



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove
Highgate
London N6 6BS

Nathan Keyte
Planning Services
Haringey Council
River Park House
225 High Road
London N22 8HQ

Date 01/03//24

Dear Mr Keyte

Planning Application. HGY/2023/3217
28 Shepherds Close, London N6 5AG

I am responding on behalf of the Highgate Society to the above application for the
“Erection of a detached part single, part two storey, 3-bedroom family home”

The Society would like to make the following comments:

The previous proposal for the site was subject of an Appeal process, a decision was made by the inspector on 31 December 2020 Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3257208. Although the current proposal is aiming to address some of the inspector’s comments in terms of the design but there are still many of his comments that have not been addressed, as fundamentally the site is unsuitable to address the issues raised in his report. We list them below indicating the Paragraph Numbers in the Inspector’s report:

21. The development would also remove a small piece of open space within what is already a highly urbanised setting. The previous appeal decision noted that the site ‘provides a wedge of open land which is in a prominent position in the Close’, and ‘provides an attractive green vista and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and this part of the conservation area’. On the basis of my observations, I see no reason to disagree with the previous Inspector.

The above statement is still very valid. the assertion by the applicant that the site is now a brownfield site is not acceptable, particularly as the applicant chose to cut 19 mature trees on the site.

22. I conclude that the development’s design and footprint would appear cramped and contrived on this site. It would be incongruous, overly large for the site and would remove the buffer that separates the Close from the development fronting Shepherd’s Hill. It would therefore detract from its context.

The applicant has tried to address some of the issues in respect of the design of the house, however, the footprint of the site still remains cramped.

24. The heritage statement notes that neither the site nor the Close have heritage significance. However, although parts of the Close might be neutral or even considered to detract from the HCA, it is within the HCA, and is therefore part of a designated heritage asset. In any case, there is very little before me to indicate how the development would improve the character or appearance of those negative elements identified by the HCACA.

Highgate Society fully supports the above assertion and notes several of our members have contacted us with similar views.

25. In the light of the above, I conclude that the development would be detrimental to the significance of the HCA, which would amount to less than substantial harm. In such circumstances Paragraph 196 of the National Appeal Decision APP/Y5420/W/20/3257208 <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 5 Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use. In this case there would be a small public benefit from the provision of one dwelling and this is considered further in the planning balance.

Highgate Society accepts the national problem with the housing shortage but strongly supports the National Appeal Decision that the harm should be weighed against the lack of any public benefit of the proposal.

26. The development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the HCA, contrary to the provisions of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). 27. It would also be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Local Plan (LP), Policy SP12

Highgate Society agrees with Paragraph 26 and its conclusion. Policy DM9 refers to sensitive handling of the sites and where this detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area, and Policy SP12 6.2.13 acknowledges the importance of any growth to respect the character of its surroundings and conserves heritage and other important features. The Proposal breaches these Policies.

28. The development would also fail to accord with Policies DH2 and DH10 of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which taken together require development to preserve or enhance the open semi-rural or village character, and insofar as I have concluded that this site was formerly garden land, to resist the loss of garden land. In any case the supporting text for this policy sets out that the concern is the erosion of green and open spaces which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of conservation areas.

42. I conclude that the development would be contrary to the Act, the Framework and relevant local policies. Although it would make a minor contribution to local housing supply, which is a material consideration, this is insufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.

Both above paragraphs 28 and 42 Confirm that the proposal does not contribute or preserve the Character and appearance of the Conservation area and the current application does not address all the reasons for the dismissal of the appeal. We fully agree that although it would make a minor contribution to local housing supply, which is a material consideration, this is insufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.

The Society therefore believes that this application should be refused for the reasons given by the Inspector Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3257208 and the paragraphs above.

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 its correspondence, or discussed verbally at any time with representatives of its Planning Group, constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such.