Partner, Planning
Date	10/2025

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of Sir Roger Cholmeley's School At Highgate ["Highgate School/ the School"] (the applicant). It relates to the proposed development of Mallinson Sports Centre (MSC) which is a live planning application under ref. HGY/2023/0338.
- 1.2 The description of development is:
- Redevelopment of Mallinson Sport Centre, to include: 1) Partial demolition of existing structure, squash and fives buildings; 2) Refurbishment and extension of the remaining facilities, comprising new part single basement, new double height sports hall and new entrances, new teaching classrooms, offices, gym and exercise studios, circulation and ancillary accommodation; 3) New basement level outdoor covered fives courts; 4) External sunken oval sports pitch; and 5) Associated landscaping and improved provision for emergency services and servicing.*
- 1.3 This submission follows extensive pre-application consultation with the London Borough of Haringey, the local community and other stakeholders. This process commenced in 2015 (2018 for this specific project) and has been ongoing during the determination of the applications. The original Statement of Community Involvement, prepared by Luther Pendragon, outlines the consultation process and highlights how the proposal has evolved in response.
- 1.4 Following the formal submission of the application in February 2023, additional consultation has taken place on a voluntary basis at the initiative of the applicant. An Addendum to the Statement of Community Involvement has subsequently been prepared by Bidwells to cover the post-submission public consultation. Furthermore, the updated Design and Access Statement details the revisions made to the scheme since its original submission.
- 1.5 Highgate School is situated in Highgate, North London and the local planning authority is the London Borough of Haringey.
- 1.6 The site is within the Highgate Conservation Area and is allocated through 'SA41 – Highgate School'.
- 1.7 A large majority of the School's playing fields are located within the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), including part of the application site, although the existing MSC buildings sit outside the MOL boundary. Further details are set out within Section 2.
- 1.8 Each application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents and plans which should be read in conjunction with the Planning Statement, these are listed in Appendix 1.
- 1.9 This statement provides supporting information in respect of the proposed development and a planning policy review, and highlights key issues and considerations which the applications will be determined against. It aims to assist Haringey Council in reaching a considered determination of the applications.

2.0 The School and Estate Project

Highgate School

- 2.1 Highgate School was established in 1565 by a Royal Charter of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the First. Sir Roger Cholmeley, the School's Founder, was granted Letters Patent to found 'a grammar school...for good education and instruction'.
- 2.2 It is three schools in one and includes:
- Pre-Preparatory School established in 1993 located in Bishopswood Road. The School teaches pupils in Reception and Years 1 and 2.
 - Junior School established in the nineteenth century on the current location of Dyne House and relocated in 1938 to Cholmeley House in Bishopswood Road. Cholmeley House was demolished in 2014 and a new Junior School was completed for the 2016/17 academic year. The Junior School teaches pupils in Years 3 to 6.
 - Senior School, located in the centre of Highgate Village. The School teaches pupils in Years 7 to 13.
- 2.3 The three schools share facilities across the School's estate which is principally formed of:
- Senior School Campus, incorporating the "Island Site" bound by North Hill (B519) and Southwood Lane (B550) and the "Dyne House" site sitting beyond Southwood Lane to the east and including the subterranean access tunnel;
 - Bishopswood Road Campus, incorporating a) key properties of Mallinson Sports Centre, Richards Music Centre, Junior School, Pre-Preparatory School, b) key openspace and playing fields, and c) various other teaching, administrative and ancillary properties; and
 - Far Field, a playing pitch located some 600m west of the Bishopswood Road Campus and contained by The Bishops Avenue and Courtenay Avenue.
- 2.4 The School is one of Haringey's leading schools and largest employers. As a charity it has developed significant partnership arrangements with a considerable number of Haringey primary and secondary schools. Its position in the Haringey community has been further advanced in 2017 with the establishment of the London Academy of Excellence in Tottenham, with the welcome and active support of Haringey Council. Highgate is the lead academic sponsor of the new school, working in partnership with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club.

The Estate Project

- 2.5 The School was initially established as a boys' only school but is, today, a flourishing co-educational independent school. It needs to ensure that the range of its curriculum, and what it offers in, for example, sport and the arts, remains relevant and of the highest quality in support of its charitable objectives. As part of this, it needs to continue to invest in new and refurbished facilities where, notwithstanding the investment of recent years, there remains a significant task across parts of the estate.

- 2.6 It has been identified by the School that there is a need to invest in the improvement of the following facilities:
- The VIth Form provision;
 - Senior School Drama provision;
 - Senior School Music provision;
 - Science Block; and
 - Internal and external sports facilities.
- 2.7 The current facilities associated with these essential requirements are inadequate either as a result of the increased popularity and opportunities within these academic and extra-curricular areas or as a result of the current provision using ageing and converted buildings and areas of the estate.

VIth Form Centre

- 2.8 VIth Form facilities have evolved over the years and do not provide adequate space for self-study or for socialising. In addition, there are no specific VIth Form teaching spaces which should be laid out in order to promote discussion and student-led learning in preparation for university study. By co-locating VIth Form social areas, support services and teaching spaces the School will facilitate a culture of independence and pre-university readiness.

Senior School Drama provision

- 2.9 The School has introduced Drama as a curriculum subject from Year 7 to Year 13. However, the School's facilities lag behind its ambitions both for teaching and for productions. Drama productions are currently hemmed in by Highgate's facilities. The School cannot currently provide each Senior School student with an opportunity to be in a play. The Estate Project seeks to rectify this.

Senior School Music provision

- 2.10 Pupils who either wish to study academic music and/or learn to play instruments and collaborate as part of ensembles or orchestras have increased at Highgate by circa 33% over the last seven years and the popularity and take-up of music is expected to continue to grow. The School therefore must introduce flexibility into its estate to provide for the continued growth of the popularity of music within our pupil body. In addition, a larger facility is required for the ever-growing orchestras and choirs to rehearse and perform.

Internal and external sports facilities

- 2.11 The School offers sporting excellence employing specialist sporting coaches and currently has sporting facilities, both indoor and outdoor. The Mallinson Sports Centre requires significant maintenance in terms of both upkeep and investment to modernise and substantially improve the facility. The outdoor facilities require improvements to optimise their use in term time and ensure they are fit-for-purpose and welcoming for both users of those facilities and spectators.

Building refurbishment needs

- 2.12 In assessing the opportunities for the academic requirements set out within the brief, the School has considered those buildings and areas of the estate that are in need of substantial repair and maintenance, or general modernisation as they are no longer fit-for-purpose as modern educational environments. It was identified that there was significant investment needed into:
- Senior School Campus: Science Block (internal refurbishment of science laboratories) and the Dyne House site;
 - Bishopswood Road Campus: Dining Hall, Caen Wood Hall, the Mallinson Sports Centre and associated buildings, the Rifle Range and the Richards Music Centre.

Preparing the SPD

- 2.13 The entirety of the School's estate is covered by Allocation SA41 of the Haringey Local Plan Site Allocation DPD (2017). The allocation required the adoption of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which appropriately manages future developments across the Estate.
- 2.14 Whilst the allocation envisaged that this would be in the form of two campus masterplans, it was agreed that given the interconnection of the sites and the need to manage the brief requirements across them, a single comprehensive document should be prepared.
- 2.15 As a material consideration, the SPD should be given weight in the planning balance and it is set out within the independent applications how the requirements of the SPD have been met.

3.0 The Site

- 3.1 The application site is located within the Bishopswood Road Campus and accommodates both internal and external sporting facilities including a swimming pool, sports hall, squash courts and Fives courts. A full description of the existing development is set out in the supporting Design and Access Statement.
- 3.2 It is noted that the original pool hall block and associated plant and ancillary spaces were completed in 1969, and that the sports hall and gym extension with associated entrance and ancillary spaces were added to the south in 1989.
- 3.3 On the northern part of the site, which is more open, there is a Fives court building, dating from the early twentieth century, and a Squash Courts building dating from the 1960s, adjacent to which is a ball-games, hard-court area with tall, chain-link perimeter fencing.
- 3.4 The MSC sports centre overall comprises indoor facilities including a main sports hall, a 25m six lane swimming pool hall with spectator seating, a gym, other minor sports spaces, wet and dry changing rooms and toilets, and reception and administration rooms.
- 3.5 The existing MSC lies within the Highgate Conservation Area and, having been developed in a piecemeal fashion, is recognised as detracting from the overall quality of the Conservation Area.
- 3.6 Despite this, the facilities provide a valuable resource for the School. For a sports centre, the building adopts a low scale and profile within an area which largely comprises taller three and four storey buildings. In addition, the fundamental structure of all the retained buildings is sound, so that with care and targeted refurbishment, the buildings can continue to function for many years ahead, reflecting a progressive environmental policy of re-use of resources by the School whenever feasible.
- 3.7 Accordingly, as the first phase of the wider MSC masterplan, the swimming pool has recently been refurbished in accordance planning permission HGY/2018/1223.
- 3.8 A small part of the application site is within Metropolitan Open Land, with the boundary being drawn tight to the existing buildings adjacent to the southern wall of the sports centre.
- 3.9 As explained earlier, the site falls within the wider Highgate School Site Allocation SA41.

Planning History

- 3.10 Key applications relevant to the proposed development are as follows:

PLANNING REF	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
HGY/2015/1029 Mallinson Sports Centre Highgate School Sports	Refurbishment and extension of the Mallinson Sport Centre, including part single and part double storey extension to the front and a part one storey extension and two storey rear infill extension, as well as internal and external alterations.	Granted (Not implemented)

Field Bishopswood Road London N6 4NY		05 June 2015
HGY/2018/1223 Highgate School Sports Field Sports Centre Bishopswood Road London N6 4NY	Refurbishment of the existing swimming pool building including the replacement of the existing metal sheet roof and wall cladding, replacement of existing windows, replacement of existing mechanical and electrical plant.	Granted 31 May 2018
HGY/2021/2096 Mallinson Sports Centre Highgate School Sports Field Bishopswood Road London N6 4NY	Construction of a single storey glazed front entrance.	Granted 27 August 2021
HGY/2023/0331 Highgate School North Road London N6 4AY	Request for a formal screening opinion to confirm if an Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') is required in respect of six applications at Highgate School: HGY/2023/0313 (Junior Field Playing Pitches – Decant), HGY/2023/0315 (Richards Music Centre), HGY/2023/0316 (Far Field Playing Fields), HGY/2023/0317 (Science Block), HGY/2023/0328 (Dyne House) and HGY/2023/0338 (Mallinson Sports Centre). This request is made in pursuance of Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as updated).	Not Required 29 Feb 2024
HGY/2023/0338 Mallinson Sports Centre Highgate School Bishopswood Road Hornsey London N6 4NY	Redevelopment of Mallinson Sport Centre, to include: 1) Partial demolition of existing structure, squash and fives buildings; 2) Refurbishment and extension of the remaining facilities, comprising new part single basement, new double height sports hall and new entrances, new teaching classrooms, offices, gym and exercise studios, circulation and ancillary accommodation; 3) New basement level outdoor covered fives courts; 4) External sunken oval sports pitch; and 5) Associated landscaping and improved provision for emergency services and servicing.	Undetermined (this application)

- 3.11 As noted above, a proposal for alterations and extensions to the existing MSC sports centre was approved on 5th June 2015, reference HGY/2015/1029. While pre-commencement conditions were discharged, the project was not implemented and is superseded by the phased approach to overhaul the School's sporting facilities.

4.0 Proposed Development

- 4.1 Following on from the refurbishment of the School's swimming pool, it is proposed to undertake a phased redevelopment of the Mallinson Sports Centre. The proposed description of development reads as:

"Redevelopment of Mallinson Sport Centre, to include: 1) Partial demolition of existing structure, squash and fives buildings; 2) Refurbishment and extension of the remaining facilities, comprising new part single basement, new double height sports hall and new entrances, new teaching classrooms, offices, gym and exercise studios, circulation and ancillary accommodation; 3) New basement level outdoor covered fives courts; 4) External sunken oval sports pitch; and 5) Associated landscaping and improved provision for emergency services and servicing."

- 4.2 The project has been advanced following the school's review of academic requirements. This project has identified a requirement to provide for an improved sport and exercise (SpEx) offering including its internal and external sporting facilities predominantly situated within the Bishopswood Road campus. The need is associated with the increased popularity of sporting and extra-curricular areas and reflects the changing priorities at a national level.

- 4.3 A detailed description of the proposed development is set out in the Design and Access Statement, key elements include:

- Demolition of existing Fives Court building and Squash building at the north end of the site, and associated ancillary demolition.
- Construction of a north-west extension to create a second indoor sports hall with associated circulation, storage and plant.
- Construction of a south extension to the existing sports hall for eight new external covered Fives Courts with run-off area one level below local ground level.
- Construction of an entrance with foyer, reception with café at floor above, and with improved new access stairs down to the existing changing rooms and circulation.
- Renovation to the existing sports hall to enhance natural lighting.
- Internal and external provision of Part M compliant lifts and stairs to bring full accessibility.
- Associated ancillary studio spaces to form connections, extensions for waste storage, plant and services.
- Hard and soft landscaping.
- New mechanical and electrical fit-out to all new extensions.
- Re-grading and landscaping of the existing sports playing area to the east of the existing sports hall to improve sports facilities, and also to provide a temporary flood basin to mitigate potential surface water flooding based on future climate change predictions.

- 4.4 As stated above, the works are intended to be constructed in phases; however, for the purposes of this application it is not considered a "phased development" in planning terms. The refurbishment of the existing Swimming Pool Hall and adjacent wet and dry changing areas has already been completed and will be retained at the heart of the proposed scheme.

5.0 Policy Overview

- 5.1 Planning Practice Guidance [‘Practice Guidance’] states that to the extent that development plan policies are material to an application for planning permission the decision must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise. This reflects section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Development Plan

- 5.2 The development plan consists of:
- London Plan (2021)
 - Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017)
 - Local Plan Development Management Policies (2017)
 - Local Plan Site Allocations DPD (2017)
 - Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017).

London Plan

- 5.3 The London Plan (2021) sets out the strategic planning aims and policies for London. It includes a city-wide spatial strategy as well as development management policies for key strategic issues. It is the most recently adopted development plan document.
- 5.4 Of principal importance to the proposals are policies:
- **Policy S3:** ‘Education and childcare facilities’:
 - Seeks to ensure there is a sufficient supply of good quality education and childcare facilities to meet demand and offer educational choice.
 - **Policy S5:** ‘Sports and recreational facilities’
 - *“Development proposals for sports and recreation facilities should:*
 - 1) *increase or enhance the provision of facilities in accessible locations, well-connected to public transport and link to networks for walking and cycling*
 - 2) *maximise the multiple use of facilities, and encourage the co-location of services between sports providers, schools, colleges, universities and other community facilities*
 - 3) *support the provision of sports lighting within reasonable hours, where there is an identified need for sports facilities, and lighting is required to increase their potential usage, unless the lighting gives rise to demonstrable harm to the local community or biodiversity.”*
 - *“Existing sports and recreational land (including playing fields) and facilities for sports and recreation should be retained”*
 - **Policy HC1:** ‘Heritage conservation and growth’

- *“Development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets’ significance and appreciation within their surroundings.”*
- *“Development proposals should identify assets of archaeological significance and use this information to avoid harm or minimise it through design and appropriate mitigation.”*
- **Policy G3:** ‘Metropolitan Open Land’:
 - Outlines that such land is afforded the same status and level of protection as Green Belt.
- **Policy G4:** ‘Open space’ states that development proposals should:
 - *“not result in the loss of protected open space” and “where possible create areas of publicly accessible open space, particularly in areas of deficiency”.*
- **Policy G5:** ‘Urban greening’ outlines that:
 - *“major development proposals should contribute to the greening of London by including urban greening as a fundamental element of site and building design”*
- **Policy G6:** ‘Biodiversity and access to nature’ states that:
 - *“development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain”.*
- **Policy SI2:** ‘Minimising greenhouse gas emissions’
 - *“Major development should be net zero-carbon”, “should include a detailed energy strategy...” and “A minimum on-site reduction of at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations is required for major development”.*
 - *“any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either:*
 - 1) *through a cash in lieu contribution to the borough’s carbon offset fund, or*
 - 2) *off-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain”.*
- **Policy SI7:** ‘Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy’ states that:
 - *“Referable applications should promote circular economy outcomes and aim to be net zero-waste. A Circular Economy Statement should be submitted”.*

Local Plan

- 5.5 In relation to the proposed development, the most pertinent policies of the Haringey Local Plan include:
- **Site Allocation SA41:** The site forms part of the wider Highgate School allocation. The allocation reads as:
 - *“Exploration of how school facilities can be enhanced while simultaneously benefitting local communities including potentially increasing accessibility through the landholdings.”*
 - It states that development shall be pursued in accordance with a future SPD. The Highgate School SPD was adopted in March 2021.
 - *“The objectives of the Highgate Bowl site should be considered on any properties that fall into this site allocation”.*
 - **Policy SP0:** ‘Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development’:

- *“When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”*
- **Policy SP4:** ‘Working Towards a Low Carbon Haringey’:
 - *“Over the life time of the Local Plan, reducing energy use in buildings and working towards a low carbon borough will be one of the key challenges facing Haringey”*
 - *“From 2011 onwards all new non-residential development shall be built to at least BREEAM “very good” standard and should aim to achieve BREEAM “excellent” or the current nationally agreed standard. All new non-residential development shall be zero carbon from 2019.”*
- **Policy SP9:** ‘Improving Skills and Training to Support Access to Jobs and Community Cohesion and Inclusion’:
 - *“The Council will encourage the provision and growth of education and training facilities within the borough”*
- **Policy SP12:** ‘Conservation’:
 - *“The Council shall ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey’s heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment”.*
- **Policy SP13:** ‘Open Space and Biodiversity’:
 - *“All new development shall protect and enhance, and when and where possible, extend the existing boundaries of the borough’s Green Belt, designated Metropolitan Open Land, designated Open Spaces, Green Chains, allotments, river corridors and other open spaces from inappropriate development.”*
- **Policy SP16:** ‘Community Facilities’:
 - *“The Council will work with its partners to ensure that appropriate improvement and enhancements, and where possible, protection of community facilities and services are provided for Haringey’s communities”*

Neighbourhood Plan

5.6 The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in July 2017 and now forms part of the development plan. The Neighbourhood Plan includes relevant policies, such as:

- **Policy TR1:** ‘Promoting Sustainable Movement’
 - *“New development should promote walking, cycling and public transport use.”*
- **Policy OS2:** ‘Protection of Trees and Mature Vegetation’
 - *“Within the conservation areas or when protected by a TPO, specimen, veteran and mature trees and mature vegetation, which have townscape, ecological or amenity value should be retained where possible.”*
 - *“There should be no net loss of trees or as a result of development, and pro rata replacement will be expected”*
- **Policy DH2:** ‘Development Proposals in Highgate’s Conservation Areas’
 - *“Development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate’s conservation areas”*

- **Policy DH7: 'Basements':**
 - *"Where basement development does not fall in the scope of permitted development, and where there is evidence that there may be problems with drainage or flooding, applications for basement development will be supported only where they meet the requirements set out within this policy."*
- **Policy DH8: 'Refuse Storage':**
 - *"Where appropriate, all proposals for new buildings will be required to ensure that waste facilities are well designed and sensitively integrated into developments."*

Material considerations

National Planning Policy

- 5.7 The National Planning Policy Framework ['the Framework'] represents up-to-date government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application or appeal. This includes the presumption in favour of development found at paragraph 11 of the Framework.
- 5.8 Following the submission of the application, in the context of the election of a new government, a revision to the NPPF was published in December 2024 with a view to speeding up the planning process as a tool for powering growth.
- 5.9 Paragraph 100 states that: *"It is important that a sufficient choice of early years, school and post-16 places are available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:*
- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post-16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and*
- b) work with early years, school and post-16 promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted."*
- 5.10 Key sections of the Framework include:
- Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development
 - Chapter 4: Decision making
 - Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities
 - Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport
 - Chapter 11: Making effective use of land
 - Chapter 12: Achieving well designed places
 - Chapter 13: Protecting Green Belt land
 - Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

- Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

- 5.11 In respect of policies relating to Metropolitan Open Land, it is set out that the same tests are to be applied as for Green Belt. The policies are set out at Section 13 of the Framework and reviewed in detail at Section 7 of this Planning Statement.
- 5.12 Supporting the Framework is a series of online Practice Guidance which is also considered a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Highgate School SPD

- 5.13 The Highgate School SPD was formally adopted in March 2021. The SPD was developed in partnership between Haringey Council and Highgate School, to provide further guidance on adopted Local Plan Site Allocation 41 in relation to the enhancement or redevelopment of Highgate School's estate. The document exists to shape and form future planning applications. As such, it has been a key material consideration in the preparation of this planning application.
- 5.14 The principle of development is accepted by virtue of the site's allocation, the SPD states that:
- "The MSC requires significant maintenance in terms of both upkeep and investment to modernise and substantially improve the quantum and quality of space provided by the facility. In 2017, the School had to close its swimming pool with immediate effect due to the degradation of the ceiling and roof of that part of the MSC. The age of the building, coupled with a significant demand for additional hall, studio and storage space, is putting significant pressure on the school's Sports and Exercise (SPEX) programme."*
- 5.15 In relation to forthcoming applications at Mallinson Sports Centre, the SPD states that the Council will expect any redevelopment scheme to:
- *ensure that the Mallinson Sports Centre does not impact on the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land and does not adversely affect the character of the Metropolitan Open Land or where proposals would be considered inappropriate development must be supported by Very Special Circumstances (Policy SP13 and Policy G3 in the London Plan);*
 - *be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment;*
 - *preserve or enhance the Highgate Conservation Area (Policy SP12);*
 - *ensure that all new development is of high architectural quality and responds to the surrounding streetscape (Policy SP11);*
 - *ensure that any proposed development would not have an adverse impact on any trees within the Metropolitan Open Land boundary (Policy SP13);*
 - *ensure that any adverse effects on the amenity of the surrounding area are minimised;*
 - *improve accessibility, in particular disabled access;*
 - *seek to enable community use consistent with Sport England's guidance;*
 - *enhance sporting facilities (Policies SP9 and SP16 in Haringey's Local Plan, and Policy S4 in the London Plan);*

- *the impact of the temporary loss of sports facilities must be mitigated in order to align with national policy. and;*
- *any new/improved facilities should align with Sport England's Design and Cost guidance.*

6.0 Statement of Consultation

- 6.1 Luther Pendragon have produced a Statement of Community Involvement which has been submitted in support of this application. For robust understanding of the consultation undertaken by the School the Statement of Community Involvement should be read alongside this Planning Statement.
- 6.2 In addition, an Addendum to the Statement of Community Involvement has been prepared by Bidwells. This covers the community engagement that took place following the formal submission of the applications.

Consultation Following PPA

- 6.3 In 2021 the School entered into a Planning Performance Agreement with the local planning authority which resulted in a series of workshops attended by key planning and conservation officers. The design of the proposed development has been revised in response to comments received.

Quality Review Panel

- 6.4 All applications forming the Estate Project were considered at a meeting of the Haringey Quality Review Panel on 2nd February 2022, with formal written feedback received on 15th February 2022.
- 6.5 The meetings were attended by four Panel members, the School's estate team, the design teams led by Hopkins Architects and Ed Toovey Architects, Bidwells and key officers from the Haringey Council.
- 6.6 Overall, the meetings were extremely positive. Feedback being constructive and relating to detail of the proposals across the various schemes presented.
- 6.7 The Panel's summary in relation to the MSC proposals are noted as follows:

"The panel thanks the design team for their presentation and feels that the strategic approach that the design team has adopted promises to deliver a successful facility that offers much to the school and wider community. It welcomes the ambitions for sustainable design that have been adopted, but urges further progress here, where possible. In particular, given operational energy requirements of the swimming pool, the panel would like to see every opportunity taken to minimise the emissions associated with it, now and in the future. The functional limitations of a sports hall are noted, but the panel feels that some opportunities exist for enriching the architecture, through materials, detailing and fenestration. The approach taken to the southern elevation, incorporating the five courts, successfully enhances what is currently a bland façade, and the panel feels that this justifies the minor encroachment onto Metropolitan Open Land."

- 6.8 We address these comments within our assessment, below.

Development Management Forum

- 6.9 At the request of the planning authority, the School took part in an online Development Management Forum on 19th October. This meeting allowed members of the public to raise issues and ask questions of the project team. Where necessary the scheme has been revised to address comments made.

Pre-application Committee

- 6.10 Finally, the School attended a meeting of the Pre-Application Planning Committee on 7th November 2022 at Tottenham Town Hall. This provided the opportunity for the School and the design team to present the schemes and take questions from members of the Planning Sub-Committee.

Post Submission

- 6.11 Following the submission of the applications in January 2023 the applicant has engaged in further consultation with the local community. Please refer to the Addendum to the Statement of Community Involvement for further information.

7.0 Planning Assessment

7.1 The key policy issues in relation to the development are:

- Principle of development
- Metropolitan Open Land
- Design
- Flood risk
- Drainage
- Basement Impact
- Noise
- Heritage
- Daylight Sunlight
- Sustainability
- Biodiversity
- Landscaping
- Air Quality
- Transport
- Archaeology
- Utilities
- Fire Safety

Principle of development

7.2 The principle of an education use is already established at the site. Paragraph 100 of the NPPF (2024) states that local authorities should give “great weight” to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post-16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications. This paragraph further states work with early years, school and post-16 promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.

7.3 London Plan Policy S3 seeks to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of good quality education and childcare facilities to meet demand and offer educational choice and London Plan Policy S5 promotes the enhancement of sporting provision, the co-location of services between providers. The policy notes: “*Where facilities are proposed on existing open space, boroughs should consider these in light of policies on protecting open space (Policy G2 London’s Green Belt, Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land and Policy G4 Open space) and the borough’s own assessment of needs and opportunities for sports facilities, and the potential impact that the development will have.*”

- 7.4 Local Plan Policy SP16 states that the Council will work with its partners to ensure that appropriate improvement and enhancements, and, where possible, protection of community facilities and services are provided for Haringey's communities.
- 7.5 The Mallinson Sports Centre is used by the School community on a daily basis and is also available out of hours for community and public use. Upon completion, the School will ensure continued community access to the improved facilities. It is noted that there will need to be a
- 7.6 The need to improve the availability of indoor and outdoor sports facilities is clearly noted within the SPD which is a material consideration of weight in light of Site Allocation SA41.
- 7.7 The proposals are not seeking to introduce new uses, but will vastly improve the quality, accessibility and sustainability of the sporting facilities on offer. The Highgate School SPD expects any redevelopment scheme to *"enhance sporting facilities"*. Therefore, subject to matters associated with Metropolitan Open Land, it is considered that the principle of the proposed development is established. Indeed, the feedback of the independent Quality Review Panel summarised that:
- "the strategic approach that the design team has adopted promises to deliver a successful facility that offers much to the school and wider community"*

Metropolitan Open Land

- 7.8 It is noted that an element of the proposed development interacts with Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). In development plan terms, London Plan Policy G3 identifies that MOL is afforded the same level of policy protection as the Green Belt.
- 7.9 The policy states:
- "A: Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) is afforded the same status and level of protection as Green Belt:*
- 1) MOL should be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national planning policy tests that apply to the Green Belt*
 - 2) boroughs should work with partners to enhance the quality and range of uses of MOL.*
- B: The extension of MOL designations should be supported where appropriate. Boroughs should designate MOL by establishing that the land meets at least one of the following criteria:*
- 1) it contributes to the physical structure of London by being clearly distinguishable from the built-up area*
 - 2) it includes open air facilities, especially for leisure, recreation, sport, the arts and cultural activities, which serve either the whole or significant parts of London*
 - 3) it contains features or landscapes (historic, recreational, biodiverse) of either national or metropolitan value*
 - 4) it forms part of a strategic corridor, node or a link in the network of green infrastructure and meets one of the above criteria.*

C: Any alterations to the boundary of MOL should be undertaken through the Local Plan process, in consultation with the Mayor and adjoining boroughs.

MOL boundaries should only be changed in exceptional circumstances when this is fully evidenced and justified, taking into account the purposes for including land in MOL set out in Part B”.

7.10 The NPPF (2024) states that *“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”* (paragraph 154). However, seven exceptions to this policy are set out, including:

- *...b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- *c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;...*
- *g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.”*

7.11 Where these exceptions do not apply, inappropriate development is *“by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”* (paragraph 153).

7.12 It continues, stating that *“‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”* (paragraph 153).

7.13 In respect of the MSC proposals the development should be considered as an exception as set out at paragraph 154 of the Framework. The justification for this is set out as follows.


Appropriate development

7.14 The precise boundary of the MOL designation is noted in detailed plan at 4.5 of the Design and Access Statement as repeated in the plan overleaf. It demonstrates that there are two key elements of the built development which result in an incursion on to MOL.

7.15 The first is an extension shown in blue tone, which is a small extension of approximately 1.2m to the MSC entrance. The entrance is a key element of the design of the MSC project and creates an important sense of arrival to the facility. In accordance with paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2024), this is an alteration which does not result in a disproportionate addition to the existing building. Further, the alteration will not prejudice the wider function of the MOL at the Bishopswood Road Campus. Accordingly, this element of the works does not result in a conflict with development plan policy.

7.16 Considering the second element, it is noted that the proposed Five courts will deliver an area of sunken covered (but open to the air) hard standing appropriate for the game of Fives. This is noted by the area toned in orange (the covered courts) and yellow (an open external area of over-run) within the detailed plan overleaf.

- 7.17 As an area facilitating external recreation in an otherwise sterile part of the MOL designation, it is considered that the development should be considered as provision of appropriate facilities in connection with an existing outdoor sport use.
- 7.18 Further, given the sunken nature of the development, and the architectural approach to maintaining views through and across the Fives courts themselves, it should be considered that the openness of the MOL is also maintained. Accordingly, we conclude that this element of work also does not result in a conflict with the development plan.
- 7.19 It should be noted that the proposed revisions to the scheme that have resulted from the post submission consultation process do not alter the extent of the proposed incursion into the MOL.



Very special circumstances – a fallback position

- 7.20 Whilst it is concluded that both elements of built development do not constitute inappropriate development, we provide a fall back very special circumstances case in the event that the decision maker does not agree.
- 7.21 The existing MSC buildings lay completely outside the MOL, but the south and east faces of the building form the MOL boundary. The proposals seek a minor encroachment into the MOL on to an area of defensible boundary which otherwise have little or no contribution to the purpose of the specific MOL designation.
- 7.22 The minor encroachment will allow for a more successful development. It will deliver a legible entrance to the MSC facility and it will bring another recreational activity to the south of the building focussing on the heart of one of the School's principle locations for sports and exercise.

- 7.23 In respect of the Fives courts themselves, the below ground development will be topped with an open structure, featuring a green roof which create a more active, vibrant and positive engagement with the MOL than existing development. It does this while retaining the MOL's openness.
- 7.24 In this respect, it was considered at QRP that:
- "The approach taken to the southern elevation, incorporating the fives courts, successfully enhances what is currently a bland façade, and the panel feels that this justifies the minor encroachment onto Metropolitan Open Land"*
- "The panel does not have concerns about the encroachment onto Metropolitan Open Land along its southern edge and feels that the treatment of the fives courts improves the façade facing onto the sports fields."*
- 7.25 The existing buildings are architecturally poor, with the Conservation Area Appraisal stating that they detract from the character of the area. The quality of the proposed buildings and the standard of sports facility which will be provided are design-led and considered to vastly improve the site, this further strengthens the case for the acceptability of the proposals in accordance with the requirements of the development plan.
- 7.26 Furthermore, the GLA have provided a Stage 1 Report (3 July 2023), the summary of regarding the land use principles which considered the impact of the three scheme that impact MOL stated that:
- "The sites are within land designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and the proposals are inappropriate development. However, given the minor projection of the Mallinson Sport Centre and Richards Music Centre into MOL and the temporary nature of the decant building, with well-considered design approaches, **GLA officers are satisfied that there would be very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to MOL.** The Council should nevertheless ensure that the various local benefits proposed would be appropriately secured as part of any planning permission."* (emphasis added)
- 7.27 It is concluded that the impact on the MOL of the built development is negligible and that the design response has been formulated such that the impact is minimised as much as is physically possible, maintaining the overall openness. The following very special circumstances would clearly outweigh the potential harm to the MOL as well as all other planning harm which results from the proposed development:
- The School's Accommodation Need Statement which outlined the requirements for the additional facilities proposed at the Mallinson Sports Centre.
 - Paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that LPAs should *"give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post-16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on application"*;
 - That there is no site preferable in planning terms upon which the required accommodation could be provided;
 - That the facilities will improve the accessibility to high quality sports infrastructure for Highgate's partner schools and the general public, when it is not in use;
 - The redevelopment will improve a building which is currently identified as a detractor from the Highgate Conservation Area within the Conservation Area Appraisal.

- 7.28 Therefore, should the decision maker consider that very special circumstances be necessary considering the nature of the minor impact or harm, it is wholly considered that the necessary high bar of policy protection is overcome with other considerations to counter any impact. In this respect, the balance of VSC is achieved and the proposal is compliant with the development plan.

Design

- 7.29 London Plan Policy D3 requires that development should make the best use of land by following a design-led approach, ensuring that development is of the most appropriate form and land use for the site. Development should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. This means ensuring that development is of the most appropriate form and land use for the site. Form and layout of buildings and spaces should enhance local context by positively responding to local distinctiveness. Furthermore, Local Plan Development Management Policy DM1 highlights that 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.
- 7.30 Highgate School SPD states that redevelopment should “*ensure that all new development is of high architectural quality and responds to the surrounding streetscape (Policy SP11)*”.
- 7.31 The submission is supported by a revised Design and Access Statement (Aug 2025) prepared by Ed Toovey Architects, which sets out a detailed design rationale and documents how this has been influenced and revised through consultation with the community, design/ conservation officers and the independent QRP. More recently there have been some design changes in response to post-submission conversations with the community, these have been covered in the revised Design and Access Statement prepared by Ed Toovey and where drawings have been revised this is clearly indicated in the documents and drawings schedule found in Appendix 1 of this Planning Statement.
- 7.32 The fundamental aim of the design is to transform a recognised detractor to the Conservation Area in to one which provides a positive contribution, whilst meeting the needs of the Schools expanding SpEx curriculum.
- 7.33 By retaining the essential elements of the existing building that have longevity, a series of alterations and extension will provide spaces of the required technical and functional standard, in a unified appurtenance of a coherent whole with its own identity.
- 7.34 To achieve this, careful space planning and utilisation of levels has resulted in significant area and mass being sensitively placed to address the prominent corner plot and key neighbours to the site.
- 7.35 It is noted that the Sport England raised concerns about the proposed rooflights within the sports hall as they are generally not considered best practice for sports such as badminton as they direct light could temporarily impair the player’s vision. However, internally the rooflights will be screened to prevent direct sunshine penetrating to the playing area below, the principle being as illustrated below with screening in the zone of the roof structure.




Figure 1 – Example demonstrating how the internal shade screens will prevent direct impinging the players

- 7.36 The revised proposals focus upon the northern elevation of the Sports Centre, which sits at the juncture of Broadlands Road and Bishopswood Road. These revisions have been shared informally with the LPA prior to their finalisation, it is our understanding that these have been shared with a LPA Conservation Officer and Urban Desing Officer, both who formed part of the original Quality Review Panel and they were satisfied with the proposed changes.
- 7.37 The Figures below show the revised scheme which reduced the building's depth at the Broadlands Road end of the building. Stepping the building back and internalising the cycle storage provides further green space and allows for additional tree planting. In between the Sports Hall 1 and Swimming Pool two squash courts have been provided, this has been directly in response to Sports England comments which objected against the loss on the site.




Figure 2 - Extract of the Superseded First Floor Plan as Originally Proposed




Figure 3 - Extract of the Revised Proposed First Floor Plan

7.38 Further details can be found within the revised Design and Access Statement (Aug 2025).



Figure 4 – Illustrative CGI as originally submitted (Dwg no. 182 / V / 002)



Figure 5 – Revised illustrative CGI based on the scheme that setback from Broadlands Road (Dwg no. 182 / V / 002 Rev A)

- 7.39 Overall, it is considered that the proposals have been design led, well thought-out and have resulted in high architectural quality respectful to local context. This is in stark contrast to the existing structure. On balance, it is considered that the proposals are of appropriate design, scale and mass.

Accessibility

London Plan Policy D5 expects development proposals to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design, whilst the Highgate School SPD states that the Council will expect any redevelopment of the MSC to *“improve accessibility, in particular disabled access.”*

- 7.40 The current building does not provide disabled access to most facilities, only allowing disabled access into the main reception area and mezzanine hall. The proposed development is to provide a centre which will be fully accessible and inclusive in accordance with today's regulations and expectations.
- 7.41 The development will meet all requirements of Part M of the Building Regulations and has been designed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The development will meet to the needs of all possible users, including those with disabilities or other impairments.
- 7.42 Further detail can be found within the ‘Accessibility & Inclusivity’ section of the accompanying Design and Access Statement.
- 7.43 The development proposals are consistent with the development plan and will greatly improve the accessibility of the site.

Secure by Design

7.44 A Secure by Design Statement has been prepared by Ed Toovey Architects and submitted in support of the application. This details the design measures that have been incorporated to improve the security of the site.

7.45 The Metropolitan Police's Designing Out Crime Office provided a consultation response on 12 May 2023, in conclusion this response stated that:

"In principle we have no objections to the development of the site, but wish to take into consideration the physical changes to the original sports centre building and associative grounds. Therefore, we would recommend the attaching of suitably worded conditions and an informative. The comments made can easily be mitigated if the Architects/Developers ensure the ongoing dialogue with our department continues throughout the design and build process. This can be achieved by the below Secured by Design conditions being applied (Section 2). If the Conditions are applied, we request the completion of the relevant SBD application forms at the earliest opportunity.

The project has the potential to achieve a Secured by Design Accreditation if advice given is adhered to."

7.46 If the LPA sees the conditions as necessary, then the applicant is satisfied and minded to accept these conditions.

Flood risk

7.47 London Plan Policy SI12 looks to ensure that developments minimise and mitigate flood risk and address any residual flood risk. Similarly, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP5 requires all development in Haringey to be water efficient during construction and operation and to reduce all forms of flood risk. The site allocation requires a site wide flood risk assessment, and this is confirmed within the SPD.

7.48 Local Plan Policy DM24 (Managing and Reducing Flood Risk) seeks to ensure that all proposals for new development avoid and reduce the risk of flooding to future occupants and do not increase the risk of flooding, requiring new development to manage and reduce surface water run-off, and water and wastewater discharges.

7.49 Edenvale Young produced a Flood Risk Assessment in support of this application. It notes that whilst the site is in Flood Zone 1, there are risks associated with management of surface water. This is known to be an issue in the wider locality.

7.50 Accordingly, detailed hydraulic modelling has been undertaken in consultation with the lead local flood authority (LLFA). The structures have been designed to ensure the building is safe from 1:100 + 40% allowing for climate change, events. The recommendations of the FRA are taken on board within the design proposals.

7.51 In order to alleviate existing risks locally, the proposal includes a sunken sports pitch, to double as a flood storage attenuation area. The modelling shows that this strategy is effective at mitigating

internal flooding to the school and those downstream of the school, reducing potential flood level by up to 100mm.

- 7.52 Thames Water provided comment. They gave no objections subject to a condition securing a Pilling Method Statement prior to the commencement of pilling due the proposals being within 15m of underground sewerage utility infrastructure.
- 7.53 During the statutory consultation period comments were received from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LB Haringey). Initial comments raised no objections, however, further comments were made following a review of the BIA, FRA and SuDS Review Report (June 2023) prepare by Haycocks Environmental Consultants (instructed by Broadlands Road residents). This resulted in the appointment of Campbell Reith on behalf of LB Haringey to undertake an independent review.
- 7.54 A revised Flood Risk Assessment (Mar 2025) has been prepared by Edenvale Young.

Drainage

- 7.55 Policy SI13 of the London Plan sets out that proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and sets a preference for green over grey features in line with the policies defined drainage hierarchy. Development proposals for impermeable surfacing are acceptable where it has been demonstrated that they can be shown to be unavoidable. Local Plan Policy DM25 outlines that all proposals for new development must seek to manage surface water as close to its source as possible in line with the London Plan drainage hierarchy. The Council requires Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to be sensitively incorporated into new development by way of site layout and design, the policy then sets out the requirements for various types of development.
- 7.56 A detailed SUDS Strategy Report has been prepared by PJCE. It notes that the site's geology is formed of extensive clay layer of at least 50m depth, therefore infiltration is not viable. With poor infiltration and limited space, the site is poorly suited to extensive SuDS approaches. Accordingly, green/ blue roofs, trees and attenuation are applied to a wider strategy.
- 7.57 Overall, the proposal is to limit the site to a runoff rate of 8.0l/s up to 1-in-30-year storm (greenfield rate). This will be increased to 12.0l/s for rainfall up to 1-in-100year +40% Climate Change.
- 7.58 Attenuation structures will be designed to capture, and store all storms up to 1-in-100year +40% Climate Change event the detailed design of which will follow post approval. It is expected that the planning authority will control the approval of these details via planning condition.
- 7.59 A revised Drainage and SuDS Statement (Jan 2025) has been prepared by PJCE.
- 7.60 With these controls in place, it is considered that the scheme is compliant with the development plan in respect of flood and drainage matters.

Basement impact

- 7.61 Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH7 requires consideration of the impact of subterranean development.

- 7.62 The main sports hall floor is proposed to be sunken down into the ground at basement level on the south side, to reduce the overall height and reduce the visual impact of massing compared to many typical sports centres. Accordingly, a Basement Impact Assessment has been prepared.
- 7.63 Following a review of ground conditions, it is noted that there is limited groundwater present, reflecting the clay geology of the site. Accordingly, there is likely to be little impact on subterranean flows.
- 7.64 Whilst it is noted that the proposed works may result in risks associated with slope stability, the proposed construction method including continuous piled walls, is considered wholly appropriate and a tried and tested solution. With the appropriate structural design, it is not considered there will be residual risk to slope stability.
- 7.65 In respect of risk associated with flood, it is noted that these risks are high in the current state. The report concludes that the proposed development will completely de-risk the site, leading to the development not being in an area which is required to consider flooding as part of the basement construction.
- 7.66 Accordingly, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed basements will not be detrimental to the region in terms of groundwater, slope stability and surface flow and flooding. Indeed, in respect of the latter, the development proposes improvements on the existing situation. Therefore, it accords with the development plan in this respect.
- 7.67 Since the submission of the application there has been further development of the basement and attenuation bowl's design to provide reassurance to both the community and the LPA that the proposals will have an acceptable level of impact on the neighbouring occupiers. As part of this process Campbell Reith were instructed as an independent third party consultant to scrutinise the proposals on behalf of the LPA. This manifested in multiple technical meetings/workshops and culminated in the publishing by Campbell Reith of their "Basement Impact Assessment Audit" for the Mallinson Sports Centre project. During the process the proposals were comprehensively interrogated by the independent consultants with their final findings being published within Revision P2 of the Audit (October 2024). It is our understanding that this independently prepared report has been issued to LPA. In addition, these discussions resulted in the preparation of a revised version of the original Basement Impact Assessment (October 2024 - Revision 06).
- 7.68 It is noted that the revised design to the northern elevation (Broadlands Road) resulted in a reduced building footprint and resultantly a slightly smaller basement extent. It is our understanding that the LPA are satisfied that Campbell Reith does not need to undertake a further review to their Audit as a result of the building footprint becoming smaller. This proposed alteration the basement following the formal completion of the Campbell Reith Audit process has been covered by preparation of the "Basement Extent Change Review" prepared by A-squared Studio. This document concluded that:

"In the context of the findings of the BIA, the following key points are noted:

- The basement area is being reduced, not increased.*
- The basement depth, has been retained at the same level and has not been deepened.*
- At the time of writing this note it is considered that there are no other aspects of these proposed scheme amendments of relevance to the conclusions of the BIA.*

On the basis of the above, it is the opinion of A-squared that the findings of the BIA are not altered in any way by these changes and that, as a result, revision of the BIA would serve no purpose other than to coordinate the presentation of revised scheme drawings / figures / sections etc.”

- 7.69 The proposed scheme has been independently audited by an expert third party. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed scheme is acceptable in terms of basement impact.

Noise

- 7.70 Local Plan Development Management Policy DM23 states that where an activity with the potential to generate noise is proposed a Noise Assessment should be submitted in support of the application. In order to meet the sustainability requirements of the London Plan the proposals seek to incorporate air source heat pumps (ASHP).
- 7.71 There will be five ventilation Air Handling Units and twelve ASHP units in two locations. Nine ASHP units are to be located between the existing Sports hall and the existing Swimming Pool and the remaining three ASHP units are located to the rear of the new Sports Hall building immediately opposite the boundary fence to No 27 Broadlands Road. Further details can be found within the accompanying Noise Report.
- 7.72 The calculations show that with appropriate mitigation arising from fresh air inlet and exhaust air outlet silencers, a noise level of no more than 32dBA can be achieved at 1 metre from the windows of the neighbouring residential property at 27 Broadlands Road.
- 7.73 The proposed mitigation measures will allow for compliance with Haringey’s noise regulations and is acceptable in planning terms.

Heritage

- 7.74 Local Plan Policy DM9 (Management of the Historic Environment) states that 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.
- 7.75 Local Plan Strategic Policy SP12 (conservation) states that *“The Council shall ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey’s heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment. The borough’s heritage assets include Statutory Listed Buildings”*.
- 7.76 Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH2 (Development Proposals in Highgate’s Conservation Area) states that *“Development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate’s Conservation Areas, and respect the setting of its listed buildings and other heritage assets. Development should preserve or enhance the open, semi-rural or village character where this is a feature of the area.”*
- 7.77 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF (2024) states that Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk

through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account: d) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; e) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; f) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and g) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

- 7.78 A Heritage Statement has been prepared by Bidwells in support of the application and there has been extensive engagement with design and conservation officers of the local planning authority.
- 7.79 The existing buildings are recognised as being a detractor to the Conservation Area and as noted within the Heritage Statement the buildings have a negligible historic and aesthetic value and the proposals are outlined as offering an enhancement to the character and appearance of the conservation area reflecting the requirements of Section 72 of the 1990 Act.
- 7.80 It is noted that the site is closely positioned to a group of listed buildings and concluded that the impact to the setting and significance of the listed group is neutral and there has been due regard to the desirable objective of preserving the setting of the listed buildings in accordance with Section 66 of the 1990 Act
- 7.81 In causing no harm to the significance of the heritage assets identified, the relevant policies of the NPPF and development plan are satisfied.

Daylight Sunlight

- 7.82 Local Plan Policy DM1 states that the Council will support development proposals that “*provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity space where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land*”.
- 7.83 Anstey Horne undertook daylight and sunlight analysis on the residential properties to the north side of Broadlands Road and No. 27 Broadlands Road to the north-east of the site. The Daylight Sunlight Letter concludes by stating:
- “The results of the assessment confirm that all of the windows and rooms tested within 27 Broadlands Road will exceed the BRE’s guideline values for both daylight and sunlight. Whilst some of the windows assessed experience very small reductions in VSC, these reductions are well within the guidelines. For DD, none of the rooms are shown to experience any reduction.*
- In terms of sunlight, all of the rooms are shown to greatly exceed the guideline values on both an annual and winter basis with the proposed development in place.*
- In conclusion, the layout of the proposed development follows the BRE guidelines and will not significantly reduce sunlight or daylight to the existing surrounding residential properties.”*
- 7.84 The proposed changes have only made relatively minor changes the massing of the proposed building which will not result in a material impact on the Daylight Sunlight outcomes.

- 7.85 Therefore, it is considered that the proposals will have an acceptable impact on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties in accordance with development plan policy.

Sustainability

- 7.86 This application is supported by a suite of sustainability documents that have been prepared by Peter Deer & Associates including an Energy Strategy, Sustainability Statement, Whole Life Carbon Assessment and a Circular Economy Statement prepared by Eight Versa. These demonstrate how the development responds to the development plan with a particular emphasis upon the London Plan 2021 standards which are widely regarded as being at forefront of planning policy in sustainability terms.
- 7.87 In response to comments from LB Haringey's Carbon Management Team, the School's sustainability consultant for these proposals (Peter Deer and Associates) have prepared a revised Energy Strategy, Sustainability Statement, Whole Life Carbon Assessment. This followed a meeting held on 10th March 2025 between AECOM, Highgate School, Haringey's Carbon Management team and the Case Officer. A summary of the revised energy hierarchy findings are below.

Be Lean

- 7.88 The designers have selected the lowest practicable and achievable thermal fabric U values using readily available building materials (brick, block and mineral Wool insulation). After completing the MSC sports facilities, energy use is predicted to be lower than the original pre-developed building. The predicted energy savings reduce energy consumption from the new sports hall by installing high efficiency, ultra-low NOx condensing boilers and enhanced control systems to optimise the boiler operation.
- 7.89 The predicted energy requirement for lighting has increased, even though the building is designed with the latest low-energy LED lighting and integrated luminaire lighting controls. This results from the algorithms used in the energy compliance model, which does not make allowance for increased lighting required for the sports halls.
- 7.90 The energy required for the fans and pumps is higher than the base building as the algorithms underestimate the requirements for ventilation in sports halls.
- 7.91 It has not been possible to design and select building systems that match or better the base building.
- 7.92 Calculations suggest this approach could save 14% of regulated baseline emissions.

Be Clean

- 7.93 Highgate is a residential area with no significant developments and is unlikely to be prioritised for the initial Development of the district heating scheme. There are no plans to develop a district heating or ambient loop network in the locality.

- 7.94 A communal heating system with Combined Heat and Power (CHP) is not proposed as CHP machines cannot meet the new building regulation emissions reduction and local air quality requirements.
- 7.95 Air source heat pumps with refrigerant coils in ventilation units as well as Air source heat pumps with low temperature heat emitters will be used to provide space heating and ventilation. Fitness studios will be provided with local heat recovery mechanical ventilation units and heating /cooling via multi-split air source heat pumps.

Be Green

- 7.96 On site energy generation from a large Photo Voltaic (PV) on the roof of existing buildings and new extensions will reduce carbon dioxide emission by 79% in existing areas and 42% in new extensions in comparison to building regulations compliant development. The main advantage of using PV is that Electricity is generated during daylight hours when the school uses the indoor sports facilities and the pool plant is at peak operation.
- 7.97 The School building along Bishopswood Road take their power from a recently installed transformer. The electrical arrangement allows the surplus power generated at the MSC Sports centre to be used in other school buildings. The interlinking of the school is the first step towards a zero-carbon status. Calculations suggest this approach could save 63% of regulated baseline emissions.
- 7.98 The Photovoltaic array is predicted to generate over 60% of the overall energy used in the proposed development.
- 7.99 In total, the overall emissions saving against the baseline, is 77% beyond Building Regulations Part L.

BREEAM

- 7.100 In line with Local Plan Strategic Policy SP4, the proposed development will achieve a minimum BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' and has demonstrated a pathway to achieving 'Excellent' through the detailed design phase.

Biodiversity

- 7.101 London Plan Policy G6 expects development proposals to manage biodiversity and achieve biodiversity net gain. Local Plan Policy SP13 notes all development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation, contribute to wildlife and ecological habitats and, where possible, include green and brown roofs, rainwater harvesting, green walls, bird and bat nesting/roosting opportunities.
- 7.102 It has been confirmed by Applied Ecology that there are no impacts on statutory or non-statutory wildlife sites are anticipated as a consequence of the proposed development.

- 7.103 Further, it is concluded that the site is dominated by amenity grassland, buildings and hard-standing, and these represent habitats of negligible ecological and biodiversity value that do not represent a significant development constraint. However, adjoining woodland, hedgerows and mature and semi-mature trees were of elevated ecological value and should be retained and protected where possible.
- 7.104 Whilst the assessment recommends that no further survey work would be necessary, it flags there is likely to be a range of mostly common garden and woodland birds utilising the site for nesting, primarily in the areas of woodland. Reasonable impact avoidance measures are therefore to be applied during clearance and construction.
- 7.105 None of the buildings within the site are assessed as being of value to roosting bats, and the woodland area and lines of trees were assessed as being of low value to commuting and foraging bats. Whilst the presence of hedgehog and stag beetle cannot be discounted, a specific survey to confirm their presence/absence is not considered necessary in this instance. It is recommended that consideration is given to avoid impacts on these species by adopting targeted enhancement measures provided as part of the proposals.
- 7.106 In this respect, it is noted that London Plan Policy G6 states that: *“Development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain”*. The landscape proposal has been considered against a Biodiversity Net Gain methodology and it is noted that the proposed development delivers an on-site net gain of +1.13 habitat units, equivalent to a net gain of 18.74%.
- 7.107 This is a significant improvement to the biodiversity of the site and it is therefore considered that proposals are policy compliant in this respect.

Landscaping

- 7.108 The proposed development incorporates a comprehensive landscape strategy prepared by Robert Myers Associates.
- 7.109 The landscaping scheme involves two main areas. The first focusses on the setting of the building and involves the implementation of new hard landscape, including connecting paths and courtyard areas around the main entrances; and soft landscape around the perimeter of the site which will involve replacing three existing trees with new, semi-mature trees.
- 7.110 The second area is an outdoor sports pitch on the existing orchard site, to the east of the new building. The design of this area has emerged as a result of a flood risk assessment exercise and is intended to serve double duty as a basin for rainwater storage as well as a space for sports and other events and activities.
- 7.111 Since the submission of the original application there have been several changes which have resulted in revised landscape proposals being prepared by Robert Myers. The reduction of the building footprint and the internalising of the proposed cycle storage has increased the area for landscaping and planting adjacent to Broadlands Road.

- 7.112 It is considered that the new, improved landscape areas will provide a number of benefits for both the School and the surrounding area by:
- Creating external areas with seating for gathering and spill-out for students and visitors, and
 - extended planted areas that will enhance the biodiversity of the site;
 - Creating an appropriate setting for the buildings;
 - Accommodating changes in levels and connecting the entrances to the new buildings through accessible routes;
 - Enhancing the streetscape by infilling gaps in the line of trees along Bishopswood Road and introducing generous areas of low planting between the pavement and the building;
 - Providing visual amenity for both the school and the public, as all the planted areas will be viewed from Broadlands and Bishopswood Road.
 - Regenerating the Orchard site with a new sports area and introducing more diverse woodland structure through replanting and management.

Trees

- 7.113 In respect of trees, reflecting the requirements of London Plan Policy G7, the aim of the project has been to avoid tree loss if possible by the careful siting of the building extensions and structures.
- 7.114 In the final design some trees will be lost as the root zones extend so far into the available site, but the number has been minimised and includes trees that are in poor condition.
- 7.115 Three trees are proposed for removal associated with the built development. These are:
- T13 (Cat C) – Poor quality.
 - T45 (Cat B) – Moderate quality.
 - T4 (Cat A-B) – Good quality.
- 7.116 Two of these trees (T4 and T45) are positioned alongside Bishopswood Road and offer an amenity benefit locally.
- 7.117 The School has undertaken further work regarding the proposed tree planting across the MSC site with discussions with supplier Civic Trees. In response to the loss of the two trees along Bishopswood Road a total of 7no. trees will be planted along this stretch.
- 7.118 These will be *Tilia x euchlora* (Caucasian Lime) with 35-40cm girth and 10-12m height. The proposals will continue the tree lined avenue feel of the street by planting the semi-mature trees along the boundary of the Junior Field Playing Fields between MSC and RMC.




Figure 6 - Extract from the revised Landscape Strategy Report (Mar 2025)

- 7.119 Whilst the team has done all it can to explore how these trees could be retained, the new sports hall must be the size proposed to meet various sports standards and it cannot be located in any other location. It has been determined that removal of these trees is the most suitable option. Although trees will be removed, planting locations for many more new trees are shown on the proposed site plan.
- 7.120 Since the submission of the application, further detailed design work has been undertaken on the basin design. This has altered the shape of the proposed basin design.



Figure 7 - Extract of the Landscape Masterplan from the revised Landscape Strategy Report (Mar 2025)

- 7.121 An additional 33 trees are proposed to be removed in association with the flood mitigation, of which 27 are of lower quality (Category C or B/C). Five are Category B and there are none of good quality (Category A).
- 7.122 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment notes that whilst the number seems high, apart from one, all trees for removal are tightly spaced within a woodland edge and could be arguably justified as good woodland management. With a total area of less than 0.2 acres of woodland, a useable space to be created within the basin and will be mitigated by the new planting of no.73 trees and woodland management plans for the remainder of the woodland.
- 7.123 A revised Landscape Strategy Report (Mar 2025) has been prepared by Robert Myers Associates and a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Mar 2025) has been prepared by SJ Stephens.

Urban Greening

- 7.124 The Landscape Strategy Report (Mar 2025) includes a revised Urban Greening Factor calculation which resulted in a score of 0.74 which is significantly in excess of the target of 0.3 for predominately commercial developments as outlined by London Plan Policy G6.
- 7.125 It is considered that the proposals have taken significant steps to ensure that high quality landscaping and greening of the site can be achieved, therefore, on balance, it is considered that the proposed development accords with the Development Plan.

Wider Landscape Enhancements

- 7.126 As part of the community workshops and the School's commitment to being a long term steward of the community they have offered up wider estate wide landscaping and planting works, this is in addition to the landscaping already proposed under the as part of the current planning applications.
- 7.127 Further detail of the estate wide biodiversity proposal can be found within the Highgate School Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (Aug 2025) prepared by Applied Ecology, with the landscape plans available in Appendix 1 of that document.

Air Quality

- 7.128 Local Plan Development Management Policy DM23 places emphasis on proposals to improve or mitigate air quality buildings of occupier of the development and the borough as a whole and London Plan SI1 requires new development to be at least Air Quality Neutral. The Air Quality Assessment (AQA) concludes that the development is better than air quality neutral in relation to the building and transport emissions and is therefore entirely policy compliant.
- 7.129 However, it is noted that during construction, vehicles are likely to use Bishopswood Road and Broadlands Road. Continuous air quality monitoring should be considered if demolition or earthwork phases are undertaken during the term time to ensure impacts are acceptable. No ecologically sensitive areas are near the site except for numerous roadside trees, which help reduce dust and noise emissions.
- 7.130 As part of the formal consultation process the LBH Carbon Management Team (Pollution) provided comments. Their comments concluded that *"...we have no objection to the proposed development in respect to air quality and land contamination but the following planning conditions and informative are recommend should planning permission be granted."*
- 7.131 The applicant is willing to accept the proposed conditions.

Transport

- 7.132 NPPF (2024) paragraph 116 stipulates that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.
- 7.133 The proposals will include three new pedestrian entrances located on Bishopswood Road. A zebra crossing will provide access to other areas of the Bishopswood Road Campus, located on the opposite side of the road, while access to the Senior School Campus will be via the private path via St Michael's School and two controlled crossings on North Road.
- 7.134 There will be no dedicated vehicular access on Site, other than for maintenance and servicing. A new access point will in fact be provided on Broadlands Road, as described below. With the exception of Bishopswood Road, the local highway network is part of a CPZ.

7.135 There will be no car parking provided on site. In line with the QRP feedback it is proposed that cycle parking will be provided at the northwest of the Site, adjacent to Broadlands Road, with 42 covered cycle parking spaces provided at this location. In addition, eight uncovered cycle parking spaces will be provided at the south main entrance adjacent Bishopswood Road.

7.136 The Transport Statement concludes that:

“The development proposals are consistent with local, regional and national planning policy, including the Highgate SPD. No adverse impact on the local highway or public transport infrastructure is predicted. The proposals are instead anticipated to have a beneficial impact by creating a better and more inclusive street environment. As such, there is no reason to refuse the application on highway grounds.”

7.137 Consequently, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable in terms of their transport impact.

7.138 Transport Planning Associates (TPA) have prepared an estate wide “Active Travel Zone / Healthy Streets Assessment – Technical Note” (Oct 2023) as requested by LB Haringey’s Transport Officer.

Archaeology

7.139 An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been undertaken by Compass Archaeology covering the Bishopswood Road Campus. This concluded that given the lack of historic development across the site prior to the later-19th century and the subsequent level of landscaping and ground disturbance it is not deemed likely that any archaeologically significant deposits will be affected. The proposal is compliant with the development plan in archaeological terms.

7.140 As part of the statutory consultation process, the Great London Archaeology Advisory Service (Historic England) provided a formal consultation response (17 Mar 2023).

7.141 The site is in an area of archaeological interest with the comments stating that:

“The application site lies within the former mediaeval hunting park of the Bishop of London and Roman finds are recorded in the wider landscape. Works for the new basement may reveal evidence of the human exploitation of the area including the hunting park and the Bishops' later use of the land, including the substantial boundary shown on the 1815 enclosure map.”

7.142 Further it was stated in their comments that the significance of the asset and scale of harm to it is such that the effect can be managed using a planning condition. The proposed condition requires no demolition or development to take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

7.143 The applicant is willing to accept the proposed condition.

Utilities

- 7.144 A comprehensive Utilities Assessment has been prepared by Peter Deer and Associates and is submitted in support of the application. Utilities are to be provided as existing, and as set out in the report there are no impacts of material concern in planning terms.

Fire safety

- 7.145 The proposals are supported by a revised Fire Statement prepared by AECOM (revision March 2025), this document was revised to ensure that the amended scheme was comprehensively reviewed. London Plan Policies D5 “Inclusive Design” and D12 “Fire Safety” are both relevant policies.
- 7.146 This statement details how the Proposed Development meets the requirements of the London Plan, specifically Policy D12 and D5 and includes a signed declaration from a competent person confirming its compliance with the Plan.
- 7.147 The proposals comply with Policy D12 as set out in the Statement.
- 7.148 In relation to Policy D5, there is one area where step free access has not been provided. This is the escape from the 1st floor Gym area. This is an existing escape condition which is currently managed by the school. A refuge is provided, and to facilitate the effective evacuation of people from the refuge an emergency voice communication (EVC) system will be provided
- 7.149 As noted within the report, steps have been taken to upgrade the overall fire safety provision and meet the intent of the London Plan as best as possible. Some elements of the fire strategy will require further, detailed development and agreement with the ‘Stakeholders’ as the design progresses. This will include consultation with the Building Control Authority, who will in turn consult with the Fire Brigade.
- 7.150 Resultantly, it is considered that the proposals are compliant with relevant planning policy.

8.0 Conclusions

- 8.1 The proposals form a key part of the School's programme of redevelopment, refurbishment and modernisation across the estate. The proposals seek to provide an improved quality of sports provision which is flexible, accessible and resilient. The proposed development will vastly improve the quality and breadth of sport and exercise that the school is able to offer.
- 8.2 The proposals have been sensitively designed to mitigate potential impacts on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, including noise, and daylight & sunlight to the neighbouring properties, in particular 27 Broadlands Road. The proposed SuDS attenuation will provide benefits for residents by reducing flood risk, again particularly those who are located on Broadlands Road. There has been an independent audit of the Basement Impact Assessment which should provide comfort that the impact is acceptable.
- 8.3 The proposals are considered to accord with Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 1990 Act. The development will enhance the conservation area by delivering significant design improvements to a building which is recognised as detracting. In causing no harm to the significance of the heritage assets identified, the relevant policies of the NPPF are satisfied, in addition to local heritage policies.
- 8.4 Whilst there are elements of the proposed development which result in conflict with the adjacent Metropolitan Open Land, it is considered that the development does not constitute inappropriate development and is therefore acceptable in planning terms. Should the decision-maker not agree with this, the benefits of the scheme manifestly outweigh any harm to the MOL demonstrating that very special circumstances exist to justify approval. It is noted that the GLA confirmed within their Stage 1 Report that their officer's consider that the development constitutes inappropriate development but are satisfied that there would be very special circumstances to outweigh the harm to MOL.
- 8.5 We review remaining development plan policies in detail within this statement and we conclude that the proposals are compliant with it. Further we find that there are no material considerations which weigh against this conclusion. Rather, the material considerations add further support to the approval of the scheme. Furthermore, this revised Planning Statement provides relevant updates from the statutory consultation process, where requests for further information have been made this has been provided within the revised pack of information.
- 8.6 The principle of development accords with the development plan when read as a whole and therefore benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 8.7 Consequently, the development proposals should be approved without delay.

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS

KEY	
	Latest version
	Superseded
	As originally submitted

ORIGINAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION	REVISED OR NEW SUPPORTING INFORMATION
Planning Application Form and Certificates	As originally submitted.
Site Location Plan	As originally submitted.
Existing and proposed drawings as set out in the table below	Please refer to the table below
Air Quality Assessment	Air Quality Assessment (Mar 2025)
Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Arboricultural Impact Assessment (March 2025)
Archaeological Assessment	As originally submitted.
Basement Impact Assessment	Basement Impact Assessment (Oct 2024)
N/A	Basement Extent Change Review (Feb 2025)
Circular Economy Statement ➤ Circular Economy Appendix A GLA Template	As originally submitted.
Construction Management Plan	Outline Construction Management Plan (Mar 2025)
Covering Letter	As originally submitted.
Daylight Sunlight Study	As originally submitted.
Design and Access Statement ➤ Planning Heritage Analysis	Design and Access Statement (Aug 2025) ➤ Planning Heritage Analysis
Drainage and SuDS Statement	Drainage and SuDS Statement (Revised – Jan 2025)
Ecology Report	Ecology Report (May 2025)
Energy Assessment	Energy Assessment (Mar 2025) ➤ BRUKL

	➤ Part L GLA Reporting
Fire Statement	Fire Statement (Mar 2025)
Flood Risk Assessment (Estate Wide) ➤ Appendix A	As originally submitted.
Flood Risk Assessment (Site Specific) ➤ Appendix A ➤ Appendix B ➤ Appendix C ➤ Appendix D ➤ Appendix E	Flood Risk Assessment (Site Specific) – Revision N (Mar 2025) ➤ Appendix A ➤ Appendix B ➤ Appendix C ➤ Appendix D ➤ Appendix E ➤ Appendix F
Heritage Statement	As originally submitted.
Landscape Strategy Report	Landscape Strategy Report (Revision F – Mar 2025)
Noise Report	As originally submitted.
Operational Waste Management Note (Estate Wide)	As originally submitted.
Outline Methodology & Construction Logistic Plan	As originally submitted.
Pre Demolition Waste Audit	As originally submitted.
Secured by Design Statement	As originally submitted.
Statement of Community Involvement	As originally submitted.
N/A	Statement of Community Involvement Addendum (Oct 2025)
Sustainability Statement	Sustainability Statement (Mar 2025)
Transport Statement (Site Specific) (Jan 2023)	N/A - as originally submitted
Utilities Assessment	Utilities Assessment (Mar 2025)
Ventilation and Extraction Statement	Ventilation and Extraction Statement (Mar 2025)
Whole Life Carbon Report	Whole Life Carbon Report (Mar 2025)
N/A	Overheating Assessment (Mar 2025)
N/A	Estate Wide Programme Review & Construction Traffic Forecast (Aug 2025)
N/A	Active Travel Zone / Healthy Streets Assessment – Technical Note (Oct 2023)
N/A	Highgate School Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (Aug 2025)
N/A	External Lighting Statement (Mar 2025)

N/A	Active Travel Zone / Healthy Streets Assessment – Technical Note (Oct 2023)
-----	--

DRAWING TITLE & DRAWING NO.	NEW OR REVISED DRAWING
Location plan 1182_ GL_001	As originally submitted.
Estate Wide Plan - Site Application & Ownership Boundaries A_HS-RMC2_2010 Rev A	As originally submitted.
Landscape	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin seating 733_01 (CD) 001 Rev P3	Superseded by Landscape Strategy Report
Sports Pitch Flood Basin steps 733_01 (CD) 002 Rev P3	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin grass bank 733_01 (CD) 003 Rev P3	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin Levels plan 733_01 (DP) 001 Rev P3	
MSC Material plan 733_01 (DP) 002 Rev P2	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin Material plan 733_01 (DP) 003 Rev P3	
MSC Lighting strategy plan 733_01 (DP) 004 Rev P2	
MSC Tree planting strategy plan 733_01 (DP) 005 Rev P2	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin tree planting strategy plan 733_01 (DP) 006 Rev P3	
MSC Green Roofs plan 733_01 (DP) 007 Rev P2	
Urban Greening Factor plan 733_01 (DP) 008 Rev P2	
Site plan 733_01 (MP) 001 Rev P3	
MSC Landscape Masterplan 733_01 (MP) 002 Rev P2	
Sports Pitch Flood Basin Masterplan	

733_01 (MP) 003 Rev P3	
MSC South Terrace Section 733_01 (SC) 001 Rev P2	
Sections through Sports Pitch Flood Basin 733_01 (SC) 002 Rev P3	
Existing	
Site plan existing 1182_GL_002	As originally submitted.
Ground floor plan existing Level 2 1182_GA_001	As originally submitted.
First floor plan existing Level 3 1182_GA_002	First floor plan existing Level 3 1182_GA_002 Rev A
Roof plan existing 1182_GA_003	Roof plan existing 1182_GA_003 Rev A
Elevation West existing 1182_GE_001	Elevation West existing 1182_GE_001 Rev B
Elevation North existing 1182_GE_002	Elevation North existing 1182_GE_002 Rev A
Elevation South existing 1182_GE_003	Elevation South existing 1182_GE_003 Rev B
Elevation East existing 1182_GE_004	Elevation East existing 1182_GE_004 Rev A
Elevations Squash Fives existing 1182_GE_005	As originally submitted.
Elevation North Pool Hall existing 1182_GE_006	Elevation North Pool Hall existing 1182_GE_006 Rev A
Section AA existing 1182_GS_001	Section AA existing 1182_GS_001 Rev A
Section BB existing 1182_GS_002	Section BB existing 1182_GS_002 Rev A
Section DD existing 1182_GS_004	Section DD existing 1182_GS_004 Rev A
Section FF existing 1182_GS_006	Section FF existing 1182_GS_006 Rev A
N/A	Section GG existing 1182_GS_007
N/A	Section HH existing 1182_GS_008-A


N/A	Section JJ existing 1182_GS_009-A
N/A	Section KK existing 1182_GS_010
Demolition	
Ground floor plan Demolition Level 2 1182_DEM_001	As originally submitted.
First floor plan existing Demolition Level 3 1182_DEM_002	First floor plan existing Demolition Level 3 1182_DEM_002 Rev A
Roof plan existing Demolition 1182_DEM_003	Roof plan existing Demolition 1182_DEM_003 Rev A
Proposed	
Site plan proposed 1182_GL_012	Site plan proposed 1182_GL_012 Rev D
Basement floor plan proposed Level 1 1182_GA_010	Basement floor plan proposed Level 1 1182_GA_010 Rev D
Ground floor plan proposed Level 2 1182_GA_011	Ground floor plan proposed Level 2 1182_GA_011 Rev D
First floor plan proposed Level 3 1182_GA_012	First floor plan proposed Level 3 1182_GA_012 Rev D
Second floor plan proposed Level 4 1182_GA_013	Second floor plan proposed Level 4 1182_GA_013 Rev D
Roof plan proposed 1182_GA_014	Basement floor plan proposed Level 1 1182_GA_010 Rev D
Elevation West proposed 1182_GE_011	Elevation West proposed 1182_GE_011 Rev B
Elevation North proposed 1182_GE_012	Elevation North proposed 1182_GE_012 Rev B
Elevation South proposed 1182_GE_013	Elevation South proposed 1182_GE_013 Rev B
Elevation East proposed 1182_GE_014	Elevation East proposed 1182_GE_014 Rev B
N/A	Elevation West proposed - Long Context 1182_GE_015
Part Elevation West proposed Detail 1182_GE_021	Part Elevation West proposed Detail 1182_GE_021 Rev B
Part Elevation North proposed Detail 1182_GE_022	Part Elevation North proposed Detail 1182_GE_022 Rev B

N/A	Section KK existing 1182_GS_010
Section AA proposed 1182_GS_011	Section AA proposed 1182_GS_011 Rev C
Section BB proposed 1182_GS_012	Section BB proposed 1182_GS_012 Rev C
Section DD proposed 1182_GS_014	Section DD proposed 1182_GS_014 Rev B
Section FF proposed 1182_GS_016	Section FF proposed 1182_GS_016 Rev A
N/A	Section GG proposed 1182_GS_017
N/A	Section HH proposed 1182_GS_018-A
N/A	Section JJ proposed 1182_GS_019-A
N/A	Section KK proposed 1182_GS_020-A
General illustrations 1 1182_V_001	As originally submitted.
General illustrations 2 1182_V_002	General illustrations 2 1182_V_002 Rev B
N/A	General illustrations 3 – 3D CAD White Model Context View 1182_V_003

APPENDIX 2

SITE ALLOCATION

SA41: HIGHGATE SCHOOL



Proposed Site Allocation

2.119 Exploration of how school facilities can be enhanced while simultaneously benefitting local communities including potentially increasing accessibility through the landholdings.

Commentary

2.120 The site falls within the Highgate Conservation Area. The school essentially occupies two campuses- the more prominent one at the junction of Highgate High Street and North Hill; the other within the Bishops sub-area of the conservation area. The site has a prominent position, both in terms of the location as well as status within the wider area. Whilst the aesthetic value of buildings would have to be considered based on individual proposals, the site has high communal and historic value.

2.121 Highgate School aims to expand to continue to meet the education needs of local schoolchildren. Additionally the school represents a significant landowner within the Highgate area. The Council will work in conjunction with the School to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document which appropriately manages future developments on this landholding.

Address	Highgate School, North Road & Southwood Lane, Highgate, N6		
Site Size (Ha)	15.63	PTAL Rating	1b-3
Timeframe for delivery	2011-2015	2015-2020	2020 onwards
Current/Previous use	School grounds		
Ownership	Single private freehold		
How site was identified	Existing pre-applications		
Planning applications	Highgate Conservation Area Metropolitan open land: Highgate School Playing Fields Locally listed buildings: Bishopswood Road, Castle Yard, Osborne Road Listed buildings: The Highgate Tabernacle, Highgate School – Old School Building, Highgate School Chapel, War Memorial at Highgate School, and many adjacent		
Indicative Dev' Capacity	None identified.		

Site Requirements

- Development on the site shall be in accordance with a future SPD. The SPD will take the form of two campus masterplans that take a comprehensive approach to the effective planning and delivery of new accommodation to meet the long term needs of the school and supporting enhanced community use and benefits.
- These will focus on creating improved management and quality of provision, potentially including new buildings.
- Open space should be made as accessible as possible in line with Policy DM 20.
- The site lies within the Highgate Conservation Area and development should preserve or enhance its appearance as per the statutory requirements.
- Development should preserve the setting of the statutorily and locally listed buildings on the site and neighbouring the School, having regard to their significance. Historic England has also highlight the potential for significant archaeology including a medieval settlement and recorded pre-school chapel.

Development Guidelines

- The objectives of the Highgate Bowl site should be considered on any properties that fall into this site allocation.
- A Supplementary Planning Document will be developed by the Council in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This will take the form of masterplans to guide development on these sites, and ensure development comes forward in a co-ordinated manner. This will consider in more detail issues regarding heights and design.
- Any Masterplanning should give appropriate regard to the open character of the Bowl as well as the character of the Bishops area.
- A flood risk assessment is required for any development. Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment further outlines when an assessment is required and what it should include.



