29 January 2014

St Luke’s Hospital
in the London Borough of Haringey

planning application no. HGY/2013/2379

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning application combined stage 1 and stage II referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment and refurbishment of the former St Luke’s Hospital for 161 residential units including basement parking and landscaped gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is Hanover and the architect is Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principle of residential redevelopment with conversion of heritage buildings was supported previously and is again. The main change from the previous application relates to affordable housing provision, which has been assessed as being the maximum reasonable amount.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Council’s decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this instance Haringey Council has resolved to grant permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Haringey Council be advised that the Mayor is content for it to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct refusal or direct that he is to be the local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 On 22 November 2013 the Mayor of London received documents from Haringey Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town &amp; Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor had until 2 January 2014 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. Unfortunately the Mayor was unable to issue a response within the deadline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 The application is referable under Category 1A.1 of the Schedule to the Order 2008: |
• 1A.1 - “Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats.”

3 On 13 January 2014 Haringey Council decided that it was minded to grant planning permission, for the application, and on 16 January 2014 it advised the Mayor of this decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, direct Haringey Council under Article 6 to refuse the application or issue a direction to Haringey Council under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor has until 29 January 2014 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

4 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

5 The site is the former St Luke’s Hospital which is predominantly vacant but still partially occupied by Camden & Islington NHS Foundation Trust, currently used for administration only, and Simmons House which is occupied by the Whittington Hospital NHS Trust which provides in-patient and day-patient psychiatric care to adolescents. Simmons House is a more recent addition to the site and is excluded from the redevelopment area.

6 The site includes a series of hospital buildings set in mature landscape which is designated as part of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and as a Historic Park and Garden. There is one statutory listed building to the south of the site, the Administration building (grade II listed) and two other locally listed buildings of heritage value, Roseneath and Norton Lees.

7 The site is bounded by Treehouse School to the west, the B550 Muswell Hill Road to the east, Woodside Avenue to the south and Grand Avenue to the north. All these roads fall within Haringey jurisdiction as the highway authority. The A1 Archway Road, located 1 kilometre to the south of the site, is the nearest part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).

8 The nearest rail or underground station to the site is East Finchley underground station, approximately 1.2 kilometres to the west of the site and served by the Northern line. Two bus services operate along Muswell Hill Road adjacent to the site; Route 43, between Halliwick Park and London Bridge, and Route 134, between North Finchley and Tottenham Court Road. A further two services, the 102 (Edmonton Green – Brent Cross) and the 234 (High Barnet – Highgate Wood) are also accessible from Muswell Hill Road and Fortis Green Road, approximately 275 metres to the north-east of the site. As such, the site has a low public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2, on a scale from 1 to 6 where 6 is excellent.

Details of the proposal

9 Conversion, alteration and extension of the Listed Administrative Block and Locally Listed Roseneath and Norton Lees buildings to provide a total of 25 flats. Demolition of remaining buildings and erection of nine blocks of flats to provide 115 flats and 21 houses. The current application is very similar to the previously refused application (see below), with just a minor change to block WB01 and a change in the mix of affordable units.
Case history

10 The Mayor was consulted on a similar application for 165 units in 2013. Acting under delegated authority the Deputy Mayor provided his initial response (D&P/2045/01) in June 2013. The Deputy Mayor supported the principle of development but raised issues relating to affordable housing, playspace, biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation and transport.

11 Haringey Council refused the application in July 2013, principally because of the affordable housing offer but also on grounds relating to the absence of a section 106 agreement. Acting under delegated authority the Deputy Mayor decided he was content for the Council to determine the application itself (D&P/3045/02).

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

12 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Affordable housing: London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Revised Housing Strategy;
- Transport: London Plan; the Mayor’s Transport Strategy;
- Sustainable development: London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor’s Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor’s Water Strategy

13 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 2013 Local Plan, the 2006 Unitary Development Plan and the 2011 London Plan (with 2013 Alterations).

14 The following are also relevant material considerations:

- The draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (January 2014)

Principle of development

15 As stated in paragraph 9 this application is virtually identical to the 2013 application which the Deputy Mayor previously supported. The only change of strategic importance relates to affordable housing, which is discussed further below. As such the principle of residential redevelopment of the site, with conversion of the three heritage buildings is supported.

Affordable housing

16 At the time the Deputy Mayor provided his initial comments the affordable housing offer had not been finalised, by the time the Council took its decision the applicant had changed its offer from 21 general needs units (15%) to 51 over 55s units (32%). There was disagreement between the Council and applicant regarding whether this represented the maximum reasonable amount, the Council also concluded that the provision of age restricted affordable housing did not meet the Council’s priority needs.

17 Since refusal of the previous scheme further discussions have taken place between the applicant and the Council. This application provides 48 affordable units, which equates to 30% provision by unit. As the majority of the units (42) are one/two bedrooms, the calculation by
habitable rooms is less (24%). The tenure split between affordable rent and shared ownership is 73:27. Twelve of the affordable units will be general needs housing and 36 are for over 55s.

18 The Council has had the affordable housing offer independently assessed and having regard to the advice in the NPPF regarding the need to provide a competitive return to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable, and a further review of costs, values and profit, the Council is content that this is the maximum reasonable amount.

19 With respect to the over 55s housing the Council has secured a cascade mechanism which prioritises social housing tenants within Haringey who are downsizing from larger properties. The rents of the new properties will be set at a sustainable level, to ensure that downsizing tenants do not end up paying significantly more for a smaller property than the one they currently occupy. This is supported and reflects the aspirations of the draft housing strategy.

20 Overall the affordable housing offer is supported.

Transport

21 Despite the refusal of planning permission TfL considered that the previous application sufficiently mitigated the impact of the development. The revised application has presented no new strategic transport issues and TfL consider that the proposed mitigation remains sufficient to ensure conformity with the relevant London Plan transport policies.

Other strategic matters

22 Matters relating to urban design, heritage, inclusive design, climate change adaptation and biodiversity have not changed since the previous scheme and therefore remain acceptable. Since the previous application the carbon dioxide savings target in the London Plan has increased from 25% and 40%. The applicant has submitted a revised energy strategy which demonstrates 39% savings achieved through energy efficiency savings, site wide CHP and photovoltaics. The minor shortfall is acceptable given the refurbishment of the heritage buildings.

23 In terms of playspace, which was not fully resolved previously, the development makes provision for 1,349sq.m. of playspace. The Council has also imposed a condition requiring details of doorstep and local playable space. This satisfies the London Plan requirement.

Response to consultation

24 The Council consulted 2,194 neighbours and received 95 responses of which 89 were objections, five were supportive and one was a comment.

25 The objectors raised the following matters – object to principle of scheme, scheme has not changed, negative heritage impact, overdevelopment, excessive density, poor design, insufficient parking and impact on neighbouring streets, impact on social infrastructure, negative impact on residential amenity.

26 Statutory consultee and other organisations responded as follows:

- **London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority** – need to ensure fire brigade access to within 45m of all properties can be achieved otherwise dry risers or sprinklers required. Applicant has confirmed the two blocks are more than 45m from brigade access and therefore dry risers/sprinklers will be fitted.

- **Crime Prevention Officer** – no comments.
• **Barnet** – no comment.

• **Natural England** – no objection (previous advice re bat mitigation condition still applies), this condition has been imposed.

• **Environment Agency** – no objection subject to drainage condition, which has been imposed.

• **Thames Water** – Recommend conditions regarding water supply and piling impact, these have been imposed.

• **English Heritage (Historic Buildings)** – scheme should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of specialist conservation advice (had previously supported first application, as amended, following removal of front extension to Norton Leys).

• **English Heritage (Archaeology)** – No objection subject to standard conditions, which have been imposed.

• **Sport England** – no comment.

• **Design Council** – no comments.

• **Highgate Society** – highlight archaeological significance of the site.

• **Cranley Gardens Residents’ Association** – welcome principle but object to low level of parking and absence of delivery bays and impact of construction.

**Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority**

27 Under Article 7 of the Order the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance the Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at stage I, therefore there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

**Legal considerations**

28 Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

**Financial considerations**
Conclusion

The principle of residential redevelopment with conversion of heritage buildings was supported previously and is again. The main change from the previous application relates to affordable housing provision, which has been assessed as being the maximum reasonable amount.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects
020 7983 4783  email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)
020 7983 4895  email justin.carr@london.gov.uk