



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove, Highgate London N6 6BS

9th June 2024

Planning Department
London Borough of Haringey
River Park House
225 High Road,
London , N22 8HQ.

For the attention of Nathan Keyte

Dear Sir/Madam,

HGY//2024 Demolition of house and replacement with larger house at 41 Sheldon Avenue, London N6

The Highgate Society is writing to strongly object to the above applications. The reasons for objection are listed below:

1. The proposal is for the existing house to be demolished and replaced with a new house. The Applicant's submission does not mention the embodied carbon wasted through demolition of the existing house, and the avoidable carbon emitted through construction of the four-storey dwelling and swimming pool. At a highly simplistic level, the proposal is effectively for six storeys worth of carbon emissions. A conversion would have added only two storeys worth of carbon. Again, this is simplistic but aims to highlight the huge difference between conversion/extension and demolition/new build. This is acknowledged in Haringey in their stated support for the Retrofit First Policy Local Plan.
2. The absence of mention of embodied carbon from the Applicant's submission means the Energy Statement does not actually assess the environmental impact of the house. An assessment must compare operational and embodied carbon to the existing scheme with extensions to match the proposal. By omitting embodied carbon, the supporting documentation fails to address the requirements of Policy DM21 "Sustainable design, layout, and construction". Part C of this policy states that proposals that fail to demonstrate adequate consideration for sustainable design, layout and construction techniques will be resisted. The sustainable design mantra is that reuse is always less carbon intensive than new build. The energy statement should not be the only reference point or evidence of sustainable credentials. The statement only explains the energy saved in operation, not in construction, which will be a significant compared to heating demand
3. We then come to the impact on the neighbourhood of the extremely large proposed new house. Although it is difficult to ascertain the impact in volume of the new house over the existing, this is in the region of 3-4 times the existing. This is largely achieved by increasing the footprint of the house to the side and the rear with the resultant impact on the streetscape and the amenity of the neighbours. The existing house dates from 1928 and is in the Bishop's area of the Highgate Conservation Area. It is one of the original Quennel houses within the area and form part of a coherent original development. The Heritage Statement produced by The Heritage Practice acknowledges in 7.4 of their statement that *"the existing house on the site makes a minor positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Highgate*

Conservation Area” but appears to be of the opinion that the quality of the new house will justify the demolition of the existing. The Society strongly disagrees with this conclusion. Sheldon Avenue consists of a number of early 20th century villas, with an understated Arts and Crafts style which is homogenous and as such contributes positively to the conservation area. The increase in size of this house results in it being built considerably closer to the boundary on each side. Currently there is a gap at first floor level between the existing houses at no 41 and the adjoining houses nos. 39 and 43. The gaps gives views of the gardens and golf course beyond and this green open aspect is an integral part of the streetscape. By extending the house extensively to the side, particularly at first floor level and above, this gap is closed and the open aspect is lost, thus causing substantial harm to the heritage asset of the Conservation Area

4. To reach the required increase in volume, the house not only extends sideways but also extensively to the rear. There is an established building line to the rear which respects the amenity of each property by ensuring adjoining properties do not overshadow their neighbours and that there is no loss of sunlight or daylight and no increase in the sense of enclosure. The drawings at ground floor level do not indicate the scale of the problem, but those at first floor level do. The first floor plans as existing and proposed (P0601 and P2001) indicate the full impact of the new building to the rear. No 43 is sited to the north and east of no 41 and, as Sheldon Avenue slopes in this location, is also approximately 1.5m lower. The result will be a severe reduction in sunlighting to the garden plus an impact on daylighting to the house. No daylighting and sunlighting studies have been submitted with this application and no approval should be granted until the impact on the adjoining properties has been quantified and assessed as meeting appropriate guidelines.
5. Although a considerable amount of material has been submitted as part of the Basement Impact Assessment, there is no independent assessment of this material, much of which is highly technical in nature. This should be assessed by a Haringey appointed specialist at the Applicant's expense. In addition, the amount of plant associated with the basement and its swimming pool, will be extensive. Currently the locations indicated and the lack of noise amelioration measures are likely to cause severe loss of amenity to the neighbours in no 43.

In conclusion, the Society believes this application for the demolition of the existing house and its replacement with a massive new house, which is entirely inappropriate to the area ,should be refused on the grounds of its failure to address embodied carbon through demolition, its impact on the amenity of the neighbours and its substantial harm to the heritage asset of the Conservation Area as well as other points mentioned above..

Yours faithfully,

Elsbeth Clements

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 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.

