



Planning Services Development Management, Haringey Council,
River Park House,
225 High Road,
London N22 8HQ

Haringey Planning Services By email.

Date: 05/06/2026

Dear Ms Huang,
Re: Planning Application HGY/2026/1050
Site: 34 Kingsley Place, Hornsey, London, N6 5EA

The Highgate Society has considered the application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling at 34 Kingsley Place. We object to the application in its present form.

The Society does not object in principle to the replacement of the existing unsafe and uninhabitable dwelling. We also recognise the importance of improving energy performance and supporting low-carbon housing. However, these objectives do not remove the need for the replacement building to be appropriately scaled, sensitively designed and fully justified within the Highgate Conservation Area.

Our concern is that the submitted proposal is not a modest repair of the site, but a substantial intensification of a small, steep and visually sensitive plot. The existing building is low, recessive and subservient to its surroundings. The proposed replacement would be a three-storey dwelling of approximately 108m², replacing a dwelling stated in the application documents to be approximately 47m². This is a very significant increase in scale and would materially alter the height, bulk, footprint and visual presence of No. 34.

We also consider that the proposal risks amounting to overdevelopment of a very small site. The increase from approximately 47m² to 108m², together with the three-storey form, would in our view represent a disproportionate amount of built development for this constrained plot. The issue is not only the quality of the proposed architecture, but whether this site can appropriately accommodate this scale of development without harm to its surroundings.

We do not accept that the proposal can be considered modest simply because it steps with the slope or sits below parts of the adjoining listed buildings. In this location, subordination is not only a matter of absolute height. It is also a matter of massing, visibility, relationship to the street, impact on views, loss of openness and the way the building is experienced from public viewpoints. In our view, the proposed dwelling would read as a much more assertive intervention than the existing low building.

Kingsley Place is not an ordinary residential street. It forms part of the Highgate Conservation Area and is experienced as a steeply sloping street with long views, established trees, boundary walls, varied rooflines and close relationships with nearby listed buildings, including Southwood Lodge at 33 Kingsley Place and the listed buildings at 50 and 54 Southwood Lane. As No. 34 directly adjoins No. 33, the effect of the proposal on the setting of that listed building is a major planning consideration. The Council should also satisfy itself that no works would affect the listed building, its curtilage or any associated historic boundary fabric in a way that would require separate listed building consent. These relationships form part of the character and appearance of the conservation area and contribute to the setting of those heritage assets.

The applicant presents the proposal as a sustainable replacement dwelling, but sustainability cannot be assessed only through carbon calculations. A building may perform well in energy terms while still causing harm in townscape, heritage and design terms. In a conservation area, a sustainable design must also preserve the character of the place, respect existing landscape features, protect views and avoid unnecessary harm to designated heritage assets.

We are particularly concerned about the effect on views along Kingsley Place. The site occupies a highly visible position on the slope, where the existing tree, boundary walls, open sky and long-distance views form an important part of the public experience of the street. The additional height and mass of the proposal would be experienced from public viewpoints and would alter the character of this part of the conservation area.

Despite the sensitivity of the site, the submitted material does not, in our view, adequately demonstrate the visual impact of the proposal. The Council should require clear verified views, accurate street-scene comparisons, roofline studies and visual impact information from key public viewpoints before concluding that the proposal would preserve or enhance the conservation area.

The loss of the existing silver birch is also a serious concern. This tree is not merely an arboricultural item to be classified and offset. It contributes to the street scene, softens the built form, reinforces the green setting of the small site and helps the existing building sit quietly in relation to nearby listed buildings and the wider conservation area. A replacement tree elsewhere, or a young tree planted later, would not provide the same immediate spatial, visual or conservation-area value.

A site-specific design should treat the slope, existing tree, openness, boundary walls, rear passage, long views and nearby listed buildings as primary constraints. In our view, the current proposal does not do this. It appears to prioritise built volume over the delicate character of the plot, changing the role of No. 34 from a modest, subservient building into a more assertive element in the street scene.

We are also concerned about the relationship between the public street, the narrow entrance, the private courtyard, the rear passage and neighbouring properties. This is a sensitive boundary condition. Any new access or works affecting the boundary passage should therefore be treated with great care, as it forms part of the historic and spatial character of the site. We also ask the Council to satisfy itself that the proposed window positions, glazing treatment and screening would not result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

Although technical information has been submitted, the proposal does not provide sufficient confidence about the practical effects of the works on boundary walls, retaining structures, the rear passage, drainage, tree roots and construction logistics. This is a very constrained site and the proposal appears to require complex intervention in a sensitive location. These matters should

be fully resolved before any permission is granted, particularly where they may affect neighbouring properties and the character of the conservation area.

For the reasons set out above, the Highgate Society considers that the proposal conflicts with the development plan's requirements for high quality contextual design and heritage conservation. It would not adequately preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, nor would it respond sensitively to the setting of nearby listed buildings.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims of Haringey Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12, Development Management DPD Policies DM1 and DM9, and the relevant development and heritage policies of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, including Policies DH1 and DH2. The application should also be assessed against the NPPF heritage provisions, which require great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

For these reasons, the Highgate Society considers the proposal unacceptable in its current form and asks Haringey Council to refuse the application.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Elspeth Clements
Co Chair Highgate Society Planning Committee

Disclaimer:

The Highgate Society is an unincorporated association established for the public benefit. It endeavours to ensure that the information it provides as a free service is correct but does not warrant that it is accurate or complete. Nothing in this correspondence constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such. In no event will the Society be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation indirect or consequential loss or damage or any damage whatsoever arising from any objections criticism advice and information it provides.