

HGY/2022/2731 44 - 46 HAMPSTEAD LANE

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee is no less concerned than it was regarding the earlier application but appreciates that the Applicant has submitted a separate application covering their proposed changes.

We summarise our concerns as follows:

- No-one walks in Hampstead Lane is fallacious: we are all in many and varied ways 'receptors'
- Impact on MOL not addressed. Impact would be significant
- Adverse impact on neighbour in Courtenay Avenue
- 'Bridge' would be a beacon of light at night so still needs work. Potential heat loss/gain problems
- Harm to Conservation Area is not correctly evaluated. It suggests the Bishops Area has the same characteristics as Hampstead Lane. They are, in fact, significantly different
- Repetition of the dotted outline of No. 42 over nos. 44 and 46 on drawings is misleading and inappropriate.
- Retrofitting to achieve zero carbon and effect on residents should be conditioned.

Notes

- Planning history:
[HGY/2021/2703 | 44-46 Hampstead Lane London N6 4LL](#) withdrawn.
HGY/2022/2731 pending.
- QRP Reports:

HGY/2021/2703:
QRP Report 1:
<http://www.planningservices.haringey.gov.uk/portal/servlets/AttachmentShowServlet?ImageName=1591128>
QRP Report 2:
<http://www.planningservices.haringey.gov.uk/portal/servlets/AttachmentShowServlet?ImageName=1591129>

HGY/2022/2731: none published
- Misleading information:
These are some examples:
 - on the proposed plans the red dotted line should show the extent of the existing buildings at the level of that plan; so for example any part of the existing buildings which are single storey should only appear at the same height above ground as the existing storey. The attics would be considerably

- smaller than the red dotted line and probably would apply to a lower storey given the higher ceiling heights and roof levels of the proposed scheme
- PL211: north and east elevations: no dotted lines and also the section and/or west elevation should include the house in Courtenay Avenue so that Councillors can understand the potential DM1 impacts on that house. However we do see there is an elevation from Courtenay Avenue in the DAS so that illustration could usefully be brought to Committee members' attention
 - Proposed scheme outline compared to the approved development of No.42 Hampstead Lane (HGY/2019/2944). The blue dotted outline of the approved scheme for 42 Hampstead Lane suggests without justification, in DAS page 26, 4.7 Scale and Massing that, if an identical application to that made for no. 42 were made for no. 46 it would automatically be granted approval. That is an erroneous assumption and planning committee members should, in our view, be made aware of that.
 - Heritage Statement Volume 2 para 2.2: *"The proposed development responds to the proposals dated for No. 42 Hampstead Lane scheme next door and the overall height is comparable."* This too should be ignored.
 - The proposal indicates that net zero would not be achieved so retrofitting would be required. Retrofitting and the impact on residents during that process should be covered by Condition.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee strongly objects to this application.

1. No-one walks in Hampstead Lane

Heritage Statement Vol 2 page 8 states:

"Value / importance of the view as a whole

The HCACAMP states that, " although the south side of the Hampstead Lane is in the London Borough of Camden the views of the Heath and the wooded grounds of Kenwood contribute greatly to the character of the road".

Whilst there are some trees from Kenwood Park overhanging the fence on the left, this view does not reflect the vistas or experiences described in the HCACAMP and is not a significant or highly valuable view. In essence, Kenwood Park is not visible in this view.

The receptors that experience this view are not highly sensitive and are relatively low in number.

Whilst there are some pedestrians that walk along Hampstead Lane, the footfall is low, and the road is mainly used by motorists which have a low receptor sensitivity. Visitors to Kenwood Park that come from the west tend to enter the park at West Lodge whilst those coming to the park from the Highgate direction to the east, tend to enter the park at East, the subject site sits between the two gates meaning that visitors to Kenwood Park that come to this part of Hampstead Lane are motorists that use the car parks in Kenwood Park near West Lodge.

As such the value / importance of the view as a whole is low."

The contrast between what Haringey's Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (HCACAMP) and the authors of the Heritage Statement aver could not be more stark. Firstly there is a continuous line of trees from the view shown - up the hill to the Tollhouse opposite the Spaniards Inn - not 'some trees' as stated. This part of the above extract is very plainly wrong.

Next, who are receptors of this lovely stretch of Hampstead Lane? Does no-one on a bus, on a bicycle, in a car or walking not appreciate it? Of course we do and have for all the years we have lived here. Does no-one walk along the footpaths, take their dogs for a walk along there? This is quite plainly nonsense. We are all 'receptors'. The value and importance of this view could not be higher. The CGI View 01: Proposed on page 8 indicates just how unacceptably prominent the proposal is compared to the existing view.

2. Impact on MOL

DAS 2.1 states *"The school is currently undertaking a series of engineering works that will improve drainage and reduce the risk of flooding, as well as covering the main playing field area with a permeable green artificial surface. In addition, the on-site amenity building will be replaced."*

This is not correct: the School will be making a planning application for these works in the foreseeable future.

DAS 4.7: Scale and massing: the topmost diagram: *"Proposed scheme outline compared to the approved development of No.42 Hampstead Lane (ref 2019/2944)"* superimposes the outline of the approved outline of no. 42 across nos. 44 and 46 as if a new building identical to that approved for no. 42 would have been acceptable opposite Metropolitan Open Land. That is highly speculative and must have no bearing on the current application. As we have said the Application for no.42 is out of time and has not been built.

Heritage Statement 4.1 acknowledges: *"The area has a lot of greenery due to the large amounts of planting on the private plots and the playing fields near to 46 Hampstead Lane, on the other side of Courtenay Avenue. A sense of rural greenery is enhanced by grade II* listed parkland of Kenwood which stands opposite the subject site, and has densely planted mature trees at this point."*

It is worth quoting the following section of the Heritage Statement in full. Where is there any mention of Highgate School playing field?

"4.3 The Contribution Made By Open Spaces and Other Natural Elements Within the Bishop's Area, the street trees and trees within gardens form a very important part of the suburban character and appearance of the area. The sports facilities associated with the Highgate School and the Highgate Golf Club are the only major large open spaces, which are important in creating the setting for Highgate Village and maintaining a sense of separation from the surrounding urban area. Whilst it stands outside of the conservation area, Kenwood Park, which borders the conservation

area, opposite the subject site has a large amount of mature green trees and helps to shape the character of the area. The spacious private house plots provide an attractive landscape setting to the area. These are generally not accessible to the public, but contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area due to the presence of mature trees which form the backdrop and setting for the residential areas and relate to this history of the formerly wooded area. Gardens help to separate different areas of urban development by forming green corridors that break up the built-up areas and provide valuable habitats and routes for wildlife."

The Planning Statement does not include Greater London Plan policies on Metropolitan Open Land (6.29 - relevant policies in the London Plan) nor does it include Haringey's Development Management policy (6.34 - relevant Haringey policies). These omissions must be brought to the attention of Councillors on the Planning sub committee.

The NPPF 148 requires: "*When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. '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.*"

Haringey's Development Management DPD policy DM20 F states: *Development adjacent to open space should seek to protect and enhance the value and visual character of the open land.*

No assessment has been made of the impact on Highgate School's Far Field which is designated MOL. We provide photographs below showing locations which could be used to provide verified CGIs.

It is HCAAC's opinion that this Application would cause considerable harm to the adjacent MOL, namely Highgate Playing Fields (Far Field), which would not, against the measure of 'very special circumstances', be outweighed by the proposals for this site.

3. Adverse impact on neighbour in Courtenay Avenue

HCAAC is concerned about the serious impact on the various amenities provided for in DM1 in relation to the immediate neighbour in Courtenay Avenue due to the close proximity and considerably increased bulk and elevated position of the proposed building. The bridge would be a light beacon at night, quite out of place in a semi-rural setting.

4. 'Bridge'

Heritage Statement Volume 2 at 2.2 states "*The new building will present as two properties on the approximate footprints of 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane and will be connected by a subtly designed link at ground and first floor levels.*" This is quite evidently incorrect: the link exists at second floor level as well. Because the ground

drops away significantly from Hampstead Lane, even though the second floor link is slightly set back, we would expect that it would be visible from Hampstead Lane. Heat loss/gain in what is effectively a Conservatory may require some redesign.

We consider the design of the link needs more careful consideration.

- The existing houses have side wings with subservient roofs on either side of the gap between the two houses. As proposed the roofs on either side of the bridge (which represents the 'gap') are not subservient.
- We note the QRP in relation to the withdrawn application drew attention to the adverse effect of the bridge appearing as a beacon at night. We agree. This beacon would cause harm to the Conservation Area and the setting of the other heritage assets. The neighbours to the north would also be adversely affected. Haringey's DM1 applies. An option could be to use special switchable glazing which would be less obvious at night. Please note we would not wish to see such glazing used for residents' bedroom windows to ensure they could see the night sky, outlines of trees, etc.
- We consider that the flank walls, both outside and inside, on either side of the 'bridge' should read as external brick walls as seen from outside. Internal and external lighting could emphasise the gap and materiality of those walls.
- Consideration should be given to setting back the external line of the 'gap' at the rear in order to reduce the excessive bulk of the proposal for neighbours to the north.

5. Harm to Conservation Area and other Heritage Assets

The heritage assets that need to be considered are:

- Highgate Conservation Area (Haringey)
- Highgate Conservation Area (Camden)
- Kenwood House Grade I
- Kenwood Park and Gardens Grade II*
- Other Kenwood outbuildings on Hampstead Lane Grade II

The Heritage Statement at 7 Conclusion states: *"The site has limited visibility from any heritage assets in or around Kenwood Park due to the topography and abundant presence of trees, both within Kenwood Park, on Hampstead Lane and within the boundaries of the properties themselves. It is considered that replacement building on the site would be unlikely to have an impact on any of the listed buildings and would have a limited or reduced impact on the conservation area, as a result of these trees, **although a proper impact assessment will be conducted at a later stage.**"*

(Our emphasis: has this additional document been provided?)

DAS 2.1: [Hampstead Lane] *"retains its country lane feel as it winds along the rolling topography."*

DAS 2.2: the quotation from Ian Nairn relates to other areas within the Highgate Conservation Area as do all but two of the photographic images. Further, one of those two images appears to be a rear elevation. So, in all, the only relevant image is

that of the Cottage, 1 Stormont Road, which has a very attractive gable wall elevation on Hampstead Lane. The remainder of the cited precedents should be ignored.

As with the previous quotation, Heritage Statement 4.2 lacks relevance to the application site: *"Townscape Character The streets within the Bishop's Area of the Highgate Conservation Area are an excellent example of high-quality residential development of the early 20th century. The streets are wide with gentle curves or gradients and so there are several important views and vistas within the streetscapes. There are traditionally low boundary enclosures to the streets and gap views between buildings to rear gardens, which together with mature street trees, are valuable features to the green character of the streets."*

From the section on Sheldon Avenue onwards, the Heritage Statement loses all relevance as it will be obvious that the character of the laid-out roads within the Bishops' Area of Highgate Conservation Area is quite distinctively different from the historic winding-lane character of Hampstead Lane.

DAS 4.2: *"In a previous pre-application meeting, it was stated that the site needed a strong building on this prominent site. It is considered that this has been achieved and yet respecting adjacent properties heights to prevent being over dominant."*

We have not seen notes of the pre-application meetings, neither previous or current, but the above opinion is not supported by the Quality Review Panel's Reports on the previous application.

HCAAC PHOTOS re verified views



654 Heritage Statement Vol 2 clause 2.3 uses a position further back so is better. This could better be used for MOL. See below.

View 01: Baseline on page 7 of Heritage Statement Volume 2 states: *"Value / importance of individual heritage assets identified in the view The winding, country-lane feel of Hampstead Lane is one of the characteristics of the Bishop's subarea of the Highgate Conservation Area, as described by the HCACAMP, as are the street trees and front and rear gardens which give the area a suburban feel: "Within the sub area, the street trees and trees within the front and rear gardens form a very important part of the suburban character of the area." "*

This evaluation, as before, does not fully respect the difference between the character of the Bishops Area and Hampstead Lane. The quote reveals that the author wishes to suggest the front and rear gardens relate to neighbouring streets within the sub area are in some way relevant to the country-lane feel of Hampstead Lane which they are not.

View 01: Proposed on page 8 indicates just how unacceptably prominent the proposal is compared the existing view.

View 02: Baseline indicates the low density of the house on the site.

View 02: Proposed shows a very significant (and damaging) increase in development on this very sensitive site.

View 03: Baseline shows that only the roof to no. 46 is visible

View 03: Proposed shows not only the whole of the proposed higher roofs but also the much increased overall bulk and overbearing character of this large development.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application in the strongest terms.

HCAAC PHOTOS re MOL



655



06654



56



57

The blue dotted outline of the approved scheme for 42 Hampstead Lane suggests without justification, in DAS page 26, 4.7 Scale and Massing that, if an identical application to that made for no. 42 were made for no. 46 **located adjacent to MOL** it would automatically be granted approval. That is an erroneous assumption and planning committee members should, in our view, be made aware of that.