

## Highgate CAAC objection to HGY/2022/3500 for 9 View Road

We have no objection to the retrospective element of this application as the greenhouse is a relatively small, temporary building which will not adversely affect neighbours. That said, the choice of cladding on the lower half of the greenhouse is quite odd and not in keeping with the listed house or any other surrounding buildings and so should not set a precedent for any other construction.

We do object to the proposed garden studio and office building for a number of reasons.

1. The DAS states that a new building with underfloor heating “*will positively impact the carbon footprint of the whole property*”. This cannot possibly be true unless some form of additional electricity generation is envisaged, e.g. solar panels. Without this the overall impact on energy usage will obviously be negative.

Further, 100 mm of Kingspan, a thin layer of green roof etc does not constitute “*the highest standards*” of insulation.

Had the building been placed in the opposite corner with the sizable windows facing south it might not have required any additional heating at all.

2. There are bats living in the wooded gardens along this side of Highgate Allotments. One member of HCAAC has seen bats within 25m of the proposed new building in recent months. Long-time allotment holders say there used to be considerably more bats flying around years ago than there are now. Those bats which remain should be protected. Indeed the law requires this.

Similarly, there are birds such as nuthatches, which are relatively uncommon in London, living in the wooded area immediately behind the proposed new building.

The considerable area of glazing on the front of the new building may cause light pollution problems. A condition should be set that any lighting used in or around the

new building should be bat friendly and should not disturb birds. It might be better if the building was not used outside daylight hours at all.

3. The DAS states that “No trees will be impacted by the works” but the application does not include a tree report to support this assertion. There are trees in the neighbouring garden immediately behind the proposed building and fruit trees on the allotments on the other side of the fence. The proposed building may well sit above the roots of some of these trees and the applicant should ensure that no damage is caused to them by the building itself as well as by “the works”.

4. In 2021 permission was granted to remove a TPO tree from this corner of the garden under planning permission [HGY/2021/1059](#). The Lombardy poplar removed was to be replaced by a fastigate oak. The nearest tree shown along this side of the garden on the existing and proposed plan drawings is a silver birch about 10 metres from the allotment boundary. This is far further beyond the allotment boundary than the Lombardy poplar was and appears to be a tall well established tree. Presumably this is not the replacement tree which was required under condition 3 of that permission.



Has the replacement tree been planted, and would the new building adversely affect it? If no replacement tree has been planted then the applicants are in breach of

condition 3 set on permission HGY/2021/1059 and should not be allowed to place a substantial building where there used to be a large TPO tree.

4. The applicants have not taken the building's position on the south/south east side of Highgate Allotments into account. (See photos below.)

Figure 18 in part 6 of the DAS and section drawings such as VR E300 PL6 do not continue beyond the proposed new studio or indicate the difference in ground levels between No 9 View Road and Highgate Allotments. It is drawn as level but the garden appears to be higher than the allotments viewed from the allotments, meaning that the height of the proposed building will be more significant to allotment holders than the drawings suggest. Neither is the fence between the garden and the allotment shown.

The application should have included section drawings showing the correct ground level change between the garden and the allotments and the height of the new building and all garden fences relative to the allotments, and drawings viewed from the allotments.

The precise height of the proposed new building is not mentioned but if the windows are 2m high it must be at least 2.5m. To this must be added the height of any plants which form part of the green roof. There is no clear image of the new building relative to the fence at the bottom of the garden but it is clearly higher than the side fences shown on drawings such as section VR E300 PL6.

As shown in the photos below, the new building will cast additional shade on several plots, including that used by the children at Highgate Primary School. The school should be consulted about placing a new building so close to their plot.

Clearly, the new building will cause a loss of amenity to the three or four plot holders on the other side of the fence, shading a greenhouse, trees and vegetable beds. There is nothing ecologically sound about this.



It is striking that section 6 of the DAS speaks only about sustainability from the point of view of the applicants and enhancing the living standards of the current

owners/occupiers, not the effect on other people, wildlife and the planet more generally.

5. In addition, there is currently an additional existing building in the garden which is not shown on the existing and proposed drawings. Why don't the drawings show this building? What is planned for it?





6. The applicants should also consider the impact of rainwater falling on the new building. While the green roof should absorb some of this, arrangements should be made to ensure that excess water does not pour into Highgate Allotments during heavy rain, as they are already prone to flooding.

7. Section 3.5 of the DAS says *“The proposal is in keeping with the existing scale of the garden and will not be noticeable or accessible from the public pathway (Figure 18)”*, presumably meaning the pavement in front of 9 View Road. However, if the new building is taller than the current garden fence it will be visible from Highgate Allotments, which are considered to be part of the public realm, so the new building will impact public visual amenity.

8. A condition should also be set that the new building should not be used for AirBnB style rentals or as servants’ quarters.

For all of the above reasons HCAAC believes the proposal to build a sizable new studio and office building at the end of the garden should be refused.

## Addendum

As a technical point, it is also worth noting that despite the documents for this application apparently being posted on 15th December, the dates set for this application are such that a member of the public using the new Haringey Public Register, searching the most recent week or month's applications in mid-late December would not see this application listed, as the "Valid Date" has been set as early November. We think it is unhelpful to the public for the "Valid Date" to be set this far in the past in this way.

Valid Date

05/10/2022

End of Consultation Period

13/1/2023

Target Decision Date

30/11/2022