



10A South Grove, Highgate London N6 6BS

Application for demolition of existing side extension of 29 Milton Park and erection of a new dwelling with a basement.

The Highgate Society objects to this application. The reason for this are given below:

1. Previous Application and Appeal

The application HGY/2022/2318 for a 3 storey house plus basement was refused in October 2022. An Appeal against this and numbered 3320431 was dismissed in August 2023. In the Planning Inspector's report, he concluded :

- *"In reaching this decision I am mindful of paragraph 199 of the Framework6 which says that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation."*

An essential element in the refusal was the principle of infilling the open corners between the two terraces of Edwardian houses. This was rejected as causing harm to a Heritage Asset and thus in be conflict with Policies DC3 and HC1 of the London Plan², Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan³, Policies DM1 and DM9 of the DPD⁴ and Policy DH2 of the Neighbourhood Plan⁵.

2. This application

The new application HGY/2023/2691 is for a 2 storey plus basement, 3 bedrooomed house. It is similar to the previously refused scheme but reduced by one storey. A new glazed link has been inserted at the junction with the adjoining property.

This is a highly selective submission with material missing which might otherwise be detrimental to the success of the scheme. In particular:

- There is only one section. This particularly relates to the basement treatment where there are no sections through the light well fronting the street.
- The solar panels are not shown on any of the submitted material.
- It is alleged to be designed to Passivhaus standard but no evidence to support this is given.
- There are no daylight studies to provide evidence that the daylighting meets required standard, in particular relating to the basement.
- No details are given of the boundary wall between the well and the street.

The principle of infilling the gap has been previously dealt with in the refusal notice and appeal dismissal. This scheme although slightly reduced in height still substantially infills the gap and therefore these previous grounds for Refusal and dismissal of the Appeal still stand.

3. Design:

Although it is accepted that opinions on design, particularly modern design, can vary and thus can be seen as subjective, in this case the proposed elevations and CGI's indicate a extremely unresolved building, with the facade made up of a series of disparate elements, result in a rather bizarre mixture of styles. Specifically, the following elements are identified:

- The castellated zinc pitched roof bears no relation to anything else within the area and it is difficult to see the justification for adopting this form.
- The roof material is patinated zinc but the CGI's suggest a homogenous material without any seams or joints which would be necessary for this form of construction.
- The decorative corner element of clay tiles is stated as reflecting the vernacular in the area. This is correct to a degree but, where it does occur, it is in small panels and subservient to the overall decoration of the Edwardian building rather than a dominant and alien form as here
- Precedents are shown in the Design and Access statement for the glazed link. These are different from what is proposed here, being elegant and with minimal framing. The link shown here is clunky and does not meet the aspirations a transparent link it would be likely to meet the U Values required to meet the claimed Passivhaus standard.
- The soft red brick, as shown on the CGI is rustic and has large mortar joints. Not only is this in marked contrast to the decorative features but is also alien to the brickwork of the surrounding houses.
- Solar panels are mentioned to justify the Passivhaus status but it difficult to see how this would work as the roof is north facing. Any sun from the south would be prevented from reaching the panels by the high flank walls of the two adjoining houses.
- In addition, any solar panels would project above the roofline and be visible from the street in breach of conservation area standards.
- The outlook from the basement bedrooms will be extremely poor, looking onto a 3-4m blank basement wall, 1.25m away from the windows thus impacting on the amenity of the occupants of these rooms.
- Bearing in mind the location of the basement windows, there are likely to be problems with privacy and preventing anti social behaviour. There is no defensible space separating these rooms from the public realm.

4. Daylighting:

Section 9.4 of the Design and Access Statement deals with the daylighting of the property including the basement rooms. The applicant states:

The proposal meets the daylight standard for BREEAM/Code for Sustainable Homes. These standards require a daylight factor of 2% for kitchen spaces and 1.5% for other habitable rooms. High levels of daylight in the new dwelling promote well-being and reduce energy use.

However, this is based on measurement of glazing areas of each room regardless of outlook and is "calculated" on the London Plan, rather than a modelled daylight report. These "calculations" do not take into consideration the fact that all 3 bedrooms are in the basement, a full storey height below street level, and that they are lit by a lightwell some 1.25m wide. It is highly unlikely that the basement rooms will meet current BRE daylighting standard, in particular Bedroom 3, which has not only a deep plan, but also the boundary of the well with the street adjacent to this area is bounded by the high existing clinker wall. To meet fall resistance this would need to be 1.1m high, further increasing the relative depth of the well.

5. Conclusion

Although a storey lower than that previously submitted, and subject to refusal and dismissal of the Appeal, this application is not substantially different. On this basis the Society strongly objects to this submission and trust the application will be refused on similar grounds as previously.

Elsbeth Clements

18.11.23

For and on behalf of the 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.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be subject to legal privilege and are intended only for the person(s) or organisation(s) to whom this email is addressed. Any unauthorised use, retention, distribution, copying or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system administrator at Haringey Council immediately and delete this e-mail from your system. Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect which might affect any computer or system into which they are received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure they are virus free and no responsibility is accepted for any loss or damage from receipt or use thereof.