

HGY/2026/0899: Nice Place

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling with rooms in the roof and basement (renewal of extant scheme - HGY/2022/4048)

The comments below relate to the current application

Since the first drawings were issued there may have been several amendments to the drawings nevertheless these comments from 2022 remain relevant. Clearly policy has moved on since that time. The NPPF has been amended several times. GLA requirements have changed and expanded. The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan is now in force and the New Local Plan is now emerging policy. Retention of trees and their root protection areas has become a prominent concern over the intervening period. All of the comments made by Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee remain relevant.

[HGY/2022/4048](#)

Proposal

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement dwelling with rooms in the roof and basement (renewal of extant scheme - HGY/2020/1104).

Application Status

Decision Made

Site Address

Nice Place Compton Avenue Hornsey London N6 4LH

Date Valid

17/2/2023

Decision

Approve with Conditions

Decision Notice Sent Date

28/6/2023

HCAAC's comments on HGY/2022/4048 were:

- *HGY/2022/4048: NICE PLACE, COMPTON AVENUE Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee Advisory Committee objects to this application. For the reasons set out below it must be refused. In response to the earlier application HGY/2020/1104, when the application included landscaping proposals across the gardens of both Nice Place and Far End we commented: " Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application on the following grounds: It is recognised that the character of Compton Avenue is regrettably much changed from the predominance of original Arts & Crafts properties. We note that this application includes landscaping work in the rear garden of the adjacent property, Far End. This application should include a Sustainability Statement to show that it meets the requirements of Haringey's policies: SP0: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, Policy DM21: Sustainable Design, Layout and Construction; and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan aspiration 1.4.10. The whole site is within what was The Bishop's Wood. The boundary with the Golf Club was the boundary of the wood. 68 trees are listed, of which, 30 are to be felled and a further 3 may be felled. 18 of these trees to be felled are actually in Far End and form a screen with that garden. 9 of the trees are on the Golf Course and it is not proposed to fell them. The trees are old, some may be boundary trees. We would like to see a more detailed explanation of why so many trees are to be felled and what the proposals for replacement planting are. The Far End trees would seem to be garden trees but those in Nice Place are predominantly mature woodland trees. As the site was formerly within the Bishop's Wood, this is to be expected. It gives the garden a mature historical ambience. We would have liked to have seen more detail on the condition of the trees, perhaps with supporting photographs. Although the applicant suggests that the trees will be replaced, there is no indication of what tree species are proposed or where they will be planted. Before permission is given, the applicant should give a detailed proposal of the planting plan for the new building and its garden. We also note with concern that the applicant proposes to remove trees at the front of both Nice Place and Far End. This quiet leafy road has already suffered from overbuilding and tree removal. We would like to see these trees retained or significant trees replace them. We are also concerned about soils which may have been left untouched since being the ancient woodland given the extent of basement excavation and regrading of levels in the rear gardens. Compaction of ancient soils should be avoided." All of the above points need to be considered. Please note Appendix 3 Ecological Corridors to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan seeks increased connection between Highgate Golf Course and Kenwood/Hampstead Heath to achieve greater biodiversity:
<https://forhighgate.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Plan-Appendix-3->*

ecological-corridors-schematic.pdf The policy landscape has changed in the short time since that application was approved: Embodied energy The Highgate Society first raised the matter of embodied energy in connection with the application to demolish 21 Broadlands Road and to replace it with a new house. That application was refused and the Council's decision was upheld at Appeal. Nicky Gavron (who lives nearby) and Gail Waldman made contributions to that Appeal. Nicky Gavron, on the GLA Planning Committee for many years, has since then worked unstintingly and successfully to bring embodied energy into the London Plan. There are high profile Appeal Decisions awaited on two current applications in London. Although this application would probably not be caught by that GLA policy, the Applicants may wish to be aware of current thinking on embodied energy. Concrete The use of concrete involves high levels of embodied energy. Sustainability issues - Hard surfaces Much more hard surfaces than existing are proposed. The Applicant needs to show there will be a biodiversity net gain. This area is designated to be part of a Green Chain. - Electrical Supply We note the extensive solar arrays on the crown roof however we ask that a Sustainability Assessment be required taking into account:

- charging 7 to 8 cars
- heating the swimming pool
- catering kitchen and other kitchens
- air conditioning, space and water heating, cooling, lighting
- cinema screens etc.

A carbon set-off payment would in our view be unacceptable. We wonder if an electricity substation will be required? We do not see a calculation which shows the proposal would achieve the minimum requirement of BREEAM Good.

- Air source heat pumps, etc. It is not clear how space and water heating will be provided.

- Chimneys We note that there are chimneys serving fireplaces on one side of the building.

- Cars A considerable proportion of one of the basement stories is taken up with parking for 7 large cars. If petrol-fuelled, sump oil will need to be removed. Seven EV charging points should be required, including for the eighth parking space at the front of the house at ground level.

- Basement impact The proposed basement is exceptionally large in an area where groundwater conditions are complex. We suggest that Haringey Council obtains independent advice on the submitted BIA documents. What impact

might it have of the Golf Course, for example? We would wish to see a thorough examination of this application by Haringey's Sustainability Team to ensure compliance with all aspects of DM21 without any carbon offsetting.

- Servants' quarters HCAAC is frankly appalled by the quality of servants' accommodation. A security guard watching a screen and presumably seven drivers, all excluding changeover periods, are provided with a very small restroom with:

- a small table and chairs for two*
- a sofa for three*
- a kitchenette and storage and a shower, WC and basin, all at 7.5m below ground with no daylight, presumably on 12 hour shifts. It appears the staff working in the catering kitchen do not even have that level of facilities. Where do the people working in the very large laundry room relax and make their own meals? The 'Powder room' has a WC and basin. Is that for all these members of staff? Staff in Dickens's time were given more consideration. As the site is in a 1b category for public transport where are their bicycles, motor bikes, cars to be located? The bicycle store is at the upper basement level at the diagonally opposite corner of the building. Is that of sufficient size to accommodate staff bicycles? Possibly the car space at ground level (8 spaces in total) is for their use? It appears that the staff accommodation in the previous application was generous in terms of space, with bedrooms. However the amount of daylight/sunlight those rooms received was likely to have failed, to a considerable degree, to meet BRE requirements.*

Flat arch v. curved arch We prefer the flat arch. We note the imbalance in the locations of the chimneys. We also note a vertical element which presumably relates to the car lift. Details of that element should be required. Overall Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee regrets that the design overall fails to enhance the Highgate Conservation Area.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application for all the reasons we set out in 2022. In addition, this application must presumably be assessed against all new or amended policy since that date. We remain of the view that the front elevation, in particular, would cause harm to the Highgate Conservation Area.