

	takes precedence over policies relating to conservation areas								
DM7	This policy is welcomed with reservations		Building heights should be subordinate to surrounding properties.						
DM9	No		No						
As a whole	We note that the earlier DM12 has been entirely re-written following comments from English Heritage and Highgate CAAC regarding inconsistencies with NPPF and other matters.		This policy, having been entirely rewritten, is being consulted upon for the first time. We trust the Examiner will consider what has been dropped (including the earlier DM33) to ensure our heritage assets will be sufficiently protected						
D : Conservation Areas	The words 'do not' appear to be missing before 'detract' in line 3	No			No				
Para 2.26	Satellite dishes have an adverse effect on Conservation Areas where located in a position where they are visible from the CA.	No	Para 2.26 suggests that policy is flexible on this point which would be unacceptable		No				
Para 2.58	The word 'agreed' in line 5 is inappropriate	No	The function of a Heritage Statement is a means for the Applicant to suggest to LBH what the significance of the Asset is. On receipt of that document, LBH may disagree, or not, with that assessment		No				
Para 2.58	Last line: add 'Area' between 'Conservation' and 'Advisory'								
	The Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group commends the policy put forward to Highgate Neighbourhood Forum		"The Forum encourages alterations to existing buildings to enhance energy efficiency, provided that the character of the building is not prejudiced and the risk of long-term						

			deterioration of the building fabric or fittings is not increased. Where applicants intend to invoke the energy efficiency exemptions allowed in Part L1B for historic and traditional buildings, they must explain how they have followed the English Heritage guidance that the regulations say they 'should take into account'. eg https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-insulating-solid-walls/ "						
DM11									
Para 3.3, 3rd bullet	'... strategic Borough target of 40%'	No because it conflicts with para 3.8 below	Evidence base may suggest this is the case now but it would be regrettable to give a firm target with the result that advantage cannot be taken of fluctuations in the economy and land values. This policy should be framed in the same way as the Carbon reduction one : Haringey will achieve targets in line the national and London Plan policy and/or:		No	No	No		
Para 3.8	'robustly seek... affordable housing'	No	Adopt a Haringey or, if it comes forward, a London Plan, format for viability statements that are transparent, robust and reliable with Section 106 agreements to allow claw-back		No	No	No		

			of profits in excess of those anticipated to be returned to LBH, ring-fenced for social or affordable housing.						
DM12	No								
	Para 3.15 states full width extensions would not normally be acceptable. Guidance on when full width extensions would be acceptable would be helpful and aid sound and consistent decision-making.	No			No			No	
DM18									
A. a - g	We suggest in 'b' that reference is made to DM24								
A. h - i	We suggest that issues of safety, nuisance, etc should be in a separate clause on CMPs		In 'h', we suggest adding after 'harm to' in first line : 'neighbours or people passing over their land; to'		No				
B	We suggest reference should be made to DM24 including to the supporting documents (see our comments on DM24)	No			No				
DM20	The London Plan Green Grid is broad-brush. We regret the loss of detailed Green Corridors set out in the earlier (Jan 2015) DM27 and the map attached thereto	No			No				
DM33	This policy is welcomed								
DM34	This policy is welcomed								
DM35	This policy is welcomed								
DM40	No			No					
B.	Loss of employment floorspace. The policy as written is unsound.		Where a development involves demolition of a building containing employment floorspace, the same area of floorspace must be provided in the proposed building. Replacing lost floor space elsewhere will reduce flexibility						

			and vitality of economic activity essential for growth. Using Section 106 monies for training loses the floor space altogether and therefore unacceptable.						
DM44	No equivalent policy at first consultation stage. Map required								
A.	'a window display or other appropriate town centre frontage'	No	Ye Olde Sweete Shoppe in Quernmore Road N4 has received much local opprobrium and mockery. It is doubtful that BRE Daylight and Sunlight standards have been reached in the dwelling which has replaced the shop. The Design Quality and Quality of Life (Jan 2015 DM2) of the dwelling is compromised. We assume non-retail uses would not include conversion of shops to residential in a Conservation Area	No				No	
Haringey's Policy Map	Highgate's Archaeology : We note the discrepancy between the DM policy Map and the Urban Characterisation Study Map		The Highgate Society commends archaeological areas of significance as shown on the Map referred to in Highgate Neighbourhood Forum's Policy DH12						
	SINC on SA41 (Hillcrest) not shown		Map needs amending						
Urban Characterisation Studies	Unsound because not adopted and not evidence-based. There are many typographical errors throughout the documents and road names are wrong. We suggest these documents are not fit for purpose. Suggestions such as those for Highgate Golf Club and Hornsey Lane								

	Reservoir could be presumed to indicate a presumption in favour of development.								
	<p>How do they relate to DM9?</p> <p>The Highgate Society has many reservations about the content of the document for the Highgate Conservation Area but we mention here :</p> <p>From SWOT Analysis under 'BAD':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mono-culture and exclusive • Old people and ageing population – not mixed <p>[The latter statement is not factually correct]</p> <p>From SWOT Analysis under 'CONSTRAINTS'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resistance from public to growth, development and change <p>From SWOT Analysis under 'OPPORTUNITIES':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covered reservoir on Hornsey Lane – not needed by Thames Water • Persuade older residents to down size and free up family sized housing [This is not achievable through Planning Policy] • Highgate golf course – is it really the best use of land? <p>Some of these SWOT Analysis statements would surely not pass Scrutiny and Equalities tests</p>		<p>While we welcome these studies, we consider that it is regrettable that they appear to have been produced without any consultation with CAACs, amenity societies or local people. It is not clear on what basis they have been included on the Council website or referenced in the Development Management Policies. We presume as unadopted documents they are for information only. We consider they should be given little or no weight in decision-making and references to them should be removed.</p> <p>The Highgate Society has been advised that Thames Water does require the Hornsey Lane Reservoir operationally. Clarification on this point is urgently required.</p> <p>The Highgate Society requests that the Urban Characterisation Study for Highgate be withdrawn</p>						