

6 Grange Road
Highgate
London N6 4AP

Mark Chan
Senior Planning Officer
Placemaking and Housing
London Borough of Haringey
London N22 8HQ

By email

31st August 2025

Dear Mark,

HGY/2024/1676 – 6A Grange Road, Highgate

We're sorry to have to write again, but we wanted to be sure that the unifying point of the comments in our 21st August letter as regards the above-ground aspects of the proposal had come through sufficiently clearly.

The point was that, unlike for many policy matters, (1) preserving openness around, and maintaining the gaps between, houses in the Highgate conservation area, and (2) maintenance of sufficient daylight for existing properties on the basis of the BRE guidelines, are **numerically measurable criteria**, leaving little or no room for subjectivity or interpretation.

That being the case, the point we wanted now to draw to your attention was that having demonstrated the non-compliance of the current application with both of those criteria, it must follow that to grant this application permission would be contrary to policy and lack legal basis.

Both points have been decided on by planning inspectors, point (1) in relation to the 6A site itself (the 2010 decision concerning HGY/2010/0440), and point (2) concerning the impact of another development in the conservation area on the living conditions of existing occupiers with particular regard to daylight and outlook (the 2024 Stanhope Road decision concerning HGY/2023/0949).

As regards the daylight effect of the development on No 6, these two issues from our 18th February objection (in paragraphs a. and d. of section 5) are relevant:

- (a) the BRE model showed **no difference in the daylight distribution test result** for **any of the windows at No**, as between the currently empty site and the previous (now demolished) house; in practical terms this means that when

viewed from a plane at roughly counter height anywhere in No 6, the old No 6A house was **invisible**, or at least at no point protruded any higher or further in any other direction than No 8 behind it.

- (d) the BRE Report (Issue 5, 6 December 2024) indicates¹ that their model shows that the VSC for the two ground floor windows of No 6 facing the road (windows A and B) was (as to be expected) the same for the current (empty site) and pre-existing house scenarios; but it was **less for both windows** after the proposed development (Tables 3 and 8); in practical terms this means that the development would obscure part of the sky visible from those two front windows. The enclosed annotated extract from the 6A proposed first floor plan (**Enclosure A**) shows how **this cannot (or should not) be true**.

Point (a) above shows that the two-storey element of the pre-existing house (with its monopitch roof) was **sufficiently distant not to cause No 6 any overshadowing** – i.e. it must have been at a substantial distance from the boundary. This substantiates our repeated contention about the large gap that existed between the No 6 and 6A houses. The further **Google Earth images (Enclosure B)** accompanying this letter (which show clearly that the single storey extension to the side of 6A was of a not dissimilar width to the No 6 single storey side extension) put that beyond doubt.

Point (d) above can only be explained by the proposed development **protruding substantially beyond the front building lines** (contrary to the drawings presented and assertions in the application documents, as well as contrary to policy), **or by the model created by BRE being defective** in one or more ways.

Finally, looking again at the drawings and supporting documents in this application, and the tone and substance of the public comments made on it, one is left with the distinct feeling that the wool is being pulled over our eyes. The renders are selective and the streetscape elevation is misleading and erroneous². The plans, many still superimposed with the error-strewn outline of the 2018 “approved plans” and themselves seriously flawed, amplify minor details as if the rest of the design were acceptable whilst omitting explanations of their many oddities, and the minimum of dimensions are marked (see **Enclosure C**) and separation distances shown not at all. Meanwhile, amongst the accompanying documents, the Heritage Impact Statement and the daylighting reports are exercises in inversion, and the inconsistencies between the arboricultural reports and the BIA make a mockery of environmental policy in plain sight.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Schulz

Edwin Cossio Murillo

¹ The BRE Report also suggests an effect on daylight distribution for windows A, B, C & D (Table 9) but this appears just to be a transcription error (see Table 4)

² The inclusion of the angled side wall of the No 6 side extension is inaccurate and irrelevant to a streetscape elevation – this is proved by the equivalent rear drawing showing the angled double gabled flank wall of the proposed house being no wider; the wall on the street boundary between Nos 6 and 6A is several times larger than in reality; the sizes of Nos 6 and 8 seem exaggerated compared to the photos and Google Earth images we have provided – partly because the roofs lack perspective so appear much higher than in real life.