

**Grange Cottage
8 Grange Road
Highgate
London
N6 4AP**

15 September 2026

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

Dear Mark,

6A GRANGE ROAD, HIGHGATE, LONDON N6 4AP – PLANNING REF HGY/2026/1858

We refer to the “Planning Conditions Consultation Response” (the “Note”) submitted by someone at engineersHRW who has apparently looked at the documents listed at the end of the Note.

It would have been helpful for the author of the Note to also have read your full report which is not listed at the end of the Note, and which explains in detail the Council’s stance on why conditions 8 to 12 were imposed in respect of this planning application at this particular site, rather than just the decision notice.

For the benefit of the author, you said:

“....To ensure that the findings of the independent audit remain unchanged through the detailed design stage, and to provide further assurance to those who have made technical representations, additional precautionary measures are secured through pre-commencement conditions. These require the submission of a site-specific hydrogeological investigation, updated ground-movement modelling appropriate to the sloping site, coordinated drainage and piling design, and the appointment of a supervising chartered engineer, together with real-time monitoring.”

“Such details will be developed further as part of the detailed design of the project and will in turn be subject to formal submission and approval by the Council. In line with normal practice, any such submissions will be publicly available and consulted on, providing adjoining owners and other interested parties with the opportunity to comment before the conditions are discharged.”

The author of the Note is however correct that industry experts GCG and Alan Baxter Ltd (ABL) are both of the opinion that the specific requirements of conditions 8 to 12 of HGY/2024/1676 have not been met by the reports submitted as part of HGY/2026/1858. EngineersHRW appear not to have understood why they were imposed and therefore have not carried out the work and have not provided the information required to discharge them.

It further appears that the author has not read the planning policies which apply to basement construction in Haringey. While the party wall process will also cover damage assessments, planning policy DH7 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan requires that *“under no circumstances should construction be allowed to proceed where there is evidence that damage to neighbouring properties would exceed Burland Scale 1.”*

GCG and ABL have both concluded that the damage calculations performed so far, showing borderline Scale 1/Scale 2 damage, are underestimated and that, should excavations proceed according to the plans as currently submitted, more extensive damage would result. EngineersHRW have made no credible attempt to revise these original calculations or refute GCG and ABL’s criticisms.

Secondly, while the Note refers to drainage on the No. 8 side of the site [which the drainage diagram submitted as part of HGY/2026/1858 (“2630-HRW-XX-XX-DR-C-0500-S2-P02 - Drainage Design”) shows linking in to an “existing drain” – a drain which does not exist], it is silent on the drainage proposals on the No. 6 side of the site. Further, the above drainage diagram shows rainwater and foul drains running directly through the RPA of the TPO’d tree at the front of the site on that side. Two arboricultural reports were submitted as part of the now approved application HGY/2024/1676 – a 2022 version (included as Appendix E in the Create BIA Rev K) and a “rev 2024 final” version which is included in the list of approved documents and which condition 6 of the HGY/2024/1676 decision specifies must be followed. As the “rev 2024 final” version is not listed at the end of the Note, we suggest it is brought to the author’s attention. However, neither of these reports consider the impact of routing drainage runs through the RPA of this tree, as both reports predate the drainage proposals. We ask that this matter is brought to the urgent attention of Daniel Monk. This tree is an important contributor to the character of Grange Road, hence its protection being put in place during previous development proposals for this site.

Frankly, the superficial nature of the Note and its apparent interesting suggestion of a conditional approval of conditions, (however that might work and which is reminiscent of Escher drawings of infinite stairs) does not inspire any level of confidence that engineersHGW are capable of successfully managing a project of this size, in such a restricted site, abutting the walls of both neighbouring properties and, in an area of complex geology where virtually identical works to the nearest basement caused very serious damage to the neighbouring property.

What we understand the Council is asking the applicants and their consultants to provide in order for conditions 8 to 12 to be discharged is information that will be required and steps to be taken, based on detailed designs that have yet to be provided, to ensure construction will proceed safely and in accordance with policy.

Instead, the Note appears to be a further attempt to sidestep the work necessary to discharge these conditions, specifically and carefully imposed by the Council. In the continued absence of a serious attempt to address these requirements we trust you will now formally refuse this application to discharge these conditions.

Yours sincerely

Simon and Carolyn Purves

CC: Catherine Smyth – Haringey Planning Service
Matthew Gunning – Haringey Planning Service
Daniel Monk – Haringey Tree Officer

James Argles – Haringey Planning Service
Denis Ioannou – Haringey Building Control
Andrew Darwin – Keystone Law
Luca Frasca – Alan Baxter Ltd
Kelvin Higgins – Geotechnical Consulting Group