

Respondent Name: Anne Bentham

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

Document	Policy/Para number	Legally compliant?	Sound?	Complies with DtC?	Please give further comments.	Please set out suggested changes	Do you wish to attend the oral examination?
Site Allocations	SA 43 Chapter 02: Para beginning at 2.123 and seq: Page 108 -109	Not specified	No	Not specified	I would question the soundness of the plan in relation to the requirement for a proper assessment of the site as it is now defined in the Site Allocation DPD pre-submission version 2016 following changes as a result of the previous consultation, and how this relates to the stated site requirements and development guidelines on page 109. Firstly, I note that although the development area is now smaller, there has been no change to the hectare size of the area, which is still 1.7 hectares. If the previous information was correct, the size should now be 0.50 hectares as it was on the first 2013/14 map. This has significance in relation to how to the figure for the density of units that is considered appropriate for the size of the site is assessed. Secondly, in respect of the development that would be	In the last section I set out some alternatives as it made more sense to do it there but as your form asks for it again in this section I will repeat them. 1. Alteration to include the correct size in hectares of the area of the development site. 2. Proposed Alterations to site requirements and guidelines as follows:- a) This is what SA43 states now: "The site slopes significantly from west (high) to east (low). It is considered that higher buildings would be more appropriate at the east and south ends of the site. Development adjoining the properties at 28-36 Muswell Hill Rd should be designed with regard to the amenity of neighbouring properties". I suggest that a more reasonable and appropriate alternative last sentence would be to state as a requirement that: "Development adjoining the properties at 28-36 Muswell Hill Rd and 33-44 Summersby Road, and across the narrow access road from the properties at 1 -33 Summersby	Yes

Respondent Name: Anne Bentham

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

				<p>allowed on the site, the flats on Summersby Road are not afforded equivalent protection to that afforded the homes on Muswell Hill Road. As regards to the need to consider the amenity of neighbouring properties, the only neighbouring properties mentioned are specified as 28-36 Muswell Hill Rd, while the Summersby Road flats are excluded. To apply criteria to some neighboring properties but not to others, is not justified and does not fulfill the duty of the Local Plan to contain objectively set requirements. It could not be described as a sound plan if the effects of any development on neighbours are not given either appropriate or equal treatment. - This is what SA43 states now: "The site slopes significantly from west (high) to east (low). It is considered that higher buildings would be more appropriate at the east and south ends of the site. Development adjoining the properties at 28-36 Muswell Hill Rd should be designed with regard to the amenity of</p>	<p>Road, should be designed with regard to the amenity of these neighbouring properties". b) To include as a requirement clause protecting the light of these neighbouring homes and stating what would be the appropriate style of 'good neighbour building' in this regard. c) To include a specific clause in the site requirements to ensure that any development does not affect the resident's use of their access road, Summersby Rd. d) To include clauses under the development guidelines that any development should not compromise the appearance and setting of the existing surrounding buildings, and that development should not impact on the residential and neighbourhood amenity of the adjacent blocks.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Respondent Name: Anne Bentham**

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

				<p>neighbouring properties”. - I suggest that a more reasonable and appropriate alternative last sentence would be to state: “Development adjoining the properties at 28-36 Muswell Hill Rd and 33-44 Summersby Road, and across the narrow access road from the properties at 1 -33 Summersby Road, should be designed with regard to the amenity of these neighbouring properties”. Thirdly, a proper assessment of the site as it is in the Site Allocation DPD pre-submission version 2016, would show that it is the case that the site slopes down from west to east, but to say that the higher buildings would be more appropriate on the south end of the site is to ignore the significance of this for those who live in the blocks of flats on Summersby Road who are neighbours on that side. A more reasonable alternative would be to also include additional clauses under the ‘site requirements’ and ‘development guidelines’ in relation to protecting the light of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

**Respondent Name: Anne Bentham**

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

				<p>these neighbouring homes and what would be the appropriate style of 'good neighbour building' in this regard. Fourthly, the site is accessible by road from Muswell Hill Road and only a small portion of it is accessible by way of Summersby Road. Summersby Road is narrow cul-de-sac, there are many families, some with children living in the blocks of flats and there is a children's playground (recently refurbished) at the bottom. It is therefore, a vital artery of access to those who live there. Given these facts it would be appropriate to include a specific clause in the site requirements to ensure that any development does not affect the resident's use of their access. Fifthly, given the particular position of this site, i.e. in a Conservation area, partially surrounded by dense residential buildings, being blocks of flats on Summersby Road and South Close, which are all of a pre WWII character that sit well together architecturally, there are insufficient clauses under the site</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

**Respondent Name: Anne Bentham**

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

					requirements and guidelines that recognise the peculiarities of this site and its spatial context. In this respect, it would be justified and not disproportionate to include clauses under the site requirements and development guidelines that any development should not compromise the appearance and setting of the existing surrounding buildings, and that development should not impact on the residential and neighbourhood amenity of the adjacent blocks. Such specific clauses have been included in the Site Allocation Document for other sites in the Highgate Neighbourhood area i.e. SA42 and 44.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--