



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove
Highgate
London N6 6BS

Mark Chan
Planning Services
Haringey Council
River Park House
225 High Road
London N22 8HQ

Date 25/11/23

Dear Mr Chan

HGY/2023/2785- 12 Great North Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4LX

I am responding on behalf of Highgate Society to the above application for the
“Demolition of existing house and construction of a detached three-storey building with
basement and lightwells to provide 8 new homes. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)”

The Society would like to make the following comments and objections:

Policy DM1 requires to achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. “The applicant in their Design and Access statement states *“We have sought pre-application advice throughout the design process journey, and have engaged with residents of neighbouring properties and two relevant societies to ensure our designs have incorporated everyone’s comments and requirements, ideas and aspirations for the project.”* At our meeting with the architect, we expressed our disappointment at the design of the building frontage which was shown to us and do not consider that whatever changes have been made are sufficient to address those concerns. Highgate Society is not convinced that ample consideration is given to design a scheme that satisfies the requirements of DM1 and achieve a high standard of design. We can appreciate that the applicant possibly, in order to achieve a planning consent, has opted for their stated *architectural principles of rhythm, pattern and repetition*. in our view not the best way forward for this project. Having a small new-build site is very unique in Highgate and the Society is keen to see designs that maximize this opportunity rather than to mimic the Victorian terrace to the south, or other styles nearby unsuccessfully. The site has the opportunity to provide a good contemporary design and foster a sense of calm and communal atmosphere and shared spaces for the residents. A narrow doorway in the middle of the façade opening into a dark space is not generally welcoming and will not encourage mixing with other residents. Introducing flexibility and interest in design is appreciated by residents e.g., introduction of split-level units that can be arranged as part of mix of flats and marionettes. The problems of overlooking can be resolved as part of the design concept but it will be difficult to resolve for a scheme built to the boundaries and with windows in these walls. We list (not exhaustive) below a number of detailed concerns:

1. This is a considerably smaller plot than all those surrounding it and to pack on this number of units on such a small site represents overdevelopment which is not in

space even if it is just sufficient. The site is too cramped.

2. On external daylighting and sunlighting, by building to the boundary and at increased depth and height from the existing, there will be negative impact on the neighbouring houses and rear gardens. The sunlight to the north in particular will be much reduced by the brick slab side wall. The reports should be forensically examined and any unacceptable negative impact on the amenity of the neighbours should result in a refusal.
3. On internal daylighting, there here is a concern about the daylighting to flats 1 and 2. The bedrooms have an outlook onto the walls. Not only does the daylight fail but the outlook, and thus the amenity for the occupants of the basement rooms will be extremely poor. These rooms, as Section BB indicates are a full story below ground level with a cantilevered bay over to the front, thus further reducing the light. The ground floor kitchen living rooms have an appalling daylighting result, which is not surprising looking at the depth of the rooms relative to the area of glazing. Looking at the Daylight Assessment, the 3D daylighting model (in blue) suggest the basement rooms are only semi sunk which calls into question what information the daylight modelling is based on. It is difficult to reach the BRE Guidelines standards, and although the daylighting assessor put a positive spin on this, Flats 1 and 3 fail to achieve a good result. The assessor suggests this an urban setting and therefore this failure could be acceptable. The setting is not urban - it is suburban with large detached/semi-detached houses with large gardens.
4. The plan puts bedrooms above and below living rooms in several places. Which could lead to noise transmission problems and should be avoided in new build.
5. Flats 3 and 5 bedrooms rely on windows on the boundary walls to light the rooms (although they do have a door to the rear via an attached corridor - a rather tortuous route) Not only is this contrary to Part B4 of the building regulations and raises privacy and overlooking issues, but it also prejudices the rights of adjoining owners and the planners could open themselves up to future action should they approve this.
6. The three one bed flats on first floor are badly compromised by points raised in 4 and 5 above and would be probably unsaleable.
7. The fully glazed picture windows, into the front lightwells at basement level although probably inserted to improve the daylighting in these substandard flats, will result in a massive heat loss.
8. The entrance door to the third floor flat on the half landing of the stair is unworkable as drawn.
9. The rear lightwells are drawn without any space for retaining walls around them.
10. There appears to be a loss of trees on site. There is no evidence of any replacement and the high level of site coverage and this constrained amenity space would make it difficult for any trees to survive

Highgate Society therefore request not to approve the application as it stands and to urge the applicant to reconsider their design.

The views of neighbours should be sought and upheld.

The Society therefore believes that this application should be refused.

Yours sincerely
Maryam Armstrong-James RIBA

For and behalf of Highgate Society Planning Group

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.