



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove, Highgate London N6 6BS

19th August 2025

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

Dear Mr. Chan

New House 6A Grange Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4AP Application no. HGY/2024/1676

The Highgate Society wrote on 10th February 2025 a supplementary objection to their original objection of 13th August 2024. Since then, further information has been uploaded onto the website including, in the main, further BIA information. The new information has been examined and it is felt this, along with other issues, does not address the various concerns previously raised and thus the Society's objection remains. We would like to confirm the following:

Basement Impact Assessment

An amended version of the BIA has been submitted by Create in response to previous comments from the specialists appointed respectively by the adjoining neighbours and Haringey, Alan Baxter Ltd (ABL) and Campbell Reith. (CR). In response to this CR have reviewed their audit on the basis of the additional information provided and have concluded in section. 5.12 of their report that *"Having reviewed the objections and the revised 5.12 BIA, it is confirmed that the BIA now complies with the requirements of Policy DM18 of Haringey's Development Management Plan and Policy DH7 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan."*

In response to this, further technical reports have been commissioned by the neighbours with a further report by ABL and a new report from Geotechnical Consulting Group (CGC). These were uploaded onto Haringey's website yesterday. It is acknowledged that this response is submitted beyond the statutory consultation period but due to the late submission of further substantial evidence, it is assumed this late response will be accepted.

The crucial new information is the historical damage caused to the no. 4 Grange Road, the property adjoining no. 6. This is immediately downhill from nos. 6-8 Grange Road, and was extensively damaged by extensive basement works to adjoining properties. It is hoped that the recommendations in CGC's report will be fully implemented.

Whilst CR's audit does now seem to suggest that Create's BIA meets planning requirements ABL and GCG's reports would appear to refute this and both reports suggest there are still design issues to be resolved and over optimistic predictions are made as to the impact of the basement.

In addition, in the latest submission, the groundwater drainage seems to have been omitted which will mean the flow of groundwater is interrupted resulting in both saturation upstream and arid conditions downstream. This has been identified in both the latest Alan Baxter and CGC's reports.

The recently submitted ABL report concludes *"As such, we maintain our view that this BIA fails to address key requirements of the Haringey Development Management Plan- Policy DM18 and of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH7"*

Other issues

What is concerning is the implication that the only element that Haringey consider as outstanding is a satisfactory BIA and that once this is dealt with an approval of the scheme will follow. The Society's previous objections identified a number of issues with the above ground scheme which do not seem to have been addressed at all. The assumption could follow that Haringey consider these satisfactory. In summary these are:

- **Building too large for site:** There has been no measure introduced to address this comment which has resulted in damaging impact on the neighbours' amenity. This is noticeably the impact of the new building on the sunlighting and daylighting, particularly of no. 6 which lies due south, and which previous reports have identified as being below an acceptable standard.
- **Impact on biodiversity due to the retention of the retaining walls in the rear garden:** Although the Create report conclude that these walls are above ground water level and will not impact on the hydrology, they will impact on biodiversity, effectively creating a barrier to free movement in the areas adjacent to the walls. The Society would like to see these walls removed as part of any future approval.
- **Impact of ground works on tree covered by TPO in front garden:** The Highgate Society has written to Daniel Monk, Haringey's tree officer (who we assume will be consulted) stating the following. We would like added to our objection:
"In view of what appears to us to be an inadequate assessment of the threat to the root zone of the tree from the current amended proposals, we would ask you to look urgently at the likely impact of the basement proposal on this tree at the front of the site. We previously flagged this up with you on 16th December, 2024, but the urgency of the matter is now critical as a decision is likely to be reached by the Planners imminently. It appears that the cut-out area set aside under the previous proposals to protect the roots of the tree has been dropped, and that the tree will be further impacted by the proposed line of piles outside the basement, which will run straight through the root protection zone. We would be most grateful if you can give this your urgent attention and let us know when you have been able to do this."
- **Windows close to boundary:** There are windows in the flank wall facing no 6. In previous documents, these were shown fixed shut but are currently shown opening. Under

section B4: External Spread of Fire, Approved Document B: Fire Safety, these should be fire protected and limited in size. It is assumed Haringey's Building Control Officers have been consulted on this application so it is surprising that these windows are now opening and the applicant's agent is unaware of the need to comply with this regulation.

In conclusion. it is disappointing that the points raised in our previous objections have not been addressed and we would like to confirm that our original objection remains, with additional points as above

Yours sincerely,

Elsbeth Clements
Co Chair Planning Committee
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.