

Andrew Ardill RIBA

86 Southwood Lane

Hornsey

London

N6 5SY

8th July 2026

Planning Service
London Borough of Haringey
5th Floor, Alexandra House
10 Station Road
Wood Green
London N22 7TY

Application for the Removal or Variation of a Condition following Grant of Planning Permission. Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Drawings) of Planning Permission HGY/2025/2929

Site: 86 Southwood Lane, Hornsey, London, N6 5SY

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to apply, under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, for the variation of Condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission HGY/2025/2929, granted on 27th January 2026. The variation relates solely to the coping detail at the junction between the rebuilt brick boundary wall and the new concrete retaining wall on the southern boundary. All other aspects of the approved boundary wall, including its position, build-up, materials and finish, remain exactly as approved.

For completeness, I note that a non-material amendment application (ref. HGY/2026/1380) was recently refused on the basis that the changes proposed could not be treated as non-material. Following that refusal, the change to the concrete finish was pursued separately and approved by the Council as a non-material amendment (ref. HGY/2026/1807, granted 7th July 2026), under which drawing SWL-SEC-11 was updated to Rev P9. This application is accordingly made under section 73, being the appropriate route for the Council to consider the coping amendment on its planning merits, and it addresses the coping detail alone.

1. The approved scheme and the proposed amendment

The approved drawings show a dark grey/blue plinth stone at the junction between the rebuilt brick wall above and the new concrete retaining wall below. I propose to substitute this with a lighter, sandy-toned textured bullnose coping, as shown on the amended drawings enclosed. This is the only change to the design sought; the wall is otherwise to be built exactly as approved.

The amendment arises from detailed design development. On modelling the approved detail, it became apparent that the dark grey/blue plinth introduces a visually discordant dark band between the lighter reclaimed brickwork above and the lighter textured concrete below. A comparative visualisation of the approved and proposed details is enclosed at Appendix B. In my professional opinion, the approved dark band does not sit comfortably between the two lighter materials, and the proposed lighter coping resolves the junction more coherently.

2. Significance of the heritage asset

The boundary wall is a non-designated heritage asset. It is included on the London Borough of Haringey Register of Local Listed Buildings of Merit, where the entry, under the street heading “Southwood Lane, Highgate N6”, reads:

Wall between Nos. 84 & 86 and along back of pavement (former boundary wall to Southwood House)

The register records the entry against Conservation Area 1, with an inclusion date of 25 September 1986 marked by an asterisk; the register’s key states that the asterisk “Denotes inclusion as part of conservation area designation”. A copy of the register key and entry is enclosed at Appendix C. The listing identifies the wall as a whole, included by virtue of its place within the Highgate Conservation Area, and attaches no significance to any individual detail. Its significance is accordingly derived from the wall’s visual contribution to the conservation area rather than from any individual decorative detail or from hidden fabric. In my response of 19th December 2025 during the determination of HGY/2025/2929, I set out that the wall’s significance is “primarily derived from its visual contribution to the streetscape and the public realm, rather than as hidden fabric”, and permission was subsequently granted.

The junction subject to this application is on the southern boundary and is not visible from the public realm. The Council reached the same conclusion in respect of this wall in 2015 (ref. HGY/2014/3447), where the officer’s report recorded that the wall “cannot be seen from the adjacent roads within Jackson’s Lane and Southwood Lane” and that the alteration would have a negligible impact on the conservation area. A copy of that officer’s report is enclosed at Appendix D.

3. Findings of the photographic heritage assessment

A photographic heritage assessment of the entire wall is enclosed at Appendix A. It records that the grey/blue plinth stone was found only as a transition between two different thicknesses of brickwork, or as a cap to the top of a buttress. No example was found at the base of the wall, at any junction between brickwork and a different material, or anywhere on the wall as it faces the public highway. Where the wall meets the ground it is simply detailed and unarticulated.

It follows that the approved grey/blue plinth at this brick-to-concrete junction reflects no condition found anywhere on the listed wall. The junction historically carried no coping or plinth stone at all, the original condition being an earth bank abutting the brickwork. The approved detail was therefore a new, sympathetic design addition rather than a reproduction of any existing feature of the wall.

For completeness, I set out the design history of this detail, which the officer’s report for HGY/2026/1380 compresses. In my email to the case officer of 5th December 2025, I wrote: “Two courses of blue/grey plinth stretchers will transition between the thicker wall base and thinner upper wall, consistent with detailing on other areas of the locally listed wall where it faces Southwood Lane”. At that date the revised proposal (SWL-ELE-09 P3; SWL-SEC-11 P6) showed the wall brick-faced over its full height, including the lower retaining sections, and the plinth marked a transition between thicker and thinner brickwork. In that all-brick configuration the description was accurate: the survey at Appendix A confirms that a transition between two thicknesses of continuous brickwork is precisely the configuration in which the

plinth was found on the listed wall, and the example photographs attached to my email show the same turning-head features now recorded at Photographs L and M of Appendix A.

The Conservation Officer's comments of 17th December 2025 then sought a clearer separation between the rebuilt old wall section and the retaining wall, stating that the rebuilt wall section and the new retaining wall should read as two separate walls. In response, as my report of 19th December 2025 records, "following the Conservation Officer's request for a visible distinction between old and new, I have redesigned the lower section to feature a textured bamboo-imprinted concrete finish, similar to my original pre-application submission to Haringey". The plinth was carried over into that revised design (SWL-ELE-09 P4; SWL-SEC-11 P7), where it came to sit at a junction between brickwork and exposed concrete, a configuration of which the survey found no example anywhere on the listed wall; the annotation on the approved drawings refers only to the colour of the stone. The justification of 5th December was therefore given for a superseded, all-brick iteration of the design; it was not advanced for the junction as approved. The plinth was in any event my own specification rather than a matter officers had raised, as the report for HGY/2026/1380 itself records ("specified by the applicant").

4. Assessment against policy

The wall being a non-designated heritage asset, the relevant test under the National Planning Policy Framework is a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the asset (paragraph 216). This approach is reflected in Policy DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), each of which applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets.

The proposed change to a single coping detail, at a junction that is not publicly visible, that historically carried no such detail, and in a configuration found nowhere on the wall, results in no more than minimal harm which is acceptable when weighed against the wall's significance, consistent with Policy DM9 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The junction also lies within the Highgate Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset. Because the junction is not visible from the public realm, the proposed change would have no effect on the character or appearance of the conservation area, which are preserved. The Council's decision on HGY/2014/3447 reached the equivalent conclusion in respect of more extensive works to this wall, finding a negligible impact on the conservation area. No harm to a designated heritage asset arises, and no weighing of public benefits under the Framework is therefore engaged.

It is also relevant that the coping detail formed no part of the heritage reasoning when permission was granted. The officer's report for HGY/2025/2929 (enclosed at Appendix E) welcomed the rebuilt wall as "a more accurate reconstruction of the original wall, with a clear distinction between the old boundary wall and the new retaining wall", together with the re-use of the existing brickwork. That distinction is achieved by the contrast between the reclaimed brickwork and the textured concrete, both of which this application leaves unchanged, and no condition was imposed in respect of the coping.

As set out in section 3, the exposed concrete finish exists precisely to distinguish the new retaining wall from the rebuilt listed wall. On the listed wall the plinth marks reductions in thickness within continuous historic brickwork; at this junction the element below is not historic

brickwork but the new structure. In my professional judgement a plainly new, sandy-toned coping maintains that deliberate legibility, whereas a detail borrowed from the listed wall, applied across the junction between retained fabric and new concrete, would tend to blur the distinction that the Conservation Officer's comments sought and the officer's report welcomed.

The refusal of HGY/2026/1380 found a "worse" heritage impact in two separate respects: the change of coping, and a change to the wall's build-up and position arising from the then-proposed drainage cavity (in respect of which the report also noted that no updated plan had been provided). This application does not pursue the latter. The wall is to be built in its approved position with no cavity, and an updated plan (SWL-PLA-04 Rev P8) is enclosed to demonstrate that part of the refusal no longer arises. As to the coping, the enclosed photographic assessment shows that the approved plinth was not a faithful reflection of the listed wall's detailing, so the change cannot reasonably be characterised as "worse". In any event, the relevant test is not whether the change is better or worse, but whether any resulting harm is acceptable, which for the reasons given it is. I would also observe that a refusal would not remove a coping from this junction: a plinth may be constructed in any event. The choice before the Council is accordingly between two new details in the same position, neither replicating any condition found on the listed wall, at a junction that is not publicly visible.

The proposed amendment is limited to the coping detail and does not alter the height, position, scale or massing of any structure. It therefore has no effect on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking, privacy, daylight, sunlight, outlook or noise, and raises no new amenity considerations beyond those already assessed under HGY/2025/2929.

5. Amended drawings and enclosures

The following amended drawings are submitted in substitution for those listed in Condition 2:

- SWL-SEC-11 (Rev P10), Proposed Boundary Wall Design, superseding Rev P9 (as approved under HGY/2026/1807)
- SWL-ELE-09 (Rev P6), Proposed Boundary Elevation, superseding Rev P4
- SWL-PLA-04 (Rev P8), First Floor Plan (Proposed), superseding Rev P7
- SWL-REG-01 (Rev C), Drawing Issue Register, superseding Rev B, updated only to record the issue of SWL-SEC-11 (Rev P9) under HGY/2026/1807 and the three amended drawings above.

For the avoidance of doubt, the wall position and build-up are unchanged from the approved scheme; the revised plan SWL-PLA-04 confirms the wall position as approved.

For clarity, the full list of approved plans under the varied Condition 2 would read: SWL-PLA-03 (P4); SWL-PLA-04 (P8); SWL-PLA-06 (P4); SWL-PLA-08 (P4); SWL-SIT-01 (P2); SWL-SEC-08 (P3); SWL-SEC-11 (P10); SWL-ELE-04 (P4); SWL-ELE-06 (P4); SWL-ELE-08 (P3); SWL-ELE-09 (P6); SWL-ELE-10 (P1); SWL-REG-01 (Rev C); Arbtech TPP 03; Location Plan; Arboricultural Method Statement by Arbtech 29 July 2025. This is the list approved under HGY/2025/2929, amended only by the substitution of the three drawings and the drawing issue register.

As a decision under section 73 takes effect as a new planning permission, I would be grateful if the remaining conditions could be restated in their current terms, and if the decision could record that the details approved under HGY/2026/0905 in discharge of Conditions 3 and 4 continue to apply for the purposes of the new permission.

Drawing SWL-ELE-09 (Rev P6) additionally corrects a minor graphical hatching error. This is a drafting correction only and does not alter the approved design.

6. Conclusion

The proposed amendment is a minor change to a single, non-historic coping detail, at a junction that is not visible from the public realm, on a non-designated heritage asset whose significance lies in its visual contribution to the conservation area. For the reasons set out above and in the enclosed assessment, the change results in no unacceptable harm to the significance of the heritage asset or to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, and it accords with the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. I should be grateful if the Council would approve the variation of Condition 2 accordingly.

Yours faithfully,



Andrew Ardill

BSc(Hons), BArch, RIBA, ARB
Chartered Architect

Enclosures:

- Amended drawing SWL-SEC-11 (Rev P10) - Proposed Boundary Wall Design
- Amended drawing SWL-ELE-09 (Rev P6) - Proposed Boundary Elevation
- Amended drawing SWL-PLA-04 (Rev P8) - First Floor Plan (Proposed)
- Amended document SWL-REG-01 (Rev C) - Drawing Issue Register
- Appendix A - Heritage Assessment of the Locally Listed Boundary Wall
- Appendix B - Visual Assessment of proposed change to coping stone
- Appendix C - Register of Local Listed Buildings of Merit register of local listed buildings of merit (Entry for the boundary wall on page 13)
- Appendix D - Officer's Report for planning application HGY/2014/3447
- Appendix E - Officer's Report for planning application HGY/2025/2929