

**(by email)**

Our reference: MGLA080525-5555

5 June 2025

Thank you for your request for information which the Greater London Authority (GLA) received on 8 May 2025. Your request has been considered under the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) 2004.

**You requested:**

This is a Freedom of Information Request in respect of the proposed development at Archway Campus, 2-10 Highgate Hill, London, N19 5LP.

The Local Planning Authority is Islington Council and the planning application for the proposed development submitted to Islington Council is P2024/2598/FUL ("the Application"). The applicant is Seven Capital (Highgate Hill) Ltd ("Seven") and the architects are GRID Architects and NMLA.

The Application was called-in by the Mayor of London on 31 March 2025, such that the Mayor of London will now be responsible for deciding upon the Application, instead of Islington Council, which resolved to refuse the Application in March 2025.

I hereby request copies of all documented interactions (whether in emails, letters, meeting minutes/notes or howsoever recorded) between:

1. Seven (including those representing/acting on its behalf);
2. and the Mayor of London and/or the GLA (including those representing/acting on their behalf)

arising out of, in relation to or in connection with the Application.

The timeframe must, at the very least, be from 31 March 2025 to date. It may be that there were interactions before that date, in which case the timeframe should run from the earliest of the interactions.

**Our response to your request is as follows:**

Please find attached the information that the GLA holds within the scope of your request.

# GREATER**LONDON**AUTHORITY

Please note that some names of members of staff are exempt from disclosure under Regulation 13 (Personal information) of the EIR. Information that identifies specific employees constitutes as personal data which is defined by Article 4(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) to mean any information relating to an identified or identifiable living individual. It is considered that disclosure of this information would contravene the first data protection principle under Article 5(1) of GDPR which states that Personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject.

If you have any further questions relating to this matter, please contact me, quoting the reference MGLA080525-5555.

Yours sincerely

## **Information Governance Officer**

If you are unhappy with the way the GLA has handled your request, you may complain using the GLA's FOI complaints and internal review procedure, available at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/governance-and-spending/sharing-our-information/freedom-information>

**From:** [Spatial Planning](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Archway Campus, Highgate Hill, Islington - TfL Pre-Application Advice  
**Date:** 08 April 2022 15:36:20  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)  
[Spatial Planning - Pre-App Feedback form.doc](#)  
[Archway Campus, Highgate Hill, Islington - TfL Pre-Application Advice.pdf](#)

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside this organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear [REDACTED]

Following on from your recent pre-application meeting for the above site, please find Transport for London's formal advice letter attached for your information. Should you have any questions about these comments, please contact Matthew Muldoon.

Please will you forward this letter to your colleagues who also attended the meeting.

Your views are important to us and in order to improve our service, we would appreciate it if you would complete and send back the enclosed feedback form ASAP.

Kind regards,

TfL Spatial Planning

Spatial Planning | City Planning

Level 9, 5 Endeavour Square, Westfield Avenue, Stratford E20 1JN



This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. [www.forcepoint.com](http://www.forcepoint.com)

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.



Our Ref: ISTN/22/49

[REDACTED]

Vectos

Network Building, 97 Tottenham Court Road, London

(By Email only)

**Transport for London**  
City Planning

5 Endeavour Square  
Westfield Avenue  
Stratford  
London E20 1JN

Phone 020 7222 5600  
[www.tfl.gov.uk](http://www.tfl.gov.uk)

06/04/22

Dear [REDACTED]

## **RE: Archway Campus, Highgate Hill, Islington London**

Thank you for taking advantage of the TfL pre-application advice service, which is aimed at ensuring the preparation of developments that are successful in transport terms and which conform to relevant London Plan policies. This letter sets out the advice provided by TfL on the transport issues discussed at the pre-application meeting held on 23 March 2022.

The following comments are made by TfL officers on a 'without prejudice' basis only. You should not interpret them as indicating any subsequent Mayoral decision on any planning application based on the proposed scheme. Furthermore, these comments also do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority.

The advice in this letter is based on the Transport Assessment Scoping Report dated March 2022 supplied in advance of the meeting; discussions during the meeting, comments provided by TfL colleagues who were unable to attend

The meeting was attended by the following persons:

### **TfL attendees:**

[REDACTED] (Chair) - City Planning, Spatial Planning (Chair)  
[REDACTED] - City Planning, Spatial Planning  
[REDACTED] - Bus Service Delivery  
[REDACTED] - Network Sponsorship  
[REDACTED] - Network Sponsorship  
[REDACTED] - Asset Operations  
[REDACTED] - Bus Network Development  
[REDACTED] - Public Transport Service Planning  
[REDACTED] - Bus Operations

### **Developer/Applicant Attendees**

██████████ - Vectos  
██████████ - Vectos  
██████████████████ - Fellow Consultants  
██████████████████ - Fellow Consultants  
██████████ - Seven Capital  
██████████ - Seven Capital  
██████████ - Bidwells  
██████████ - Grid Architects

### **Islington Council**

██████████ – Case Officer

### **Site location and context**

The proposal seeks to redevelop the vacant educational building most recently used by Middlesex University to provide circa 300-400 residential units, 300 student accommodation units and 500m<sup>2</sup> of retail commercial floor space

Archway Road A1 borders the site to the east. Highgate Hill B519 borders the site to the south and west. The A1 Archway Road forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), with a further section of the TLRN being directly south at the site at Tollhouse Way.

The site is located approximately 200m north of Archway London Underground Station, which provides access to the Northern Line. Upper Holloway London Overground Station is also located approximately 500m south east to the site.

There are a number of bus stops located on Archway Road and Highgate Hill, providing access to services 143, 210, W5, 41, 43, 134, 263 and the N20. There is also both a southbound and northbound bus stand located on Archway Road, with the services 17, 143 and 390 operating on Archway Road Northbound, and services 4, C11 and W5. Each stand is 79 metres in length and provides space for up to 6 buses to stand.

The site has an excellent Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 6b where 0 is the lowest and 6b is the highest.

There is comprehensive cycle infrastructure surrounding the site, with on/off carriageway cycle routes on the west side of Highgate, Tollhouse Way and Archway Road.

### **Transport Assessment (TA)**

The TA will need to be prepared in accordance with latest TfL's TA best practice guidance <https://www.tfl.gov.uk/info-for/urban-planning-and-construction/transport-assessment-guidance>. Further detailed guidance in relation to this development

proposal is set out below. As noted above, the applicant provided a Transport Assessment Scoping Note for discussion during the meeting and the TA shall be prepared in line with comments made in the meeting and within this response.

### **Site Access and Layout**

Our urban design colleagues were not able to attend the meeting, however they have provided some written comments/questions on the proposals.

TfL recommends that the developer provides information for how the entry points for pedestrians and cyclists align with pedestrian/cyclist crossing across both Archway Road and Highgate Hill. Also, including how the public realm landscape design supports walking and cycling routes, it should be shown how they can support key desire lines to connect up with the wider network. Routes from blue badge parking to allocated mobility units should also be shown.

TfL advises that the TA includes a site circulation plan that identifies where there are conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists, and blue badge car parking, delivery and service vehicles. Where conflicts are unavoidable, the design should include mitigation that promotes active travel.

TfL recommends the existing site entry on Archway Road is set back to allow a wider footway and safe entrance to the site. This should be further explored by the applicant and TfL welcome further discussion on this point.

TfL confirmed the existing vehicle access points are established on site, and only if there were changes to the access on site that physically change the operation of TfL highway would TfL request a Road Safety Audit (RSA). The scope of the safety assessment and/or RSA should be shared with TfL. TfL would expect that vehicle access to the site by Heavy Goods Vehicles will be managed to minimise conflict between vehicles entering the site and operation of the cycle route. The predicted delivery vehicles and type should be shared with TfL on the Archway Road access to confirm the access arrangement is acceptable.

### **Car Parking**

The development proposes to be car-free in nature with the exception of blue badge spaces. Car free developments in highly accessible locations are in line with London Plan Policy T6.B and are therefore strongly supported. The applicant raised their reluctance to provide a further future 7% of blue badge parking in the meeting, which is required by London Plan Policy T6.1 G, due to site constraints and concerns regarding a vehicle dominated public realm along the north-south route within site. TfL may deem this proposal acceptable, however the applicant must make it a priority on making the public realm accessible and permeable to all. Proposals illustrating the layout of the public realm with a 10% blue badge scenario would be useful in order to determine the appropriate level. Depending on the outcome, the applicant should also be looking to provide a larger percentage of accessible cycle parking spaces.

Vehicle swept path analysis and vehicle tracking must be provided for the proposed blue badge parking spaces, showing movements needed when all spaces are taken up.

Due to the low level of car parking proposed, TfL would expect that all spaces are provided with active electrical vehicle charging points from the outset.

### **Cycle Parking**

It is understood that the applicant is committed to achieving London Plan cycle parking but given the site constraints, suggests that there may need to be a trade-off between quantity and quality. Given the recent investment in the local area that has delivered a step change in cycle facilities around the Archway interchange, the applicant must aim to provide LP compliant quality and quantity of cycle parking in the first instance. There would need to be a compelling reason why this cannot be achieved, this must be highlighted in the application if submitted, which will result in further discussion.

It is expected that the cycle parking provided will be a sufficient and accessible mix, without relying upon two-tier racks. The London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) is clear that not everyone can use two-tier racks; a failure to provide an adequate proportion of accessible cycle parking stands will disproportionately affect children, older people, women and disabled.

TfL are looking for an accessible mix that contains a minimum of around 20% for Sheffield stands

The applicant will need to provide further information on how cyclists access the long stay parking, where the lifts to the cycle parking will be provided and where the short stay cycle parking will be provided in the public realm. This will need to be thought through in relation to the landscape plan.

It is expected that all doors in and out of long stay cycle parking stores are to be automated, fobbed and self-closing.

Cargo bike spaces should also be located in the public realm, in order to support sustainable freight, in line with London Plan Policy T3 (Transport Capacity, Connectivity and Safeguarding). The applicant advised that for deliveries, they are proposing to make sure there is significant space around the buildings for delivery drivers to park their bikes. This should be highlighted and justified in the TA, which TfL may deem to be acceptable.

### **Healthy Streets and Vision Zero**

The Healthy Streets Approach aims to improve air quality, reduce congestion and make attractive places to live, work and do business. There are ten Healthy Streets indicators, which put people and their health at the heart of decision making and aim to result in a more inclusive city where people choose to walk, cycle and use public transport. In line with London Plan policy T2, all on-site public realm shall be designed to high quality to be in line with the Healthy Street principles which would encourage the uptake of sustainable travel behaviours, walking and cycling.

Within the Healthy Streets TA, the applicant must undertake an Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment considering existing walking and cycling environment and identify possible local walking and cycling improvement opportunities within a catchment for a 20-minute journey time for walking and cycling.

The ATZ assessment shall also consider public realm schemes, and new pedestrian/cycle routes about to be delivered and reflect walking and cycling desire lines in accordance with London Plan policy D7 (Public realm).

The applicant will be required to demonstrate how they are delivering this mayoral objective, not just on site, but on those key routes to and from the site. Proposed Healthy Streets improvements must not be restricted to within the site's red line boundaries.

Accident analysis should be included within TA submission; the applicant is urged to use the findings to take a proactive and innovative approach to accident prevention as set out in the Vision Zero Action Plan. Safety improvements, no matter how small will be supported by TfL. The applicant should therefore identify improvements in this location that could be secured by section 106 agreement.

TfL expects that the applicant to enter a s278 agreement under Highways Act 1980 with TfL and Islington Council to deliver any walking/ cycling improvements on the TLRN and local highway network respectively.

## **Public Transport Impact**

### Buses

There is no plan to impact the size or operation of the bus stand on Archway Road, which is welcomed. However, concerns were raised in the meeting regarding potential conflict between buses exiting the stand and vehicle movements into the development, which would also potentially result in a sightline issue for cyclists.

Regarding the proposal to relocate the bus stop on Highgate Hill to facilitate a loading bay, we raised concern about the potential impact and delay on buses when exiting the stop. The operation of the bus network is sensitive to marginal changes in bus infrastructure that cause delays which in turn can increase costs. TfL would expect that any changes to the bus stop consider the operability and accessibility of this stop and identify any mitigation as necessary. In general, TfL will not agree to any bus stop changes that have a detrimental impact on bus operations.

TfL understand that the proposed loading bay is only expected to serve part of the site. TfL request further information and details of how the site would operate if it was just serviced by the proposed loading bay at the south east of the site, having regard to forecast servicing trips and considering any changes to the site layout that could enable this. The applicant must eliminate all other reasonable options if the proposed loading bay is agreed to be necessary in accordance with Healthy Streets principles.

The proposed location of the residential units was also raised as a potential concern. TfL often suffer complaints from residents regarding noise when residential properties



are built adjacent to bus stands. The proposed residential element should therefore be designed in accordance with the 'Agent of Change Principles', London Plan policy D13, Your submission should set out any interventions taken to prevent/manage this.

There is no existing common stop for routes 43/134 travelling northbound in proximity to Archway Station, TfL would like the applicant to consider whether this could be provided

### **Trip Generation**

We would expect to see trip generation split out by station, line and direction. The split between LU and LO may be allocated by commuting destination and commuting mode choice in census data.

We would also expect to see a basic level of station impact assessment undertaken for the impact of generated trips on Archway station's key assets (e.g. Gate line and stairs). This should be done using the formulas within the LU Station Planning standards and making use of publicly available demand data (NUMBAT 2019) to assess the impact on key assets' capacity utilisation of the following demand scenarios: Base, Base+Development Trip Gen. and Base+Development Trip Gen+Nearby Consented Scheme Trip Gen.

Equally we'd also expect to see some assessment of the impact of additional demand on LU line capacity utilisation. This should be done using the same data and scenarios, alongside rolling stock capacity figures (with the assumption of four standing passengers per square metre) and line frequencies (which can also be accessed through NUMBAT 2019) to understand the % of capacity utilised for each of these scenarios.

Post meeting, from our discussion with colleagues, given that the development will increase the commuting traffic to Archway Station, TfL may request a contribution towards ticket hall exterior improvements, of a similar scale to the public realm improvements in surrounding area.

Bus trip generation figures should be split out by route and direction. This should be based on the future network following changes which were consulted on recently: <https://haveyoursay.tfl.gov.uk/routes-21-143-263-271>

For the local network this means that route 271 is withdrawn and route 234 is extended from Highgate Wood to Archway Station via Archway Road

### **Delivery and Servicing**

A robust assessment of delivery and servicing demand should be undertaken, with consideration given to the increase in online deliveries in recent years. A worse-case assessment for all land uses should be undertaken. The proposed developments and redevelopments within this site should seek to design out the requirement for reversing.

It is vital that the applicant explores ways of reducing the number of large vehicle delivery trips to this site, due to the site constraints considered above. Significant

measures must be put in place in order to reduce the potential impact on local highways and the quality of the walking and cycling environment, such as online booking systems and servicing consolidation

Due to the comprehensive cycling infrastructure surrounding the site, the applicant should explore the use of cargo bike deliveries in order to support sustainable freight, in line with London Plan Policy London Plan Policy T3 (Transport Capacity, Connectivity and Safeguarding).

It is also expected that all servicing arrangements will be secured through a Delivery & Servicing Plan (DSP) by planning condition

### **Construction**

It is expected that a framework Construction Logistics Plans (CLP) will be included in the planning applications and the detailed CLP will be secured for sign off by TfL and the Council prior to commencement. These, and the final documents, should be prepared in accordance with TfL guidance <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/construction-logistics-plan-guidance.pdf> having regard to matters including the local environment, scope for consolidation, and ensuring safe walking, cycling routes, bus lanes are maintained throughout the construction period.

Consolidation with other sites in close proximity should be explored, in order to minimise potential congestion and vehicles in and around site. This should be combined with cumulative impact analysis.

TfL would also encourage the applicant to provide details of how cargo bike deliveries will be provided for and encouraged at the site as part of the application

Due to nearby London Underground infrastructure, the development proposal will have complex infrastructure protection requirements and the applicant should therefore continue to liaise closely with London Underground. An Asset Protection condition will be requested to ensure liaison continues if planning permission is granted.

### **Travel planning**

It is understood that in line with London Plan policy T4, a Framework Travel Plan will be produced. It is expected that the travel plans will include measures and aims to increase the mode share for walking and cycling as well as public transport, supporting the Mayor's sustainable travel targets. The final detailed submission shall be secured by s106 agreement.

### **Summary**

There are several issues which require further discussions and action, particularly:

- How the entry points for pedestrians and cyclists align with pedestrian/cyclist crossing across both Archway Road and Highgate Hill.
- Route from blue badge parking to proposed mobility units
- Potential changes to existing entry on Archway Road

- The conflict between buses exiting the stand and vehicle movements into the development
- Design to protect bus infrastructure
- Bus journey time impact assessment
- Loading Bay operations
- Protection of Underground Infrastructure

Yours sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Lucinda Turner

**Director of Spatial Planning**

Email: 

Cc All at meeting +  (GLA) &  (TfL)



## Feedback form for TfL pre-application advice scheme

You have requested a TfL pre-application advice on a development proposal and in order to improve the service we currently provide, we would appreciate if you could provide us with feedback and comments on your experience. Please submit the completed form with your comments directly by email to [Spatialplanning@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:Spatialplanning@tfl.gov.uk).

**NAME:**

**ORGANISATION:**

Date of meeting:

Site Name:

*Please underline the relevant response or the number on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being 'not at all' and 5 being 'very', in response to each of the following questions.*

1. Have you been through a GLA pre-application meeting on your scheme prior to meeting with TfL Borough Planning for pre-application advice or plan to do so?

YES

NO

2. Overall, how easy did you find the pre-application request process?

1

2

3

4

5

3. How clear was the application form?

1

2

3

4

5

4. How useful did you find the information available on TfL website?

1

2

3

4

5

5. Overall, were you satisfied by the meeting arrangements?

1

2

3

4

5

6. Do you have any comments on the meeting arrangements?

--

7. Did you receive a proposed agenda prior to the meeting?

YES

NO

8. How effectively was the meeting managed (i.e. chaired)?

1

2

3

4

5

9. Did the meeting cover all expected topics?

1

2

3

4

5

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

--

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

--

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

YES NO

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

YES NO

YES NO

--	--

2