



Appendix 1: GLA pre application advice

In response to a FOI request by the SNB community group, full minutes to a meeting held between the GLA and the developer (12th May 2021) were released. A commentary on how these have not been responded to in the current application is contained in the following table:

GLA pre application advice	Reflection/commentary
<i>The proposal includes a higher proportion of one and two bedroom units in relation to local plan policy, and so the applicant is advised to establish an appropriate unit mix as required by the Council.</i>	This design report does not cover housing mix (see accompanying report, Victoria Quarter: Quantity not Quality). However, the limited mix offered is linked to the lack of variety in typologies.
<i>It is understood that the overall play space provision for age groups would be below the minimum requirements set out by London Plan Policy S4.</i>	In addition to a lack of provision, some of the play space provided is of low quality (in terms of wind microclimate and overshadowing)
<i>London Plan Policy D3 encourages the optimisation of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility, and capacity of existing and future transport services. The higher the density of a development, the greater the level of design scrutiny that is required, particularly qualitative aspects of the development design, as described in London Plan Policy D4</i>	Refer to Section Three Design scrutiny for a scheme of this size is an absolute requirement in the London Plan. It is also seen as important by the GLA who reference the London Plan here. However, the application has never been assessed by a Design Review Panel.
<i>... it is noted that the site layout remains broadly similar to the previous scheme, and as explored further below, officers consider that there is now scope to explore alternative layouts and architectural typologies to find an optimal design solution for the site.</i>	Refer to Sections Four and Five It is clear that the 'broadly similar' site layout of the current proposal (in comparison to the previously refused submission), does not constitute an 'optimal' design in the GLA's view. The Save New Barnet group's proposal (Appendix Three) suggested building maisonettes along the railway boundary to:
<i>Officers requested that alternative layouts and typologies be explored to find an optimal design solution for the site.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • break up the visual monotony of the architecture by introducing some variation in typology • help mitigate environmental issues (heat and noise) • provide a dwelling type which, being more 'house-like' than a flat would provide better accommodation for families
<i>The proposal has a potential to deliver further improvements in terms of urban design and site layout and therefore, alternative architectural typologies and public realm improvements should be further explored. In particular the introduction of mews type buildings should be considered to define courtyard buildings/amenity spaces.</i>	Fairview have ignored this advice, omitting (from the 2017 scheme) two mews houses in Block J and replacing all the maisonettes in Block H with flats.
<i>The approach from the south to the north and creation of pedestrian paths is legible, however, the proposal does not clearly define a pedestrian route while Block A appears to restrict the quality of pedestrian routes and, the proposal lacks defined pedestrian routes at the entrance of the site. Consideration should be given to improvements of pedestrian routes and maximising widths of paths within the development to ensure free and safe pedestrian movements</i>	Refer to Section Seven The public square adjacent to Block A is affected by the wind microclimate on its northern side, an effect of building to eight storeys. The width of Spine Road, maintaining only a minimal twenty metres between buildings, does not allow for generous pavement widths – these appear to be only about two metres at most. Dimensions are not given. Arrangements for refuse collection mean there is a significant risk that obstruction will occur on collection days (See accompanying report)



<p><i>The block layout and architectural typologies appear regimental in character and the proposed courtyards lack definition between public and private spaces. The scale of the courtyard buildings could create windy outdoor spaces. While it is clear the design team have given thought to the developing architecture, officers consider that there is scope for greater ambition in the architecture and urban design, and greater variety in typologies, particularly for the central courtyard buildings. It is critical that design interventions respond to the built environment context, including the character and materiality of existing surroundings. The design team should explore introducing mews type buildings to create maisonettes or perimeter blocks to better define the courtyard buildings, outdoor amenity spaces and east and west links of the site. Such an approach would help create a stronger sense of place, weaving together the different elements of the scheme in a convincing spatial narrative.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Five This comment speaks for itself. The intrinsic problems created by Fairview’s layout strategy stem from not having taken the sites’ context into account; no attempt has been made to respond meaningfully to the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape features. The uniformity of the layout and building typologies does not foster the creation of a strong sense of place.</p> <p>As discussed above (and in more detail in Appendix Three) the Save New Barnet group proposed maisonettes in an alternative masterplan concept but were told in a zoom meeting in that these were wasteful of space and therefore expensive to build.</p>
<p><u>Height and massing</u> London Plan Policy D9 states that tall buildings should only be developed in locations identified as suitable in development plans The application site is not located in an area which is identified as being appropriate for tall buildings. As such, the proposal would not comply with the locational requirements of London Plan Policy D9 51. Height is subject to a full assessment of the future planning application against Part C of Policy D9, including the proposed architectural design, and the supporting Townscape Visual Impact Assessment and Heritage Assessment to justify how the scheme could be considered acceptable in this location. Careful consideration of microclimate impact and sunlight/daylight penetration is also required to ensure that the proposed height and massing would not overshadow public realm areas for longer periods of time and would not impact on daylight amenity of the proposed and neighbouring properties. The applicant is advised to continue to work closely with the Council to establish appropriate heights. Ultimately an issue of noncompliance with Policy D9(B) would need to be considered in the context of the scheme’s performance against the London Plan as a whole, as well as all other relevant material considerations and public benefits</p>	<p>Refer to Section Six These planning polices are noted by the GLA (without commentary) but they underline the point that the site is not in an area considered appropriate for tall buildings. It is worth noting that 10 out of 13 blocks in this scheme would be classed as ‘tall’ in the London Plan.</p> <p>It is unclear whether this assessment should be part of a Design Review (which has not happened)- or alternatively, how it should be carried out.</p> <p>It appears from this comment that, at the time of the meeting, the GLA did not consider that building heights were set in stone. Yet no subsequent adjustments appear to have been made. The London Plan classifies buildings over six storeys as ‘tall’ (see section 6). Ten out of thirteen blocks would be considered ‘tall’ under the London Plan.</p>
<p><u>Residential quality</u> The provision of dual aspect units should be maximised, and single aspect units only provided where these units would constitute a more</p>	<p>Refer to Section Nine 28% of units across the site are single aspect 13% are single aspect and west facing and flats overlooking the railway not only face west but are</p>



<p><i>appropriate design solution in terms of optimising the capacity of a particular site whilst ensuring good design. Potential issues associated with single aspect units in terms of passive ventilation, privacy, daylight, overheating and noise should also be appropriately addressed. North facing single aspect units, which contain three or more bedrooms or are exposed to significant noise impacts should be avoided.</i></p>	<p>also affected by train noise.</p> <p>There are 72 single aspect flats (13.2%) affected by noise levels serious enough to require mitigating. Some of these are on Spine Road where tall, closely spaced buildings have created a noise canyon (see section 9). Others face the railway where they also face overheating issues.</p>
<p>Architectural quality 55. <i>The intended scale/density of the proposal will require exceptional attention to detail and architectural quality</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Ten This is not evident. Elevations rely on ‘fancy’ brickwork. There is a limited variety of basic components . Windows are UPVC</p>
<p>Fire Safety 57. <i>Further to the above, Policy D5 within the London Plan seeks to ensure that developments incorporate safe and dignified emergency evacuation for all building users</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Nine This completely contradicts the ‘stay in place’ policy proposed by the developer</p>
<p>Sustainable development 71. <i>It is noted the previous application did not meet the Be Lean targets; the applicant is required to ensure that the design meets the Be Lean targets for this application.</i> Cooling and overheating 75. <i>The Good Homes Alliance (GHA) Early Stage Overheating Risk Tool should be submitted to the GLA alongside the planning application to identify potential overheating risk and passive responses early in the design process</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Nine The early stage risk assessment tool has identified flats in seven blocks are at high risk of overheating. No detailed assessment has been provided.</p>
<p><i>Appropriate density of the scheme should be developed in consultation with the Council, to ensure that the aspiration to build densely needs to be balanced with an environment that supports the quality of life of local and nearby residents. Permission for 8 storey tower noted.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Eight This statement implies that densities were still under development at the time of the meeting and sets out parameters in terms of the local context and community in order to achieve appropriate densities. It does not read, as interpreted by the architects, that a high density scheme can be accommodated per se. There seems to have been no change in the 550-dwelling target during the design process, suggesting that this was a given rather than something arrived at through consultation. The fact that there is only permission for one eight storey tower is noted but without commentary. The GLA has not made any explicit conclusions on this.</p>
<p><i>It is also important that design considers the quality of spaces and the outlook from the flats to deliver the highest residential quality.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section Five Due to the layout of the blocks, only a minority will have views of the greatest potential asset and opportunity of the site which are views of Victoria Recreation Ground. Most look directly into the side of another block at a distance of twenty metres.</p>
<p>The GLA concluded that ‘<i>The proposal has a potential to deliver further improvements in terms of urban design and site layout and therefore, alternative architectural typologies and public realm improvements should be further explored. Appropriate density and height of the scheme should be developed in consultation with the Council.</i>’ It appears that this has not been done.</p>	