

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
3629	765	Charles Robins		213.15		15/10/2014 18:07:3	15/10/2014 18:07:36	What about some more community events? e.g. rotating in N6 - i.e. not only Fair in the Square but involving the fringes of N6 a bit more? would that be an option?And how about some community cafe, e.g. run by locals who struggle to find employment?... just some more ideas!	All great ideas - just need people willing to transform them into action.
5935	765	Allan rapley		84.13.		13/11/2014 19:48:4	13/11/2014 19:48:48	If the 271 terminus is to stay in Highgate Village then we need more and improved covered seating for waiting travellers.The metal barrier fencing and crazy paving could also be removed.The Menuhin tree (deceased) is being replaced by Camden this winter planting season ,in an enlarged plot.	Noted
6685	765	Geoffrey Walker		87.112		19/11/2014 09:11:0	19/11/2014 09:11:06	We need to do 'something' about parking in the Village.I'm all for having a 'garden centre' in the bowl and miss the last one!	Parking is high on the Forum agenda + members are involved in a new charity trying to secure the garden centre for community use
6692	765	Ruth Hazeldine		86.153		19/11/2014 10:32:0	19/11/2014 10:32:02	I strongly urge all efforts to be directed to preserving the open space of the Highgate Bowl. If we fail in this then the door is opened for further devastation of our special and loved village environment. Additionally, by supporting The Harington Scheme's plans and endeavours we are also supporting The Bowl.Further, I support efforts to persuade TfL to re-route the 271 turnaround out of the village to a less intrusive place, such as the bottom of North Hill. i know people have been pushing for this for years, unsuccessfully, but we should not give up.People want more parking in the village – I disagree! Instead we should campaign for more frequent bus services with smaller busses – lets keep cars out of the village. A shuttle bus service between Highgate/C.End and M. Hill is an excellent idea!	All covered in the Plan and Forum working to achieve
6705	765	Willemien Hines		77.99.		19/11/2014 15:26:5	19/11/2014 15:26:54	Many admirable proposals. Safe cycle learning space and dedicated cycle ways get my top vote.	Support noted.
6798	765	Keith Gold		79.70.		20/11/2014 09:26:4	20/11/2014 09:26:40	The establishment of a permanent cafe in The Square would be great for the Village. A would a focus on the availability of residential property for the older generation so that they could downsize but stay in the area.	Policy SC1 has been strengthened to reflect this
6808	765	Tony Baker		91.125		20/11/2014 16:19:3	20/11/2014 16:19:39	North Road/North Hill's trees are of great importance. There are some gaps. Could these be filled?	Addressed in action plan
6809	781	Tony Baker		91.125		20/11/2014 16:26:4	20/11/2014 16:26:41	I agree strongly that alternative solutions should be pursued.	Noted
7417	765	Tony Rushbroo		86.176		24/11/2014 12:41:0	24/11/2014 12:41:02	A lot more rubbish bins and removal of 'speed bumps'	Noted
7418	765	Patricia Bishop		86.176		24/11/2014 12:43:0	24/11/2014 12:43:03	Waterlow Park will need funds as Camden are providing fewer resources.Trees on either side of the Bridge had a protection order which may need renewing, and attention to the embankment on Archway road with its trees and vegetation is important.	Noted and included in CIL spending list

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12163	871	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	g 93.96.		09/01/2015 17:43:2	09/01/2015 17:43:26	I take issue with the several actions at the end of the document. CA3, 5 & 8 represent expenditure of public money that would not represent significant benefit to the residents of Highgate. It is illegitimate to advance these policies with no attempt to demonstrate their desirability to residents. My expectation is that CA 3 & 8 would not represent value for money in light of alternative uses for the money. CA 5 is similarly inappropriate, with such resources being better provided outside the area. The proposed action on housing is also based on a misunderstanding of the requirements of Highgate's residents. The problem arises from attempting to address these issues by focusing on too small an area and neglecting the fact that Highgate is surrounded on all sides by a vast urban area. If this plan has a legitimate remit, it is to serve the current residents and as such, it is not clear that the planning principles are justified. Specifically, the emphasis on affordable housing (by which I take it to mean housing that is cheaper than the market average - all housing being affordable to someone who has the money to buy it) lacks justification. It is simply a mistake to pursue on such a small geographical scale measures to alter the housing stock and demographics of the area, possibly against the wishes of the residents and with no reference to co-ordination across the wider area. I think the recommendations in general suffer from failing to offer any evidence base for the conclusions. As a result, they read like a list of platitudes relating to a particular political view of the direction in which Highgate should be led.	Noted but refuted
12165	863	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	g 93.96.		09/01/2015 18:10:1	09/01/2015 18:10:13	It is unclear to me whether the objectives of this plan are justified at all. Much emphasis is put on 'vitality' and 'viability' which seem like quite vague things to base serious policy on. Vitality means possessing/demonstrating life - what do you mean? Is this really saying anything meaningful at all? What type of life and how much? The plans stated aim is to bring more visitors to Highgate - that would be 'more vitality' - but it is also a policy I oppose because as fairs on Pond Square demonstrate, it causes problems for the local transport infrastructure, primarily traffic jams up Highgate Hill. I would certainly oppose creating a permanent market area on Pond Square as a case of too much vitality. On that definition of vitality, you would be better converting all the properties to the residential category. Viability is also used loosely with no real appreciation of its meaning. How could Highgate become 'unviable'? Viable for achieving what end? Clearly the goal of the plan should be ensuring that the local economy provides residents with the services they want. As a result, it is not clear that the councils should obstruct businesses by preventing changes of use on vaguely defined notions of viability and vitality. Retaining properties in A1 category where there is not depend for them will result in empty shops or high streets full of charity shops. Also, it is not clear that creating employment is a reasonable objective of the plan. Highgate isn't an island but is integrated in to Europe's largest city. Many residents leave the area for work and others come from outside to work here. I cannot think why, considering the employment opportunities across London, it should be an objective of a local plan to provide it.	Plan objectives substantially changed in next draft
12187	833	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	g 94.193		10/01/2015 08:34:2	10/01/2015 08:34:22	The relative attractiveness of cycling for flat-dwellers is reduced by the lack of storage space for a bike. Currently, the bike parking provision in the area is inadequate. One option would be to encourage local schools to share their provision, which is largely unused currently. For instance, St Aloysius has a covered bike shed, adjacent to Hornsey Lane, which is largely unused. Access by locked gate for registered local residents would be of benefit to the local community.	Noted and to be pursued by Cycling Action Group

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12188	885	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	g	94.193	10/01/2015 09:00:1	10/01/2015 09:00:13	As a resident whose property is across the road from and at the same elevation as the top of Hornsey Lane reservoir, with all the windows of my property facing directly on to it at a distance of a few metres, I resist in the strongest terms any attempt to give public access to the site. I believe that opening the site to the public would directly contravene my legitimate expectations when I bought my property, diminish my privacy considerably and also negatively impact the value of my property. The work required to give access would also result in considerable disruption, noise and loss of privacy. Such work would also disturb the abundant wildlife on the site. The reservoir is visited on a daily basis by many species, including foxes, magpies, pigeons, gulls, squirrels, jays and woodpeckers. The area is already exceptionally well served with open spaces. The Hornsey Lane reservoir site is less than 5 minutes walk and offers far superior resources than could be offered by the reservoir. I believe the proposal attempts to meet a non-existent need. As well as the ample provision of open spaces, the reservoirs are well kept and not unsightly. Indeed, the position of the Hornsey Lane reservoir in particular is largely concealed from the road by its height, so unlike the South Grove its appearance (and even its existence) little troubles most residents. Without a properly conducted cost benefit analysis to ascertain the desirability and negative impact of this plan, I think it would be illegitimate to pursue this with Thames Water. There would need to be a provision to compensate any negative impact on the property value of affected properties.	Reservoir action removed
12190	833	David Solomon	[REDACTED]		89.242	10/01/2015 16:29:1	10/01/2015 16:29:12	I suggest garden bridges over the A1 Archway Road, connecting East to West Highgate in a relatively inexpensive and creative way	Beyond scope of neighbourhood plan
12192	885	David Solomon	[REDACTED]	l	89.242	10/01/2015 16:31:3	10/01/2015 16:31:37	It would be great to turn the 271 turning bay on Pond Square into a space for a farmer's market every weekend (and even some weekdays)	Support noted and idea being actively pursued by Forum
12195	894	Stuart Bull	[REDACTED]		86.161	10/01/2015 16:57:1	10/01/2015 16:57:11	Congrats to everyone for all the last 3 years work leading to the well attended Consultation meeting today at 10a. My comments relate to the future of The Bowl and the wording within Policy KA3. In order to keep The Bowl "open" in aspect and access, now and in perpetuity, The Friends of Highgate Bowl - (already with charitable status), will need to acquire the land, then raise funds to secure a low impact educational facility that commercially, at the very least, covers annual maintenance and security. To do the above there needs to be A VISION that appeals to "Heart" and "Head". Yeswhen can the concept "Eden in Highgate" creep out of the shadows into full sun as a possibility. Does it have to be after the current planned progression of acceptance? First presentations to the great and good of Highgate and consultation with the Eden "mothership" first took place in 2010! Joanna Lumley first mentioned a "Garden Bridge across the Thames" in 2007!!! quote from the RHS developer of the new Singapore Gardens - "" By presenting the plant kingdom in a compelling way and introducing visitors into diverse botanical worlds, we hope to intrigue and educate them about the vital relationships between plants, people and the planet. In selecting plants, we wanted to showcase the diversity of the plant kingdom, particularly plants that are not commonly seen in this part of the world - putting together a "botanical United Nations".....school children will visit as part of their curriculum. "Could someone revisit Policy KA3: Highgate Bowl, to ensure that the plan has not restricted the Bowl's future into a piece of non commercial wasteland not owned and controlled by the local community? Are there any other realistic, commercially viable, alternatives around to safeguard public access to the Bowl? Are there any other visions that could be so naturally symbiotic to The Harington Scheme? An Eden in Highgate, in my view, could be designed (mostly glass or open) to not dominate, be visually subservient and respect local vistas. Just hoping that the actual KA3 wording isn't so restrictive to ensure we've planned ourselves into an undeliverable hole. Thanks.	FoHG Vision has been substantially expanded

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12229	765	Roger van Zwa	[REDACTED]	78.147		11/01/2015 10:30:2	11/01/2015 10:30:23	The suggested Facilities, Open Spaces, Getting Around ideas are all excellent. As priorities they all have widespread support. I suggest these are developed into a three or five year plan, so they become operational. One area that has been ignored is the land around Highgate Tube station; this includes three or four sites all around the station which are at present officially unused and overgrown. This site has considerable potential for recreation of many kinds. It will need imagination, but could become a major asset for all 'Highgaters'	Areas around Highgate Station addressed in KS2 and KS5
12235	885	David Solomon	[REDACTED]	95.150		11/01/2015 17:58:2	11/01/2015 17:58:28	It looks like that, as well as myself - David Solomon - there is also a David Solomons in the area. For the avoidance of doubt, I, David Solomon, support the relocation of the 271 bus turning bay but would oppose the establishment of a farmers' market in or around Pond Square, which would be highly inappropriate in, or close to, a residential square that provides an oasis of peace within busy Highgate Village. I would add that I am highly in favour of the reference to the Square in the plan.	support noted
12240	890	Chris Tuppen	[REDACTED]	4 2.96.2		12/01/2015 18:05:1	12/01/2015 18:05:18	Main detractor to the area is wheelie bins being overfull with rubbish on the pavement attracting rats, foxes and other vermin. We want our essential weekly refuse collection back in high density population (16 people living in the 4 storey Milton houses) area.	Addressed where possible in Plan
12245	890	Nicole de Lalou	[REDACTED]	77.101		13/01/2015 11:53:0	13/01/2015 11:53:00	The comment by Chris Tuppen is spot on. In any area of the country, particularly in a conservation area, it is scandalous to have a situation with wheelie bins as we do in the Miltons. It is super high density living, with a majority of the houses converted into at least four flats. As there is nowhere to store the bins save the pavements, the whole situation is not only unsightly, but often presents difficulties when negotiating pavements with pushchairs or for older people, without even considering the aspect of foxes and rats feasting on the spoils of the bins and refuse on the pavements. The situation has only got worse since 5 March 2012 when this ill thought-through, cost saving exercise was introduced. One size doesn't fit all and weekly collections of household refuse need to be re introduced to a part of the borough which is unlike most others.	As above
12247	765	Gareth Davies	[REDACTED]	188.29		13/01/2015 22:13:2	13/01/2015 22:13:25	Investment in sports and youths clubs ensuring continued development and protection of healthy activities.	noted
12248	890	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	94.193		13/01/2015 22:24:0	13/01/2015 22:24:08	Weekly is a practical policy that everyone wants - yet this forum seems to have lots of ideas that no one wants. The councils need to focus on delivery basic services and then get out of the way of local business and community organised action.	Neighbourhood planning is community, not Council, led
12249	885	Gareth Davies	[REDACTED]	188.29		13/01/2015 22:24:3	13/01/2015 22:24:33	I would like to see protection of local outdoor facilities such as relevant football/cricket/rugby pitches, golf courses, walking routes, swimming ponds etc. In our struggle to keep a population healthy Highgate may benefit from a well thought out plan for improved activity choices. It's unlikely the plan can cover all aspects but spaces for play do need protection as well as support and promotion of local clubs. In a far reaching plan local clubs could be involved in post curricular activities so schools and the community as whole can benefit from a 'health' network that would aim to support school leavers in an active lifestyle. I am happy to help where I can.	Plan protects these facilities where possible
12250	894	Richard Clarke	[REDACTED]	94.193		13/01/2015 22:35:5	13/01/2015 22:35:57	I think the best use for the Bowl area would be to develop it for commercial use, possibly organised round a central square. If it was sufficiently large, with one or two restaurants and pubs and a few boutique shops, it may become a shopping destination. It could also incorporate some flats above shops. Alternatively, Highgate is in desperate need of more parking.	Noted
12261	830	Louise Lewis	[REDACTED]	81.152		14/01/2015 20:06:5	14/01/2015 20:06:53	In your key map 'school grounds' only seem to cover the 'open spaces' within school the school grounds. I would have thought a more acceptable definition would include the school buildings, indeed, all the land within the school boundaries. This would also make sense as the schools are the largest employers in the area and are, therefore, a major part of economic activity which is 'red hatched' on the map.	Noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12273	871	Barbara Smith		86.181		15/01/2015 14:07:3	15/01/2015 14:07:39	Re SC2 and community facilities. The Holly Lodge Community Centre had all Camden funding withdrawn in 2013. The centre is shabby and in need of upgrading if the volunteers who presently keep it going are to make it financially viable enough to offer the kind of services needed and wanted by isolated or vulnerable people in the area. If it became attractive enough to encourage regular paying lettings, clubs and workshops, it would become self sufficient and would be a valuable community asset for all, able to offer vital free services to current residents of Highgate again.	Holly Lodge CC included in CIL spending list
12298	863	Paul Renney		78.144		17/01/2015 16:28:1	17/01/2015 16:28:16	for the Archway road traders survey, it is odd that for a large number they were closed or no-one to talk to the survey; it should be repeated at sensible times and views sought.	Further surveys have taken place
12322	833	Terry Meinrath		81.152		19/01/2015 15:44:4	19/01/2015 15:44:44	Archway Road:1. A safe crossing is needed close to the new Sainsburys. 2. The traffic lights close to the corner of Causton Rd. and Archway Rd. should be moved to the corner of Causton and Archway. Over many years there have been serious accidents here, especially involving motorcyclists who are particularly 'invisible' to traffic exiting Causton and Northwood roads.	Forum is talking to TfL about these
12329	833	Nick Brown		82.45.		19/01/2015 20:40:4	19/01/2015 20:40:41	Good work. I well worded and finely argued document. I would second the proposal for wider pavements as a rule and particularly at various pinch points in the area. Especially (most of!) Southwood lane, which is a busy pedestrian thoroughfare.	Support noted.
12383	885	Jade Whitaker		81.151		23/01/2015 14:35:2	23/01/2015 14:35:20	A long time ago there were swings, a slide and a sand pit in Parkland Walk very close to the homesdale road entrance which I enjoyed as a child As a mother of two young children living in the Milton's I would like to see a small playground built on the site at the Homesdale Rd end of The Parkland Walk in front of the disused railway tunnels. This site could also be further developed to include a cafe and / secure bike parking for the tube. Currently the nearest playgrounds are in Waterlow Park and Highate Wood which are both quite a long walk for a two year old. There are many young children in this part of Highgate; on just Milton Park alone I personally know of 21 under 5yr olds who would benefit from a closer playground.	Included in CIL spending list
12384	833	Jade Whitaker		81.151		23/01/2015 14:48:3	23/01/2015 14:48:36	Pedestrian crossing Archway Rd junction with Jacksons Lane and Shepherds Hill. There is a point in the traffic signal cycle when all traffic is on red and pedestrians can cross on all roads. There is not quite enough time to cross over two roads which often people want to do. As a result they run diagonally over the whole junctions eg from Gonnermann's to Jackson Lane centre. Could a special crossing like the one at Oxford Circus be considered as people will always take the shortest route even if it comes with a risk!	Noted
12385	890	Jade Whitaker		81.151		23/01/2015 15:00:5	23/01/2015 15:00:54	In agreement.	Support noted
12386	890	Jade Whitaker		81.151		23/01/2015 15:01:2	23/01/2015 15:01:23	In agreement	Support noted
12471	890	Sarah Chapma		151.22		27/01/2015 21:49:5	27/01/2015 21:49:59	I live in an area of Highgate that is blighted by Haringey's regressive rubbish collection policy (the Miltons). Twice a month rubbish collections utilising massive bins (that can only be stored on the pavement by many properties) is not an appropriate strategy for an area with lots of high multiple occupancy buildings yet Haringey continues to ignore residents' feedback on this matter. It is an issue of hygiene (that just gets worse as the weather improves), and has seen an increase in vermin and foxes in what is supposed to be a Conservation Area - pretty much every morning I am forced to side-step waste strewn on the pavement by foxes and I'm greeted by a fox most evenings, and my neighbour's giant rat discovery made the press!! I'm supportive of any Highgate Neighbourhood Forum policy that helps to tackle our bin issues.	Addressed in DH9 and CA 34 in next draft of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12473	890	debora weston	██████████	94.175		27/01/2015 23:56:2	27/01/2015 23:56:20	I agree with the comment that one size doesn't fit all comment. This is not a neighbourhood of single family houses. Again I found myself trying to fit one last trash into the overfull bins yesterday, aware that when I woke the following morning the sidewalk would be strewn with it's contents.	as above
12474	890	debora weston	██████████	94.175		28/01/2015 00:04:3	28/01/2015 00:04:37	Having lived in the area for the past 15 years, it has been disappointing to see how some of the small details that make the neighbourhood what it was when we came are disappearing with the cutbacks. Timely rubbish pick-ups is just one element. I would like to think we could find ways to preserve the heritage of the area....refurbishing our cast iron lampposts would be a great start.	as above
12482	890	Jill	██████████	77.99.		28/01/2015 05:40:1	28/01/2015 05:40:15	The issue of wheelie bins in the miltons needs to be addressed in real terms. The forum is a fantastic opportunity to engage as a community of Highgate with one voice. I am pleased to see that the forum is not a voice box for the council as we need to be able to deal with things practically. The improvement in the street scene by new pavements and resurfacing has been a good sign and that good work needs to continue. Haringey council are currently wasting council funds by having to employ people to spot check and the like. I would be a lot happier if a cost effective and more regular solution were put in place for waste collection. We are also awaiting the work on lighting posts and I note that the rose garden is still without its heritage lamp. There needs to be more tree planting along streets as well These things impact people on a daily basis and should now be addressed without politics being involved. practical and workable solutions that impact the quality of our daily life please. There should also be a review of archway road and there should be consideration as to the improvement of shop frontages. Shops do have a responsibility to make good their frontages and too often they appear scruffy and ill maintained. Simple improvements could make it look a lot better along with an extra crossing please	Addressed in DH9 and CA34 in second draft of Plan
12485	890	Kate Stanyer	██████████	80.169		28/01/2015 10:04:5	28/01/2015 10:04:56	I completely agree with all of the points above on the wheelie bins situation. Fortnightly collection just doesn't work in properties which are split into up to 4/5 flats and the state that the roads and pavements are left in as a result, is just not acceptable.	as above
12491	890	james Bradley	██████████	118.14		29/01/2015 01:56:2	29/01/2015 01:56:21	Completely agree with Kate, the current policy has not accounted for the division of various houses into flats. Also, what's the point of having "conservation areas" if no conservation is actually carried out (I'm not advocatign the removal of the conservation areas but the importance of actually supporting them)? Looking to address the lampposts would be a good start...	as above
12498	890	Lance Potter	██████████	82.32.		29/01/2015 17:39:5	29/01/2015 17:39:57	Just a few observations. In most places in England, if you leave your wheeie bin on the pavement on a non-rubbish collecting day you will be prosecuted by the council. Our "conservation area" has massive wheelie bins permanently on the pavement as there is nowhere else to put them. A possible solution is to have small portable bins that can be kept inside, or in the small front area, and have a twice weekly collection. Once upon a time Ralph Crisp campaigned to have the old lamps refurbished and re- installed. In the meantime we were to have "temporary" modern lamps. The modern lamps were installed; then nothing. The water board held an open meeting at St Augustine's hall to tell us about the proposed work at the triangle. I left the meeting with the impression that after all the work was completed the triangle would be restored to its full size and planted up. We have a tiny triangle and no plants, did I get it wrong?	as above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12500	836	Francis Oeser		87.113		29/01/2015 21:14:4	29/01/2015 21:14:46	Highgate must decide whether it's inner or outer borough (I sense it tries to be both). Outer boroughs have a lower density and more POS (I used to be a judge in 'Britain in Bloom', visiting ALL boroughs). POS issues must NOT prevent future changes of land use - a policy of 'No Change' would become a disaster. Garden size and street tree policy is far more important in maintaining Highgate's character, diversity and charm regularly use the High Street. The division between boroughs is NOT visible, except in car parking (the Haringey side is more liberal, Camden slaps tickets on anything that moves making visits erksome). I agree, "Traffic" is a big and serious issue- the new scheme at The Archway will be hugely beneficial to Highgate, reducing through traffic and increasing access to the Archway area, including the Whittinton a local (if poor) health facility. Archway Road will increase as a barrier between E&W. The loony traffic and pedestrian lights need extending (in spite of risk of accidents) to join our separated parts of Highgate.	Noted
12521	856	Stephen Panke		87.112		31/01/2015 17:40:2	31/01/2015 17:40:22	The HNF Plan is a document whose vision I heartily support. Highgate is a beautiful village that has broadly developed sympathetically over the centuries. The HNF is now an opportunity to ensure that the residents of the area have a real chance to influence and determine and monitor development policies that retain and enhance the strong local and community bonds, encourage local commerce, improve transport links, retain our architectural heritage, and develop in an ecological and sustainable way. The HNF plan seems to me to cover all of these issues and deserves the broad support of the community. Two particular issues that are of concern are a) retention of important and historic open spaces and b) encroachment on and destruction of front gardens for parking spaces thus destroying street scenes. These issues are covered by the plan and have my support. Thank you to the HNF Team	Support noted
12526	890	Inna Ward		80.189		31/01/2015 23:19:3	31/01/2015 23:19:36	Apart from being unsightly and a health hazard due to vermin, the numerous overflowing wheelie bins in the Miltons make it difficult for buggies and wheelchairs to navigate the pavements. A solution I have seen working elsewhere is giving up a couple of car spaces in the main road and building permanent lockable sheds that can accommodate very large bins and would be emptied at least once week. As to the heritage lighting, this would really give the area a much-needed facelift. It seems to be a relatively simple improvement that would pay off for years to come.	As above re bins - heritage lighting campaign has paid off
12531	890	Richard Troman		86.176		01/02/2015 10:51:5	01/02/2015 10:51:51	First, I'd like to thank the Forum for their hard work on this project and especially in relation to the plans for the careful development of Highgate and preservation of its heritage and character. I would like to add one comment about the importance of the Plan recognising the importance of 'noise' as an environmental issue. If we are to preserve and even improve the character of Highgate then it's important that residents are not affected by excessive noise pollution, for example loud music coming from places of business/leisure/places of worship. Can we stress in the Plan that Planning and Enforcement teams for either council pay extra attention to noise pollution and disturbance to the community? This is especially important in areas such as Archway Road, where there has in the past been the impression from the councils that 'it does not matter' what goes on there and businesses can do whatever they please with regards to creating disturbances. Along with preserving and protecting our 'visual' heritage we must also campaign to ensure that residents can live a peaceful and undisturbed life in Highgate and I therefore hope we can stress 'noise reduction' in the plan. Thank you.	Support noted - unfortunately noise abatement largely outside scope of Plan
12532	836	Louise Lewis		124.18		01/02/2015 10:53:4	01/02/2015 10:53:45	One of the more intriguing attractions of the centre of Highgate is the number of 'yards'. I'm not aware of anywhere else with so many little back alleys and courtyards, some with flagged paving, some with old houses and hints of times gone by. This is an aspect we should try and preserve, enhance and, as they are often private, increase access.	Noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12534	856	Hilary and Jeff		77.103		01/02/2015 12:52:3	01/02/2015 12:52:36	<p>Dear HNF team Congratulations to the Forum on a first-class document. It is obvious that an enormous amount of work has been ongoing for a very long time and we are grateful for the time dedicated by all those who have contributed. We are very supportive of the overall direction and balance of the Plan. We would suggest some further consideration might be given to the following: Young People – Policy SC2 You identify the need for community facilities for young people among other, but when looking through the Vision and the detailed Plan, there is no further reference (that we could spot) to what these might be, particularly in relation to older children/young people (age group 14-18) who are not currently well catered for within Highgate. The Plan should try and identify what Highgate currently has to offer for this age group (if anything) and explore any possibilities for increased provision. (See more in Sport facilities section below) Sport We feel the Plan needs to devote more space to sport and perhaps could benefit from input from someone with expertise in this area (not something we can offer I'm afraid). We think a more detailed map of the current sporting offerings within the Plan area – the map on page 28 does not really do this item justice – perhaps distinguishing between private facilities and public facilities. We think this would show up quite starkly the lack of public facilities which would highlight the importance of keeping those that we currently have and looking for opportunities to create more. Unfortunately it is quite hard to see the sites identified on the map as dedicated to sport: , but it appears to show 4 – the Waterlow Park Tennis courts, Highgate Woods Cricket Pitch, the Highgate Golf Club (Private club), The Mallenson Sport Centre (Highgate School with some public access), the Archway Swimming Pool (outside the Plan area) Should the bowling Club at the bottom of Fitzroy Park be added? We noticed football being played on a pitch adjacent to the Highgate Woods cricket pitch. Indeed there seem to be two pitches there. Are We know that some facilities just outside the Plan area have closed (Kenlyn Bowling Club) or will be moving away (Chandos Tennis Club), causing a net loss of local sporting facilities. We think the Plan needs to highlight the vital importance of preserving those few local public community facilities we have and also include some intent with regard to increased provision. Has any detailed discussion occurred on possible ideas for this? Can the local schools (Channing/Highgate) offer anything further in this respect. To the extent they already do, should this be mentioned in the Plan? Traffic and Parking At the recent meeting there was quite a lot of reference to the fact that Highgate High Street would have to remain as a traffic throughway (as it always had been), and that is understandable. However, most of the congestion issues are caused when delivery lorries clog up the narrow sections of High Street. For many years, lorries over a certain size and weight have been banned from the Village, but exceptions seem to be made in relation to Tesco and also Dutch flower deliverers. Are these exceptions required to be made? Can we propose that the restriction on the weight and size of vehicles entering the Village should be without exception, except by licence for, say, people moving house? This would certainly encourage delivery vehicles of a sensible size and minimal environmental impact. In addition the part of the High Street between the Highgate Chapel mini roundabout and the 271 Bus Turnaround should be designated more strongly as No Parking. The current single white line gives the wrong signal. There should be double yellow/red lines at this pinch point. If there need to be a loading bay it should be cited at the widest point next to one of the bust stops and time restricted to exclude rush hours Damage to carriageways and Pavements by Development work We never cease to be amazed that apparently developers have no obligations to repair and reinstate the damage they cause to public highways and footpaths by their cranes, heavy lorries and development activities or if they do have obligations, these are never enforced, leaving the local council to foot the bill (when they eventually get round to dealing with the issues caused). Cracked pavements, damaged curb stones, dangerous potholes – Developers should be held to account! Housing – SC1 The list of required needs make no mention of Key Workers, even though the location of the Whittington Hospital (just outside the area) presents major benefits for the residents of Highgate. Do we need to consider nursing staff and hospital workers? Development Backland</p>	Noted - map updated + facilities mentioned included in CIL spending list

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
								<p>development – the Plan dealt with Backland development but it was not quite clear what the policy was intended to be with regard to extensions to/redevelopments of existing houses that substantially fill in the back garden. Could this be made clearer?Key SitesHighgate railway station. What sort of Business/Knowledge centre is envisaged. There are already plenty of ecological information sites in Highgate Woods and Queen’s Woods. Is there scope for anything more exercise focused here? A walking centre? The Start of an ‘outdoor gym’ located along the old railway line?Given the obvious local need for more affordable housing there would appear to us to be considerable potential in the strip of land between Archway and Highgate Woods immediately to the west of the tunnel which, by rafting over the existing tube line, could provide space a major development site for HMOs, studios as well as one/two bedroom flats. This, strangely, does not form part of the Key Area 1 site. Not only would this go some way to solving the requirement for more key worker accommodation it would also help to re-balance Highgate’s ageing demographic profile with accommodation that would be suited to, and sought after by younger buyers releasing other more appropriate sites for the development of homes for the elderly.Pond SquarePond Square should be the focal point of Highgate village and for the Highgate community. It is currently a rather dull, uninviting infill - certainly not an area where members of the community bump into each other and relax in pleasant surroundings. If it to remain as it is, - that is, hardstanding with a few trees - then as a space it should be put to use for weekend markets (farmers’, arts and crafts, etc), and children’s entertainment. Ideally though, it should be properly landscaped with gardens and perhaps a pond (!) but still considered for weekend daytime community uses.We fully support the idea of creating a (paved) public space on the site of the 271 Bus turn around and feel this should be a natural extension of Pond Square, connecting it to the High St.(Whilst recognising the objective of preserving the tranquillity of Pond Square), If Highgate is to be “vibrant” as well as “peaceful” the Plan should embrace some ideas to attract younger residents into the visit and create demand for retail services other than estate agents and charity shops. We should try and think of ideas which would provide a modest ‘draw’ whilst not changing the essential tranquilities of the neighbourhood. One idea would be to copy Hampstead’s very successful ‘Creperie’ stall - hardly revolutionary, but fun and easily managed with restricted trading hours, and guaranteed to increase the footfall through, and the vitality of, the village.Local Planning Resources The hard work, planning and vision that has gone into this document will count for nothing if the Haringey and Camden Planning departments fail adequately to discharge their responsibilities either through lack of resources, competence or enforcement. There are countless examples within the borough of inconsistent application of the council’s own guidance, conservation area policy and in too many instances an absence of enforcement. As part of the ‘localism’ addition to the planning process should there not be the ability to call the planning department to account where it is seen to be failing the community through lack of resources or ability? Perhaps we should have a local representative (a community planning Zsar) who at the pre-committee stage can oversee, comment on and even formally state objections to any officer recommendation which does not conform to existing guidance, established policy or is at odds with the local vision. Planning committees would have to take particular note of any such objection in considering an application. We already can object to planning applications - this would be an objection to the way the application has been considered and reported on by planning officers. (The Highgate Society’s Michael Hammerson is already working tirelessly to hold the Council to account, but from the outside and from the stance of a pressure group, which is so often ignored). Once again, fantastic work so far.</p>	

██████████ a

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12536	890	Luba Chmil	[REDACTED]	82.45.		01/02/2015 20:43:3	01/02/2015 20:43:33	The horrendously huge bins lined up on the pavements of Milton Road and Milton Avenue remind me of an army of Daleks, hogging a significant portion of the pavement and making the area just not feel very nice to walk about, especially when they are overflowing with rubbish. Smaller bins that can be stored in the gardens of the properties need to be brought back with weekly refuse collections as soon as possible. It's hard to believe that the Miltons are in a conservation area, as so little has been done to stop the area looking rundown- the manky lampposts that look as if they are just about to fall apart don't help- the council should consider replacing them with the Heritage style lampposts that other big chunks of Highgate seem to have. What about the Miltons?	as above
12538	871	Louise Lewis	[REDACTED]	124.18		02/02/2015 01:47:0	02/02/2015 01:47:06	We should commend our great number and variety of pubs as social centres enhancing the social and cultural life of the area while reminding us of our history. We should aim to sustain them. They should be included on the map. There is a lot of evidence to show that young people who have links and loyalty to the area, are forced to move away because they cannot afford the accommodation. Similarly people who would have commitment to the area cannot move in. Meanwhile, many of the people who buy the more expensive houses in the area seem to have little commitment to the community and retreat behind high walls and closed gates.	Pub Club established. SC1 on housing amended
12553	890	Paul Dubois	[REDACTED]	94.175		03/02/2015 12:11:4	03/02/2015 12:11:40	I wish to express my concern over the waste management in the Miltons Area of Haringey (Highgate). Three years ago the Council implemented a new policy of placing huge recycling and waste wheelie bins onto the public pavements in the area. The council now collects recycling every week and general rubbish every fortnight. Since this area is made up of many multiple occupancy houses (Victorian terraced properties converted into flats) the waste spills onto the streets and has made a conservation area look very run down and unhygienic. I feel that this issue and the general neglected street scene (some of it quite dangerous with exposed electric cabling on lampposts) of the Miltons area needs to be addressed immediately by the council and included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Miltons Area is truly representative of London, with people from various socio-economic backgrounds but it is constantly getting overlooked and bypassed by other areas of the council. It is no longer acceptable that the Council ignores the issues of the local residents and it is imperative that this plan of our local area includes issues about tackling bin blight and allows residents to challenge the serious bad decisions made by the council.	as above
12566	863	Louise Lewis	[REDACTED]	124.18		04/02/2015 00:39:2	04/02/2015 00:39:27	the idea of the area as a connected wifi area, is an attractive one. would be able to use the telephone boxes as 'hubs'? We should put pressure on the companies to make the connections speeds as fast as possible. Hopefully this would attract business start ups. We should also be looking into using solar power and, possibly, wind power to generate local electricity. there is a windmill marked on old maps.	noted and included in CIL spending list
12578	833	Louise Lewis	[REDACTED]	124.18		05/02/2015 03:34:5	05/02/2015 03:34:51	I'm interested that you believe there are 7000 cars/vans in the area. I only make it 5000, and many of those in households with more than one vehicle. More significant, in my opinion, is the fact that virtually 40% have no car or van. Their environment is seriously compromised both by the number of cars in the area and the amount of traffic entering and passing through. We should have a policy of local employers encouraging employees to use public transport and discouraging them from using cars. There should be a greater emphasis on improving conditions for pedestrians in the plan. We need a bus service linking East West across the borough not just to Crouch End and Muswell Hill. It is difficult to get to the local Primary Health care centre in Park Road, to the mental health services at St Anne's and to Haringey Town Hall, let alone to offices in Tottenham. The traffic jams up Highgate Hill and through the village need serious consideration by the forum and a comprehensive plan addressing the problem needs to be negotiated with the two boroughs.	Noted and new hoppla bus campaign attempting to address this

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12604	890	Julie McLeod		78.146		08/02/2015 15:54:2	08/02/2015 15:54:22	I agree wholeheartedly with the comments regarding the wheelie bins and fortnightly refuse collections in the Miltons and I am supportive on any policy within the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum that will help resolve this problem.I also agree with the comments regarding the lampposts in the Miltons (either refurbishing or replacing with Heritage style).	as above
12607	885	Dan Kendall		213.20		08/02/2015 23:38:2	08/02/2015 23:38:28	I am very pleased to see that the small local open spaces have been specially identified as areas that require protection. I think that these space not only help define the character of Highgate, but doorstep access to open space is integral to the health and wellbeing of residents of all ages.	Local Green Space designation extended to more sites
12620	890	Michael Hamme		212.22		09/02/2015 20:16:3	09/02/2015 20:16:32	As a qualified former professional archaeologist, I strongly support the archaeological policy set out under "Development and Heritage". This makes clear that (a) the area has considerable archaeological potential, and (b) that current policies are (i) inadequate, (ii) cover far too restricted an area, given the extent of recorded archaeological finds well beyond the designated area of archaeological interest, and the documentary evidence available, and (iii) have been disregarded to a deplorable extent by both local authorities, resulting in the likely loss of significant archaeological information. Haringey policy 2, for example, states that it will "ensure that provision is made for archaeological investigation"; yet we can cite only three sites in the Haringey area of Highgate where archaeological work has been required in past decades. The Issues and Justification columns set the requirements out in detail. It is essential that area as historic as Highgate must have stronger and more detailed better protection for its archaeological, as based on this documentation and its supporting evidence.	New policy DH12 to address this
12621	890	Michael Hamme		212.22		09/02/2015 20:25:5	09/02/2015 20:25:56	Policy DH.1, while superficially strong, contains a major and possibly fatal flaw. It states that "Proposals to demolish unlisted buildings that make a significant contribution to the setting and character of one of Highgate's conservation areas (either in a location that is within or visible from the conservation area) will only be supported if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated that outweigh the case for retention." This in fact shows a signal misunderstanding of national heritage policy as enshrined in the NPPF and other guidance; the word "significant" MUST be replaced with "positive", as used in national guidance. "Significant" has an entirely different meaning, and could be used in this context to argue plausibly that any undesignated heritage asset is, by its very nature as being undesignated, "not significant" and that its demolition cannot be resisted. Many undesignated heritage assets are described in the Conservation Area Appraisals as making a "positive" contribution, and this in itself is an argument, under national planning guidance, for their preservation. Indeed, the use of "significant" when applied to the protection of undesignated heritage assets in a Conservation Area is actually contrary to national planning guidance and therefore cannot be admitted. It must therefore be replaced by "positive".	DH policies amended on advice from consultants and Councils

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12648	871	Ines Newman		78.86.		11/02/2015 12:35:0	11/02/2015 12:35:09	<p>I would like to see policy SC1 on Highgate's housing needs reworked to reflect the good aim of 'To help Highgate develop and maintain a strong, integrated community, which works to minimise social deprivation and exclusion'. The current policy will only mean more housing for the very rich. As you must be aware, even small new build flats in the Highgate area which are on the market as so called 'affordable' housing are well out of the reach of all but a small minority of top income earners or young people whose parents buy them a flat. What we need in Highgate is more council housing as it is only council housing that can meet the needs of those who suffer from social deprivation and exclusion. Even housing associations now charge 'affordable rents' which are out of the reach on most households. The idea that Highgate is suitable for self build is bizarre. You would struggle in Highgate to provide a self build house at under £1m and who are the people who can afford this amount of money who would have the time and skills to build their own house? Similarly your proposal for sheltered housing with individual carer space only caters for the very rich. There needs to be more of an evidence base on the cost of new housing in different tenures and who would be able to afford it. A case could be made for sheltered housing put up by a housing association or a co-ownership scheme for the elderly (as is currently just being built in Muswell Hill), for council housing and maybe a Foyer for young people who cannot afford separate accommodation. All your proposals just reinforce the area as an area just for the rich. On a separate point I also think that there are problems with your policy 'The ability of any new development to provide a new community facility on-site available to the whole of the population of the plan area will be treated as a benefit of significant weight'. This stems from a failure to look at the neighbourhood plans in adjoining areas and to think how community provision can be met across a wider area. At the moment we are struggling to maintain the library in Chester Road, The Community Centre in Bertram Street and the community centre in Makepiece Avenue on the Holly Lodge Estate. The last thing we need are more capital projects without revenue funding. Most new developments should seek to upgrade existing provision and support it becoming more viable (e.g. a contribution to revenue funding). There should also be work done on how community provision can be more networked across the area so that the different facilities complement and support each other.</p>	SC policies amended in next draft of Plan
12649	833	Ines Newman		78.86.		11/02/2015 12:56:5	11/02/2015 12:56:52	<p>I fully support the proposal to 'Fight for safe and well-signaled cycle routes'. My main concern is there is no safe cycling path north to south from Highgate to Oak Village/Grafton Road where the road becomes suitable to cycling. There needs to be a north south link across parts of Hampstead Heath. I know there is a strong Heath for Feet lobby and I support restricting cycling on the Heath but those who oppose one more cycle route have never tried cycling down Highgate West Hill (in the bus lane as cyclists are meant to) and turning right into Lissenden Gardens or Gordon House Road. It is extremely dangerous and one day there will be a cycling accident there. Safety is paramount and the Heath is big enough to create one more North/South Route or at least parts of such a route. The large path from Gospel Oak to the East/West cycle path that goes near the cafe and tennis courts is perfectly acceptable for joint use. Millfield Lane is far better than trying to go up Highgate West Hill and is already marked as a cycle route but it should be a formal route and Fitzroy Park should be made into a proper link to the top- alternatively cyclists should be able to use the path that goes past the ladies pond and up to the top along the fence for Kenwood. The current proposals in the plan are not satisfactory.</p>	Forum pursuing this with TfL and Councils
12651	833	Louise Lewis		124.18		11/02/2015 22:44:5	11/02/2015 22:44:57	<p>The pedestrian crossing traffic light by St Augustine's in the Archway needs to change more quickly so that pedestrians can cross quickly and safely. We to encourage more children to walk to school or use public transport. There is a significant easing of traffic in the school holidays. There is a terrible traffic jam on Muswell Hill Road towards the Woodman every school day morning. The timing and frequency of the 603 needs to be improved. I seem to remember that Highgate School (and St Michael's? and others?) did a lot of work on how pupils came to school. It was done for a meeting with TfL a few years back. Perhaps that could be included as evidence in the plan.</p>	Noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12652	885	Louise Lewis		124.18		11/02/2015 23:16:5	11/02/2015 23:16:57	I think Pond Square should have more of a village green atmosphere. I would like to see pond, or some sort of water feature representing the old pond. I would like to see more low level planting so the area looks greener and more inviting. I think this is an underused space. I'm surprised there is no mention of the Highgate Bowl in the plan. The Parkland Walk the little pocket of land between the library and Highgate Station and the Pocket Park on the corner of Shepherd's Hill and Archway should be included.	Highgate Bowl specifically covered by KS3
12712	871	Richard Shipma		109.14		15/02/2015 20:09:0	15/02/2015 20:09:04	I have to agree with Richard Clarke's comments about trying to change the housing demographic is unhelpful in a relatively small geographical area. There is a real risk of undermining what most residents value most about the area - its sense of being a bit special, perched at the highest point of London, and looking down on a distant world. I believe that this is a feeling shared by people in all types of housing - from mansions to social housing, and so it should be. Instead of adopting the "lefty" outlook [as in Louise Lewis's comment] that the rich people "behind their high walls and closed gates" "seem to have little commitment to the community", surely we should be making more effort to engage with them and encourage them to bring benefit to the community. "Rich people" should have as much right to a say in the community as "poor people", not least because they are likely to spend far more in the area. Please do not just write them off, and suggest they are less valuable to the community, out of an ingrained old-fashioned political stance when a little effort could bring an over-proportionate benefit.	Noted
									0
12714	863	Richard Shipma		109.14		15/02/2015 20:36:1	15/02/2015 20:36:17	Additionally, over the years the idea that one can stop people having cars by limiting the parking space available has proved unworkable...	Noted
12740	863	Socrates		82.45.		18/02/2015 23:36:1	18/02/2015 23:36:16	The appearance of the Archway Road needs to be looked at. Main issues include: 1) Many empty shops 2) Too many run-down retail units with tired frontages 3) Fast-moving traffic prevents potential 'high street' feel. More crossings needed in particular at Wembury Road/Langdon Park Road junctions where the road becomes two lanes and cars speed up 4) Business premises converting to residential usage further contributing to break up of 'high street' and detracts aesthetically as execution often distasteful 5) Many residential properties on Archway Road poorly maintained (in particular a long row of badly damaged fencing opposite the International Church) 6) Another supermarket would be useful. Sainsbury's is actually attracting footfall to the area. Although many may oppose this, Archway Road lends itself more to chains than the more quaint Highgate Village which has a Tesco and a multitude of multi-chain restaurants and cafes. I definitely support the proposal to encourage retail and restaurant/cafe usage of new businesses 7) Unattractive rubbish bags of businesses left on the Archway Road everyday. This rubbish spills down residential roads (e.g. Wembury Road) 8) Disconnection between the village and Archway Road. It often feels that the Archway Road is not even part of Highgate	Support noted
12795	765	Susan Rose		86.140		25/02/2015 17:29:4	25/02/2015 17:29:48	Support for Jackson's Lane Centre and Lauderdale House; these provide facilities for young and old to enjoy social and cultural events but suffer from lack of funding; with more money they could develop new events classes etc.	Noted
12796	890	Susan Rose		86.140		25/02/2015 17:37:5	25/02/2015 17:37:50	There should be more re heritage in this section; it should be made clear that the two Conservation Area appraisals which set out clearly the value of the CA and the threats to its integrity are the basis on which development which affects the character of the area will be judged. Developers must have regard to these two documents and follow their guidelines on such matters as dormers etc.	Noted - D&H policies substantially revised in next draft of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12803	833	Louise Lewis		81.151		26/02/2015 12:52:5	26/02/2015 12:52:56	I was speaking to someone at the 'hail and ride' section of W5 who seemingly hasn't been able to post her comments here, so I shall do it for her. She point out that although the 'hail and ride' section is supposed to be just that, in fact the busses only stop at certain points which have occurred from historic precedent. However, if you have never used the route at this section before, as I hadn't, or if you are new to the area, there is no way of telling where these points are. We should inform TfL of the problem and either set up bus stops or ensure that drivers always stop where they are hailed, even if it means stopping many times.	Outside of scope of neighbourhood plan
12804	885	Louise Lewis		81.151		26/02/2015 12:57:2	26/02/2015 12:57:20	I have just returned from Sydney, where some roads have planted 'build outs' rather than extra paving. This should be considered for traffic calming measures in Highgate. Any areas where ownership is uncertain, like the little plot by Cholmeley Lodge currently used for parking, should be investigated and, if possible, taken into common ownership and used appropriately.	Noted
12815	890	Louise Lewis		81.151		26/02/2015 17:55:5	26/02/2015 17:55:57	I have several points to make. 1. Basements. This section should also include hardstanding. The increasing amount of hardstanding not only from building but also from paved parking areas in gardens and the like, increases rainwater runoff and changes the hydrology of the area. All projects decreasing the permeability of the land on site should be assessed under Haringey's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Camden should either commission its own Flood Risk assessment or should try and 'extend' Haringey's. Of course the Camden part of the area is in the Fleet / Thames drainage area, whereas most of the Haringey part is in the Moselle / Lea drainage area. 2. Archaeology. HNF should map the remaining ancient walls in the area eg along Cholmeley Park and at the entrance to Elizabeth House in Winchester Road. Any development in the Area of archaeological interest within the conservation areas, should have an archaeologist to assess the situation. any findings should be in the public domain in the Haringey archives and possibly a Copy in the HSLI library. 3 Character. The yards and private roads and alleys should be accessible by the general public. The yards contribute enormously to the unique character of the village and when developed should enhance the area. 4 Approaches. The various approaches to the village area make their own unique contribution. North Hill and Southwood Lane are mentioned in the plan but Highgate Hill, with its association with Dick Whittington should be a key focus. (Indeed I'm surprised there is no mention of Dick Whittington in the entire plan.) It is especially suited for imaginative improvement as the old embankment still exists in The Bank. It is not necessary to use this road for traffic, except for access, as a perfectly good road exists in Highgate Hill itself. The wall and railings, grade II listed, should be restored to the highest standard and the road used by pedestrians and cyclists avoiding the fumes and noise of the traffic below. 5. Views there are several wonderful views in Highgate. these should be mapped and protected.	Noted - D&H policies substantially revised in next draft of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
12870	1037	Maria		146.90		01/03/2015 18:48:3	01/03/2015 18:48:38	The plan is of very poor quality, according to which St Joseph's Church on Highgate Hill is not in Highgate but Aylmer Parade is East Finchley is. Also, there has been a lack of any consultation. It seems that the same people were consulted repeatedly. The plan reads like a copy and paste of any suburb anywhere.~Presumably those who proposed that the council housing at 1-44 Summersby Close be demolished were not the council tenants living in those homes. ~The plan is also inaccurate. It states that that Hornsey Housing Trust owns Goldsmith Court but Goldsmith Court is owned by a very wealthy tax exempt Asset Trust called the Goldsmith's Trust as part of it's property portfolio. ~The plan is incoherent on the one hand it calls for suitable housing for older people and on the other it calls for the demolition of Goldsmith's Court. Goldsmith's Court is housing for older people on one level (with lift) with attractive accessible gardens close to the shops. Presumably demolition is proposed to provide a windfall gain to the landowner who will use the plan to gain planning permission, leaving the council to pick up the tab for rehousing the elderly who are evicted in the name of progress. ~Were these tenants whose homes you propose to demolish asked their opinion? Why have you not proposed that your homes be demolished? ~Even though I am registered with this website I have never received any notice of any consultation meeting. I have never seen any notice of any Highgate plan consultation meeting either at Highgate library or on the notice area outside even though I pass it some ten times a week.	Site Allocation KS5 substantially changed in next draft of Plan
12888	765	Sue Lees		86.167		02/03/2015 09:28:5	02/03/2015 09:28:54	Can we get some community energy projects off the ground? Perhaps solar panels on St Michael's school if roof faces southwards? Sorry, not au fait with alignment of buildings or whether there are any there already. Do any of the new housing schemes going on in Highgate have a requirement for solar panels?	Addressed in Community Action Plan
12917	833	Caroline Fertle		86.176		03/03/2015 22:13:4	03/03/2015 22:13:40	I would like to see the 603 operate as a proper school bus. The first one is very crowded and often does not get my kids to school on time. The second 603 bus has no school children on it at allThe service was set up to be a school bus but it needs to have another earlier service	Noted
12974	890	Martin Narrawa		92.1.1		05/03/2015 22:36:3	05/03/2015 22:36:37	Policy DH5, 2, vii states S106 CMP's should not be used for basements as they are discharged without the involvement / feedback from affected neighbours. Although this statement is true it would mean a CMP could be submitted at planning and ignored during construction. Better I think to say any CMP must have local community involvement and be enforceable (S106 or other legal agreement) prior to work starting.Also the £2/m3 levy (DH5, 2, iv) looks low when resurfacing can cost £20/m2.	Noted
13054	830	j morgan		81.152		07/03/2015 16:50:4	07/03/2015 16:50:46	Love this whole document and like the way it sets out what to expect for our plan. Clearly lots of work went into this.	Support noted
13165	894	Cindy Blaney		85.92.		10/03/2015 12:04:3	10/03/2015 12:04:39	I do not think the Haringey planners grasp the ecological importance and sensitivity of the bat habitat that is the disused railway tunnels either side of the old platform. All of the tunnels are of regional, if not national, importance for 3 species of bats, and the Natterer's bats in particular. The tunnels are used primarily for hibernation, but also at other times of the year for mating, roosting, and feeding. During hibernation, bats are at particular risk if disturbed too frequently, as this uses up precious fat reserves. Disturbance in the form of additional light and changes to air flow being the most damaging. The tunnels must remain dark, wet, and with little air flow to preserve the habitat, therefore, there is no way that opening any of these tunnels to public access could be allowed by law. Have I made that clear enough now?	Noted
13213	885	Mark Ronan		77.99.		11/03/2015 16:41:3	11/03/2015 16:41:34	I particularly value the open spaces in Highgate — that's why I bought here. I am concerned about Haringey's plans for additional housing on the Hillcrest Estate, which already has a higher density of housing than other areas. Had they wanted extra public housing they could have obtained planning permission for buildings they already owned rather than sell them off.	Ongoing discussions with Haringey Council

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13214	885	Dave Udoinam		94.175		11/03/2015 16:47:5	11/03/2015 16:47:53	I am opposed to the inclusion of Hillcrest as a development site. This is because of the loss of green spaces, overcrowding, loss of privacy, no spaces for the children to play on. I have lived on the Hillcrest Estate for over 10 years and I can't believe that there is a possibility that more housing could be erected on the estate, there just isn't the room for it. I hope common sense prevails and the plan is accepted.	as above + next draft of Plan offers further protection for Hillcrest Local Green Space
13249	885	Alphonsus Mod		87.113		12/03/2015 09:11:3	12/03/2015 09:11:35	I have been a resident in Highgate for over 35 years and the Hillcrest Estate has been a very important feature of my life. The beauty of estate is that the original architects did an outstanding job of balancing the space allocated to developing the apartment blocks and leaving adequate green space for residents to enjoy. It is also equally important that the children of the estate are able to play in a safe environment and not see their homes converted into a concrete jungle. I therefore completely support The Neighbourhood Plan that has been developed by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum.	Support noted
13259	890	Harley Atkinson		86.148		12/03/2015 17:29:5	12/03/2015 17:29:58	I would like to congratulate the many authors of this document on an excellent piece of work. I am particularly supportive of the policies DH4 (gating and enclosure), DH5 (basements) and DH7 (backland development), all of which are designed to exert proper controls on what otherwise can be (and has been) retrograde development in our area.	Support noted
13260	833	Geoffrey Walker		86.148		12/03/2015 17:40:4	12/03/2015 17:40:49	In the 'Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (draft for comment)' there is mention that the Village is reasonably well supplied with Bus Services. I disagree with this as although there are five bus routes available it remains impossible to travel from the Village to the West End without changing. There is a very simple solution to this problem. Extend the route of the C2 up West Hill to at least the Village. It could then easily continue northward. If there is a problem preventing double decker buses from going up West Hill which would necessitate the use of single decker buses then this extended route could be known as the C2 and a ½	Ongoing discussions with TfL
13364	894	m dawes		94.175		14/03/2015 14:57:0	14/03/2015 14:57:05	I am concerned about the proposed access to or from Priory Gardens in any redevelopment in key Area 2 former Highgate Rail Station. I am concerned about building being 'limited to five storeys on this site with the potential for a six storey building' at the corner of Shepherds Hill and Archway Road as set out in SA43 plans for former highgate rail station & Gonnerman Antiques site. It would be good to see some use made of this land but a six storey block seems excessive, and we are not told who the developers are or how far advanced these plans are.	Noted
13368	871	Sarah Wrightso		81.152		14/03/2015 17:43:1	14/03/2015 17:43:16	SC2 Community facilities: I think that Highgate is well served by community facilities. The need is not for buildings, but for providers to manage existing facilities and the funds to do so adequately.	Noted
13371	885	Sarah Wrightso		81.152		14/03/2015 18:48:0	14/03/2015 18:48:07	Open Spaces: Is there any reason why the 'pocket park' on Archway Rd between Boogaloo PH and Gonnermans is not included? It is landscaped & used to have 2 seats.	Noted
13378	894	Sarah Wrightso		81.152		14/03/2015 22:45:4	14/03/2015 22:45:44	KA4 40 Muswell Hill Rd: It would be a pity to lose the amenity of this local Builders Merchant. I note that it is an extremely steep site and overshadows Summersby road. Any new development here being taller is likely to do the same. KA5 Goldsmith Court: As this site lies over two sets of tunnels, the area for redevelopment will be in practice, very restricted (probably to the existing position). It will not be possible to build in front of the existing building line, due to the required sight lines for traffic turning the corner on the Archway Rd junction. If it is intended that the Parkland walk cross the site, it will also need access through the Boogaloo PH site or the allotments, neither of which would be very welcome, before descending by the south end of the tunnels. The existing detour on the Capital Ring via Holmesdale Road is fairly minimal!	Noted in revision of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13380	903	Sarah Wrightso		81.152		14/03/2015 23:13:4	14/03/2015 23:13:46	Community Action PlanCA5: unnecessary as many places to meet: knowledge obtained from libraries or internet; culture by HLSI, Lauderdale House or Gatehouse theatre/ Jacksons Lane theatre; Start-up business guidance online.CA8: why should we have a 2nd festival pa, 1 is enough!CA14: the existing bus 271 terminus is very convenient where it is!CA28: Shared road surfaces are really only possible in cul-de-sacs, or new developments.CA32: Enhancing small pockets of open space- does this not include Coleridge Gardens, Archway Rd beside the Boogaloo PH?	Noted
13427	890	Clive Lewis		94.175		15/03/2015 18:34:3	15/03/2015 18:34:39	Should DH5 positively support basement development? Could the words "will be supported whey they" be deleted and replaced with "should". This would require basement development applications to provide the information required and meet the policy requirements - but stops short of actually supporting them.	Basement policy substantially amended in next draft of Plan
13428	890	Clive Lewis		94.175		15/03/2015 18:36:0	15/03/2015 18:36:05	Should DH5 positively support basement development? Could the words "will be supported where they" be deleted and replaced with "should". This would require basement development applications to provide the information required and meet the policy requirements - but stops short of actually supporting them.	as above
13466	885	Howard Jones		77.99.		16/03/2015 18:19:4	16/03/2015 18:19:49	I oppose the possible development of Hillcrest for the following reasons: 1. Local Green Spaces. Hillcrest includes a number of green spaces which are used as amenity spaces by residents and the wider community. I agree with the designation by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum of these spaces as 'Local Green Spaces'. When they were younger, my children played on these spaces with other local children, and this contributed to the strong sense of community in this part of Highgate. One of the proposed sites is currently a football pitch which is used by children who live on the estate as well as by others. There is no comparable space anywhere in the area which provides a safe place to play within view of many of the children's homes. 2. Rights of Light. The blocking of light and loss of outlook and privacy are a major concern for those who, like us, live on Talbot Road and The Park below the embankment. The raised position of the estate would make any development seem even taller. 3. Pressure on Parking. One of the proposed sites is currently a car park, used by residents and non-residents. The whole of the area with the exception of Hillcrest is a CPZ, and removing parking space from Hillcrest would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding streets, particularly if the Bellway development on the old magistrates' court goes ahead.	as above
13505	833	Louise Lewis		81.151		17/03/2015 15:16:4	17/03/2015 15:16:43	Some earlier ideas for walkers, seem to have disappeared. HNF had a map with footpaths like Tile Kiln Lane, Park House Passage, the path between Southwood Lane and the Wrestlers, the path between the library on Shepherd's Hill and Priory Gardens. It would be positive to include such a map with possible improvements or new pathways along Jackson's Lane, Southwood Lane and Archway Road by the tube station.A major candidate for a cycle cum walkway would be The Bank. There is a perfectly good road for vehicular traffic in Highgate Hill. The Bank could be made access only and landscaped for pedestrians and considerate cyclists. This would meet many policy objectives, within traffic, open spaces, community and heritage. The wall and railings desperately need renewing as des the road surface. My understanding is that heritage lottery funding is there, with Haringey, to do it.	noted
13506	885	Louise Lewis		81.151		17/03/2015 15:19:2	17/03/2015 15:19:25	Would it be possible to add 'protected' views eg the city from the Archway and Hornsey Lane bridge, the city from Waterlow Park, the view down Highgate Hill?	This has been done in next draft where regulation allows

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
								My comments on the plan are specific and relate to proposing development with significant change on land designated as Conservation area and the review of CA boundaries generally and nature conservation. It was a known problem at Haringey that previous management were reluctant to make, indeed resisted, any proposal to change Conservation Area boundaries. It appears likely that this avoidance of the a key part of appraisal and the expectation to review boundaries was due to a poor mapping capability. The present management agrees with my stance that boundaries should be reviewed AND that they should be tightly drawn round the areas where preservation and enhancement is necessary and justified. In the draft Neighbourhood Plan significant development that will remove present inappropriate or unsightly and character damaging development on parcels of land that also carry CA status. These are the depot site in Muswell Hill Road (Key area 4) and the run of modern warehouses on the Archway Road (southern part of Key Area 1) the overlap and thus the anomaly is clear on the Key Diagram on page 5. These sites should be taken out of the designated area by a CA boundary revision to remove the anomaly. Whilst doing a revision, some properties on the west side of Stanhope Road are part of the Crouch End CA. With the old ward boundary on the centreline of Stanhope Road defining the NF area, and the proposed Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum area potentially abutting it, it makes sense to transfer these properties to the Highgate conservation area (north of the Parkland Walk over bridge). There was a view that having a development site in a CA allows negotiation of a better standard of development. This stance is unjustified and actually devalues the meaning of a Conservation Area and the reason for its designation. The redevelopment of incongruous structures and the evolution of new structures more in keeping with the scale, massing and character of existing development, or the establishment of new statement of excellent quality in the context of the area makes sense where there are isolated pockets of sub-standard development within a more cohesive area, so the site at the junction of Archway Road and Shepherds Hill does not need to be removed and its redevelopment does not, in my view, require de-designation. In respect of nature conservation the proposal to open up the bat tunnels as a walking route is a dangerous suggestion and not only removes the measures recently installed to make the habitat more conducive, but the well meaning idea actually leads nowhere useful and introduces many possibilities for crime and anti social behaviour. I therefore consider the penultimate bullet point of policy KA 2 should be deleted. The improved use of semi derelict station structures and the removal of unsightly additions is interesting as is the surface route from Highgate Library to Holmesdale Road through the suggested redevelopment site. These ideas, if sympathetically executed, could be welcome enhancements and improve the linkages between Parkland Walk (South), Highgate Wood and the Northern section.	
13509	890	Chris Mason		82.44.		17/03/2015 17:10:1	17/03/2015 17:10:11		Noted
								We have consulted our membership on the issues and the single point that concerns them is the use of the tunnels as a public route. The Friends Committee has concluded that this is an undesirable proposal and wishes to convey to the Forum the following five points: 1) Will destroy bat roosts. Bats - protected species 2) Increased lighting will affect bat habitat and behaviour outside the tunnel. Bats - protected species 3) Increased footfall/pedal fall also affect other wildlife in a particularly undisturbed section including grey wagtail on amber protection list 4) Use of tunnels will attract anti social behaviour as it does at every other tunnel and underpass notably graffiti, but also potentially much more serious crimes against the person. 5) Alternative route for connecting Parkland Walk to Capital Ring avoiding Archway Road by going up Holmesdale Road and round behind Goldsmith Court is less intrusive in the nature reserve, more open and considerably less expensive. Chris Mason - Secretary FPW.	
13510	890	Friends of the P		82.44.		17/03/2015 17:15:3	17/03/2015 17:15:38		KS2 amended in next draft of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13513	971	Ian Henghes		77.101		17/03/2015 21:27:4	17/03/2015 21:27:45	The planning application and appeals system is daunting, especially for the uninitiated. That there are disagreement about the nature and extent of proposals is unsurprising. The need for a legal pathway to planning decisions is obvious. The Planning Inspectorate is the ultimate arbiter in planning decisions, and it seems necessary that it should exist. It is however deeply troubling that Planning Inspectors exercise very significant discretionary interpretation of legislation and planning guidelines. I would urge the Forum to meet with other newly founded bodies under the localism act, and discuss the possibility of making a joint approach to parliament with a view to legislating to ensure there are clearer regulations governing the Inspectorate. It should for example not be possible for a Planning Inspector to rule against the evidence of more than a given proportion, or types of witnesses at an appeal. Presently a ruling can go against the combined weight of Local Authorities, Conservation Area Committees, Residents associations, English Heritage and other interested groups, yet there is no realistic recourse, as any legal challenge is hard to mount and has very strictly limited grounds. The present system is therefore highly undemocratic and can readily lead to inappropriate outcomes.	Noted
13514	863	Ian Henghes		77.101		17/03/2015 21:29:0	17/03/2015 21:29:08	EA1 - Highgate village would benefit from more joined up thinking from the two councils and initiatives such as a raised shared carriageway to slow traffic and make it more pedestrian friendly. Signage from Highgate Tube including 'finger post' signs should be revisited.	In Community Action Plan
13515	833	Ian Henghes		77.101		17/03/2015 21:29:5	17/03/2015 21:29:57	TR3 - encourage the provision of charging points for electric vehicles. More Visible points will help to increase uptake of environmentally friendly vehicles.	Amended to include in next draft of Plan
13516	890	Ian Henghes		77.101		17/03/2015 21:31:4	17/03/2015 21:31:46	DH1 - Where buildings are to be demolished to make way for new development attention must be given to both the surrounding architectural styles in any new proposal, as well as to the bulk and height of new developments such that they do not detract from existing views and encourage additional sight-lines rather than removing any.	Noted
13517	903	Ian Henghes		77.101		17/03/2015 21:34:0	17/03/2015 21:34:03	CA1 The HNF should consider providing a central resource for linking people with skills and interests to community based projects and opportunities. If possible a mixed model should be adopted, allowing for people to participate differently depending on the circumstances. Thus someone might volunteer on a project, or provide services under a payment free barter arrangement, or be remunerated according to an agreed model.CA2 / CA11 The Highgate Calendar should be supported to develop its full potential and promoted both as a community resource and as a way of attracting visitors.CA3 Ideas for green walkways especially near Highgate tube should be encouraged. CIL funds could usefully be applied to such projects.CA5 could be developed in tandem with CA1, but will need to be done sensitively in relation to existing community bodies and venues.CA8 is a somewhat meaningless aspiration as expressed. Better to raise the 'sustainability' profile of Highgate by encouraging energy efficiency, and low carbon schemes and initiatives and try to ensure there is a relevant presence at local events.CA20 community Wi-Fi is to be encouraged. This could build out from existing hubs such as the Highgate Society. CA22 bike routes should be encouraged wherever possible.CA25 reduction of school run traffic and encouragement of car sharing deserves the strong support of the Forum.	Support for community action noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13520	830	Edgar Whitley		86.147		17/03/2015 23:51:5	17/03/2015 23:51:52	I write in response to this draft plan. I am a house owner in Priory Gardens and have lived here for fourteen years. Unfortunately, I only learned about the Neighbourhood Plan at the beginning of this week when it was brought to my attention by someone who lives in our street who attended a meeting and emailed all the residents of Priory Gardens to inform us of the proposals. Page 9 of the report notes "the importance placed on consultation and the engagement of Highgate's residents, businesses and stakeholders". This process included "A community survey delivered to all 8000 households in the plan area". I do not recall ever receiving a copy of the community survey and a quick poll of fellow residents in Priory Gardens reveals that no neighbours in Priory Gardens appear to have received a copy either. Whilst it is possible that some of us may have overlooked the survey, the fact that no neighbours appears to have received the survey suggests that there has been a significant failure in the consultation and engagement process. This is particularly worrying because four of the Key Area proposals (KA1, KA2, KA4 and KA5) particularly affect Priory Gardens.	Priory Gardens residents particularly targeted in next round of consultation publicity
13521	830	Vivien Priestley		86.147		17/03/2015 23:52:2	17/03/2015 23:52:23	I write in response to this draft plan. I am a house owner in Priory Gardens and have lived here for fourteen years. Unfortunately, I only learned about the Neighbourhood Plan at the beginning of this week when it was brought to my attention by someone who lives in our street who attended a meeting and emailed all the residents of Priory Gardens to inform us of the proposals. Page 9 of the report notes "the importance placed on consultation and the engagement of Highgate's residents, businesses and stakeholders". This process included "A community survey delivered to all 8000 households in the plan area". I do not recall ever receiving a copy of the community survey and a quick poll of fellow residents in Priory Gardens reveals that no neighbours in Priory Gardens appear to have received a copy either. Whilst it is possible that some of us may have overlooked the survey, the fact that no neighbours appears to have received the survey suggests that there has been a significant failure in the consultation and engagement process. This is particularly worrying because four of the Key Area proposals (KA1, KA2, KA4 and KA5) particularly affect Priory Gardens.	as above
13530	830	Adrian Henrique		82.44.		18/03/2015 09:52:4	18/03/2015 09:52:43	I write in response to this draft plan. I have been a resident at 14 Priory Gardens for 15 years. Unfortunately, I only learned about the Neighbourhood Plan at the beginning of this week when it was brought to my attention by another resident of our street who attended a meeting about the Plan and emailed all the residents of Priory Gardens to inform us of the proposals. Page 9 of the report notes "the importance placed on consultation and the engagement of Highgate's residents, businesses and stakeholders". This process included "A community survey delivered to all 8000 households in the plan area". I do not recall ever receiving a copy of the community survey and a quick poll of fellow residents in Priory Gardens reveals that no neighbours in Priory Gardens appear to have received a copy either. Whilst it is possible that some of us may have overlooked the survey, the fact that no neighbours appear to have received the survey suggests that there has been a significant failure in the consultation and engagement process. This is particularly worrying because four of the Key Area proposals (KA1, KA2, KA4 and KA5) particularly affect Priory Gardens.	as above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13535	885	Sarah C		146.19		18/03/2015 13:01:1	18/03/2015 13:01:19	<p>It's wonderful that the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum has designated Hillcrest a 'Local Green Space'. Over the years, I have seen how non-residents come to enjoy and benefit from Hillcrest's open spaces, coming and just drinking in the peace and tranquility of the greenery, the trees and the wildlife (the birds and squirrels). The greatest value of the open spaces, however, lies in the sense of community they foster among the residents. Although Hillcrest's residents span many generations and represent a number of continents, the estate's green spaces provide us with the opportunity to come together and get to know one another. At the individual level, there is nothing more soothing and calming at the end of a difficult day than to enter Hillcrest and to let the greenery and the open spaces wash away the stresses and strains before you enter your block, so that as you cross the threshold of your individual flat you are refreshed.</p> <p>From your flat, there is hardly anything more enjoyable than hearing the sound of the children (of all colours and ages) playing together outside. It really warms the heart. And at the start of a new day, the birdsong that accompanies you as you leave in the morning lifts your spirit and strengthens you for the day ahead.</p>	support noted
13536	836	j morgan		81.152		18/03/2015 15:06:2	18/03/2015 15:06:27	<p>wonderful descriptors of what Highgate is a village but in London and worth a visit.</p>	support noted
13540	894	martin adeney		77.99.		18/03/2015 17:18:4	18/03/2015 17:18:43	<p>I am commenting as he Chairman of the Friends of the Highgate Bowl, the charity set up to purchase open land in the Bowl with the intention of keeping it as open land and to use it as an environmental learning centre for the local community with links to schools and also adult training in horticulture and local ecology. The plan's policy (KA3) does not commit strongly enough to keeping the current open land in the Bowl as open space. It is too focused on development opportunities in (we hope) other areas of the Bowl and while talking about footpaths and protecting the SINC designation which refers to a particular, more narrowly defined area, it does not categorically talk of preserving the open land. This should be included as one of the bullet points.</p>	KS3 amended in next draft of Plan

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13560	894	Carrie Kirkpatric		90.204		19/03/2015 08:49:2	19/03/2015 08:49:25	<p>It's disgusting that no one in Priory Gardens has been informed or consulted on these plans despite your claims of extensive consultation. We only discovered these plans a few days ago because one of our neighbours went to a meeting. Your suggestions of another access road into Priory Gardens are ludicrous and verging on insane. Where would you put it, right in the middle of the tube station? The woodland adjacent to the library and the area surrounding the old station are protected conservation areas and require permission from the council to even trim a tree. never mind rip them down, which is undoubtedly what your money hungry developers will do. Then there is the considerable noise, dirt and disruption that your construction will cause. Many residents work from home and their working days will become unbearable with the incessant noise. The next point is traffic. Priory Gardens is a quiet cul de sac, with many young families. If a large vehicle has to drive into it, it is very disruptive and they cannot turn around. Even though the official entrance to the station is through the station car park, we have found that construction vehicles always end up using our road which quite simply is not capable of withstanding that much traffic." I write in response to this draft plan. I have been a resident in Priory Gardens for a number of years. Unfortunately, I only learned about the Neighbourhood Plan at the beginning of this week when it was brought to my attention by another resident of our street who attended a meeting about the Plan and emailed all the residents of Priory Gardens to inform us of the proposals. What of the Conservation Area, the haven for wildlife, the much needed trees to counteract the significant pollution of the Archway Road? Does this all mean nothing now that rich developers have pound signs in their eyes? Your failure to even mention it to the residents of Priory Gardens, that would be so drastically affected by your schemes, is shocking and underhand. Rest assured, if you plan to destroy our lovely area, you will have a fight on your hands. And let's not forget the disastrous effect your plans would have on local house prices....Page 9 of the report notes "the importance placed on consultation and the engagement of Highgate's residents, businesses and stakeholders". This process included "A community survey delivered to all 8000 households in the plan area". I do not recall ever receiving a copy of the community survey and a quick poll of fellow residents in Priory Gardens reveals that no neighbours in Priory Gardens appear to have received a copy either. Whilst it is possible that some of us may have overlooked the survey, the fact that no neighbours appear to have received the survey suggests that there has been a significant failure in the consultation and engagement process. This is particularly worrying because four of the Key Area proposals (KA1, KA2, KA4 and KA5) particularly affect Priory Gardens".</p>	as above
13562	830	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:04:3	19/03/2015 09:04:34	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. P10. [As the Brundtland definition of sustainable development is so powerful, yet very short, it should be quoted:] "The community started with Brundtland's definition: "sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland - Commission of the United Nations on March 20, 1987) and developed a 'Sustainability Tree' illustrating local effect on the environment. (@ 'Supporting Documents' at Introduction section of website)" [above to replace:] Starting with the Brundtland Commission's definition of sustainability, first summarised in 2001, the community helped develop a 'Sustainability Tree', (pictured on website: Sustainability Tree).</p>	Noted
13563	836	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:07:1	19/03/2015 09:07:18	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. P17. [Suggest adding to the text as shown here:] "The result is limited cross connectivity and poor accessibility to some parts of the Plan area, particularly for less mobile residents, as well as increasing the number of car journeys and therefore pollution and CO2 emissions."</p>	Noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13564	856	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:14:5	19/03/2015 09:14:59	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. Page 19 Highgate Neighbourhood Forum Plan – 2015 – the Vision[Suggest amending the text as shown here:]Highgate should grow and prosper as a united community across the artificial boundary between the London Boroughs of Camden and Haringey.It should be a vibrant place that protects its unique character and heritage, while embracing new ideas and beneficial change.It should be home to a community that can work together to meet local needs, while respecting its differences and diversity.It should be a neighbourhood that complements and connects with neighbouring communities.Highgate should aim to present an example, through its planning decisions, to other similar communities and to the rest of London of the need for steady reduction of CO2 emissions, in line with the explicit sustainable policies of both boroughs.All of these factors combined should make Highgate a better place both to live and work [minor edit here – removal of the split infinitive!]P19 [the current statement (and golden threads at p9 and p10) discuss social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainability, but then lead into Social, Economic, Traffic, Open Spaces and Development, begging the question how do these last three relate to environment? How about:]The Core Objectives of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan are designed to help achieve the vision set out above. They have been carefully developed to provide a set of targets for the Plan which seek to deliver the social, economic and environmental sustainability of the Plan area, in line with the NPPF. Highgate's 'environment' is essentially it's roads, open spaces and buildings that are covered in the Plan by Traffic and Transport, Open Spaces and Public Realm and Development and Heritage. The core objectives are as follows:[P20 – Economic Activity objectives suggest following amendment:] In the interests of a varied, sustainable and lively local economy with its own identity, and retaining money within the community, we would like to encourage and support independent, non-chain retailers and businesses to be successful in Highgate village and on the Archway Road.</p>	Vision substantially rewritten in next draft of Plan
13565	885	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:18:3	19/03/2015 09:18:30	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. P56 [to be inserted after 6 Peace Park]7 Highgate School ChurchyardHighgate Churchyard is an important visual feature and ecological link at the top of Highgate High Street. This ancient churchyard is the responsibility of Haringey Council, and, as is the case with thereservoirs, there is no public access. However, in the last few years the Highgate Society has arranged with Haringey Council a wildflower-friendly mowing regime and various native wildflowers and bulbs have been planted by volunteers, to improve the visual amenity of the site from the exterior, and to boost biodiversity. In future it is hoped to take interested groups of residents round the churchyard to study both the biodiversity and the memorials.</p>	Highgate School has pointed out that the Churchyard in owned by them, not Haringey, and they would not welcome public access
13566	890	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:22:1	19/03/2015 09:22:15	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. P63. [There is a map of NO2 air pollution, but there is no equivalent for CO2 emissions from vehicles, or text relating these or anything that could be done.]</p>	Forum has undertaken further initiatives on air quality

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13570	894	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:46:1	19/03/2015 09:46:19	Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text from Sue Lees. p77 KA1 Underground rail sidings/460-500 Archway Road[Suggest add in:] As part of a transition to a sustainable low (or zero) carbon future, any redevelopment should include substantial generation of renewable energy, which might be financed by local residents via an Industrial and Provident Society (Benefit of the Community).P80 KA2 Former Highgate Railway Station[Suggest add in:] As part of a transition to a sustainable low (or zero) carbon future, any redevelopment should include substantial generation of renewable energy, which might be financed by local residents via an Industrial and Provident Society (Benefit of the Community).P87 KA4 Summersby Road[Suggest add in:] As part of a transition to a sustainable low (or zero) carbon future, any redevelopment should include substantial generation of renewable energy, which might be financed by local residents via an Industrial and Provident Society (Benefit of the Community).P91 KA5 Goldsmith's Court [Suggest add in:] Any redevelopment should include substantial generation of renewable energy.	Noted
13571	971	Sydney Charles		86.148		19/03/2015 09:47:4	19/03/2015 09:47:42	Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate (text within [] is comment, text within " " is suggested text. [P97 Delivery and MonitoringDH6/DH1A. Not sure who 'Sustainable Highgate' are?]	Text amended in next draft of Plan
13572	830	Paul Gath		213.86		19/03/2015 12:18:2	19/03/2015 12:18:29	Regarding the draft plan it appears that no one in Priory Gardens has received the consultation documents. Since the proposals may have dramatic impact on Priory Gardens I am somewhat dismayed that consultation has got off to a poor start. Please ensure this is remedied going forward and that the voices of a community of all ages are heard.Best,Paul	as above
13574	890	Gail Waldman		81.151		19/03/2015 14:48:5	19/03/2015 14:48:57	Because Highate is served by underground stations and bus routes, the area has a fairly high density rating using PTAL as set out in the London Plan. However the span of density within our PTAL rating is exceptionally wide. This span indicates that consideration needs to be given to the appropriate PTAL rating for the nature of place. It therefore makes more sense to look at the context of a development site in particular in terms of height, bulk, massing of local buildings, significant features and views and to place less emphasis on the PTAL rating.	Noted
13575	890	Gail Waldman		81.151		19/03/2015 14:54:0	19/03/2015 14:54:03	Advertising hoardings, backlit or otherwise, normally detract from a Conservation Area. The Archway Road Character Appraisal sought to restrict the impact and reduce the numbers of advertiement hoardings. HNF should include a policy which encourages removal of existing hoardings and prevents new hoardings being istalled.	Outside of scope of neighbourhood plan
13580	822	maureen		82.45.		19/03/2015 19:06:4	19/03/2015 19:06:42	I live on Hillcrest in Highgate and believe that our green spaces should be included in the plan as a local green space. Having lived here for going on 20 years, I cannot state enough how valuable the green space is to the local community. If the council build on it as they wish to, not only will we lose important open space, I feel it will lead to overcrowding and loss of privacy.	as above re Hillcrest comments

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13581	890	Delcia Keate		86.167		19/03/2015 19:58:0	19/03/2015 19:58:07	<p>The draft HNP represents a huge amount of work, largely by volunteers, which I hope will be appreciated by all who read and respond, regardless of any particular concerns they may have about its scope or content. I welcome the recognition of Highgate's unique historic character (Section 2) and that Development and Heritage is a Core Objective (Section 3: a Vision for Highgate). Deserving of mention here is that the Plan area, in addition to being almost entirely within designated conservation areas with a plethora of listed buildings, has no less than three landscapes included in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Architectural or Historic Interest: Highgate Cemetery (Grade I) and Kenwood and Waterlow Park (both Grade II*). This close proximity of three nationally designated landscapes, the setting for one of London's most important historic villages, is unique in a regional context and a major contributor to Highgate's special character. Additionally, within the Plan area are five Archaeological Priority Areas which may also have implications for any development proposals. The policies in Section 4: Development and Heritage require further consideration. First, this section focuses heavily on demolition, a significant but by no means the predominant threat; the sole heritage policy proper (DH1) relates to demolition. This should be amended to read "Proposals to demolish buildings that make a positive contribution to the setting and character of one of Highgate's conservation areas....". not 'significant' as this would dilute, and be inconsistent with, national and local planning policies and guidance. The policies otherwise do not adequately reflect the Core Objective of Section 3, or indeed issues that are raised within this section and elsewhere in the document. First, a discrete DH policy is required for the design of new development, an issue which appears at various points within the wider document but requires special emphasis here. It should state that all new development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and its setting, the setting of listed buildings and other designated or undesignated heritage assets. Second, insufficient weight is given the impact of extensions and alterations to existing buildings. This is especially prevalent in the late-Victorian and 20th century 'suburban' residential areas of Highgate, which face considerable development pressure for overscaled and poorly designed extensions, and incremental alterations which sometimes fall outside planning control - eg. replacement windows; removal of front garden walls and paving over front gardens for off-street parking, with attendant loss of planting - which cumulatively detract from the area's character. A third DH policy is therefore needed to address these matters, which may call for more robust enforcement by the respective councils and, where appropriate, the introduction of Article 4 Directions to remove permitted development rights. Third, the respective Haringey and Camden Conservation Area Appraisals for Highgate should be cited as key documents which expand upon and underpin the heritage policies in the HNP. Fourth, with regard to DH2 refuge storage and the subsequent environmental policies, while certainly impacting on conservation areas, these do not belong here, but require a dedicated section.</p>	support noted
13582	885	Ben Pollard		82.45.		19/03/2015 20:02:1	19/03/2015 20:02:16	<p>Re: Neighbourhood plan I live on a ground floor flat on the Hillcrest Estate. I am very much in support of the idea of keeping the green spaces on the estate as green spaces. I have a 4 year old girl and a 6 month old boy. I sometimes take my daughter out around the estate to look at the trees and pick up leaves. We also regularly go 'exploring' round the back of the estate where it is slightly overgrown, by daughter calls this the 'jungle'. It would be a real pity if this wonderful estate and all the green spaces were not preserved. I want my children to be able to run around on the grass and experience having some nature around them and not more concrete. The estate works well at the moment and will be a lovely space again once all the builders have left. Please can we keep it that way. It would be tragic if any more buildings are built on the estate.</p>	as above re Hillcrest comments

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13583	885	Michal Pollard	██████████	82.45.		19/03/2015 21:11:0	19/03/2015 21:11:06	I am a lease holder at Hillcrest Estate and I totally support the designation of Hillcrest Estate as a 'Local Green Space'. It is very important to me to maintain the quality of life we have here as we use the open spaces a lot and for various reasons and for different ages from the football pitch to the mini forest and picnics and children playing on the different areas of green. Any new tower blocks will severely ruin all that. If you need more help in support I will happily contribute !	as above
13585	833	Adrian Betham	██████████	78.86.		19/03/2015 22:51:2	19/03/2015 22:51:29	After twenty years campaigning initiated by the Highgate and Islington Societies the gyratory at Archway is now to go. The equally unnecessary gyratory in Highgate village went far sooner, accompanied by welcome easing of traffic speeds and other adverse impact on the roads both within and leading from the circuit. Those problems remain around and leading from the Wellington gyratory as evidenced by the North Hill Nightmare campaign. No one would impose such a gyratory on a cross roads these days, and policy should be for its removal just as the others introduced at the same time and for the same reason are removed. Phasing of traffic lights replacing the existing ones can be adjusted to ensure that traffic is not displaced to anyone's disadvantage, and avoidance of excess speeds and other dangers generated by the gyratory together with improved access will benefit everyone.	Noted
13586	833	Adrian Betham	██████████	78.86.		19/03/2015 23:04:1	19/03/2015 23:04:10	Highgate and East Finchley have long suffered by lack of services to the south-west, west of Tottenham Court Road and south of Golders Green to get to the West End or Paddington. Extending the C2 to East Finchley will be a simple way of mitigating this, even at the expense if necessary of curtailing the 214 to Parliament Hill Fields in its place. This would provide space for the 271 to turn in place of the 214 in North Road, improving interchange and frequency by buses to common destinations departing from the same stops and thus avoiding the suicidal dash across the High Street to catch the 271 or 210/143. Better however not to turn buses from the south at the top of North Hill short of buses from the north turning at its foot. More than adequate space exists at East Finchley station designed as a bus turn and readily accommodating all the buses needed for rail replacement when the Northern Line is closed.	Subject to ongoing discussions with TfL
13587	833	Adrian Betham	██████████	78.86.		19/03/2015 23:11:3	19/03/2015 23:11:35	The double-decker being very crowded shows that the 603 proves its worth, and that its service should be widened. More people arrive than leave Highgate by bus each morning, not least for Highgate having its own schools with many on the 603 route, but timings are only for getting to and from schools in Hampstead. Non-bus travel use shows the demand for Muswell Hill-Highgate-Hampstead-Finchley Road and the 603 should be expanded (as originally proposed) into a full service to meet this demand. If not immediately a full service, at least expand the peak hour service and use it to replace the Kenwood Concert shuttle.	as above
13588	833	Adrian Betham	██████████	78.86.		19/03/2015 23:50:2	19/03/2015 23:50:29	Our house is in North Road, right by a bus stop, and its use by double deckers has never been a problem. Now by the occasional 603 and 143 while all 143's were double decked when we chose to come here and buy the house. The double deckers are no wider and are shorter than the single decked 214's.	as above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13589	833	Adrian Betham		78.86.		20/03/2015 00:17:3	20/03/2015 00:17:35	<p>Policy should explicitly be for routes to serve common stops as soon as the converge, at the last point before they diverge, at points closest to interchange and closest to other points of demand. Though well provided in some ways, the arrangement of stops takes away from what choice there would otherwise be: - buses to Archway start from opposite sides of the High Street. - buses and right buses to as far as Moorgate, 214 and 271, leave from points out of sight from each other. - buses to East Finchley from North Hill near the Highgate Primary school, 143/603 and 243/263/N20, do not stop together there or until the other side of Aylmer Road. - buses to Archway, 143 and 263, do not stop together south of Woodside Avenue although the 234 starts from Archway Road turning right with the 143 into Bakers Lane. - 214 turns at Castle Yard but does not pick up passengers until the Hampstead Lane stop. Not far away and a frequent service but, if you miss one and have to wait 7 minutes you might miss a train at Kentish Town and have to wait 15 minutes which might mean waiting 30 minutes at Blackfriars for the next train to Gatwick and missing your flight. - At Highgate Station southbound buses do not stop together where they meet in Archway Road nearly until Jacksons Lane. Those in Muswell Hill, 43 & 134, stop across Wood Lane and as far as possible from the station without passengers actually being able to see them arriving around the bend. - At Highgate Station northbound buses to North Finchley, 263/N20 and 134/N134, do not stop together north of Jacksons Lane and again the Muswell Hill Road stop is a long dash from the Station. Similar poor onwards connections to and from Highgate occur at Muswell Hill, mitigated by the new 144/W7 stop, and at Archway but outside the area of the Plan.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of a neighbourhood plan. Ongoing discussions with TfL</p>
13590	833	Adrian Betham		78.86.		20/03/2015 00:22:2	20/03/2015 00:22:29	<p>The Highgate Society through Brendan Nolan did the study that found an extraordinary number of bus routes used by pupils getting to schools in Highgate, the point being how many changes were necessary given how few routes serve the schools themselves. This suggests policies both to improve the spread of services and to improve interchange where this is necessary, for instance not to have to dash across a busy rush hour road.</p>	<p>as above</p>
13595	885	Vanessa Lee		94.175		20/03/2015 08:41:3	20/03/2015 08:41:36	<p>I have lived in the Hillcrest estate for over 5 years and love the community spirit and feel of the area. As private residential space in London is very hard to come by or very expensive, it's lovely to have the open spaces on the estate for the children to play and for families to sit out on the benches. I have recently become a mother and look forward to my daughter playing in these areas. However since there is a possibility of new flats being built on these open spaces we are possibly looking to move away from the area as we feel taking these open spaces away would be detrimental to the area, environment, community and our future children.</p>	<p>Next draft Plan does all it can to protect Hillcrest's Open Spaces - policy OS3</p>

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13599	894	Dan Stranescu,		77.103		20/03/2015 10:31:5	20/03/2015 10:31:57	<p>Below, the Resolution adopted on 19th March 2015 by the Goldsmiths Court Residents Association, opposed to the inclusion of Key Area 5: Goldsmiths Court in the Neighbourhood Plan Draft for consultation published by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum in January 2015: We, the undersigned, resident at Goldsmiths Court, Shepherds Hill, Highgate and members of Goldsmiths Court Residents Association hereby resolve –1) That the Goldsmiths Court Residents Association seek the removal of Key Area 5: Goldsmiths Court from the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum Neighbourhood Plan pending full consultation of all residents and the elaboration through due process of a strategy accurately representing residents' views and long-term needs. Specifically –a) The Key Area 5 proposals have been prepared without prior consultation of Goldsmiths Court residents. b) The Neighbourhood Plan cannot therefore claim to and does not represent the views of Goldsmiths Court residents and cannot respond in its current form to their specific needs. c) The Neighbourhood Plan has failed to examine options for improvement of the existing housing stock through refurbishment, upgrading and incremental development of existing buildings as opposed to complete redevelopment. d) The Neighbourhood Plan arbitrarily and without proper justification shows bias in favour of wholesale redevelopment, notwithstanding the profoundly disruptive nature of such a strategy to Goldsmiths Court residents. e) In pursuing this approach, the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum has failed to promote a policy consistent with its declared support (HNF Constitution, para 5.5) for elderly and vulnerable members of the community, categories which accurately describe most of the Goldsmiths Court residents. f) Contrary to its stated policy (HNF Constitution, para 5.6), the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum has failed to differentiate between the specific needs of the Goldsmiths Court residents, most of whom have exceeded retirement age, some with physical and medical conditions which demand continuity, stability and minimal disruption of living routines and who will derive no benefit from the intended vibrancy of the public realm (HNF Constitution, para 5.2) as opposed to the wider residential and business community targeted by the Neighbourhood Plan. 2) That the Goldsmiths Court Residents Association reject and express its determination to vigorously and unequivocally oppose the presumption that individual community needs should be subordinate to the aspiration of the Neighbourhood Plan to align future development to the character of the area as a whole.</p> <p>Signatures Flat 6: John McGovern (Member) Flat 10: Dan Stranescu (Chairman) Flat 5: Joan Elsby (Member) Flat 11: Cecil Peters (Member) Flat 3: Lascelles Webber (Member) Flat 7: Mary Mangan (Member) Flat 15: Joyce Carmichael (Member) Flat 2: Claudette B Samuels (Member) Flat 8: Catherine Williams (Member) Flat 9: Mike Kennedy (Member) Flat 13: Josephine Burke (Member) Flat 16: Beverley Phillips (Secretary) Flat 10: Maria Stranescu (Member) Flat 1: Alice Judge (Member)</p>	KS5 significantly amended in next draft, in agreement with Goldsmiths Court residents
13600	856	Neil Perkins		92.25		20/03/2015 10:44:5	20/03/2015 10:44:59	<p>Pond Square is a beautiful and unique open space. It certainly is an area where members of the community bump into each other and relax in pleasant surroundings. This peaceful and tranquil space away from the traffic and bustle of the High Street certainly does not need a weekend market.</p>	noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13601	894	Rachel Allison		82.45.		20/03/2015 10:59:5	20/03/2015 10:59:55	<p>We are proposing that the station and station house are restored to form a "knowledge centre". This would include exhibition space, possibly a business hub, cycle storage etc. but everything is still very open to suggestion. Under our proposal the woods will not be touched nor the tunnels for the bats. We have met with some sections of TfL who are supportive, but we have also heard rumours that other sections of TfL have ambitious plans for the site including 6 storey housing. We will resist this strongly and are talking to Haringey to try to ensure that its site allocation document reflects ours. The point is, is that there is a large site at the foot of Priory Gardens and its inclusion in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan should afford it some protection. If you don't like what we are proposing then please write and tell us what you would like to see instead because if it is not included in the Neighbourhood Plan then it may become subject to a free-for-all. Please add any comments on the Plan to the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum website at http://www.highgateneighbourhoodforum.org.uk/plan/section-5-key-areas/ - scroll down to comment box at bottom of page, and please also sign up for our regular e-newsletter to keep in touch. The consultation officially closes on 20th March but we will keep comments open until 9am on 23rd. Additionally, you have until 27th March to respond to Haringey's Site Allocation consultation, which you can find on the Haringey council website. There have also been suggestions that Priory Gardens has not been included in the Plan Consultation process. To clarify, a survey leaflet was hand delivered to every household in the Gardens during the summer of 2012. This, and other engagement workshops and campaigns since then, encouraged people to sign up for our regular e-newsletter to keep in touch with Forum activities and, particularly, progress on the Plan. Hundreds of Highgate residents have done so. During the current Plan pre-submission consultation period, more than 100 posters were put up on all the noticeboards in the neighbourhood, and 3000 publicity postcards handed out at the tube station, pubs, coffee shops, in the Archway Road, Highgate High Street etc. There have been articles in the Ham and High and Buzz, Facebook and Twitter campaigns, two workshops and a number of 'pop up sessions at various locations in N6. There are printed copies of the Plan in several locations including Shepherds Hill library and Jacksons Lane. You can find the Highgate Overground site on pages 78-80. If anyone is willing to step forward and be the main liaison between Priory Gardens and the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum it would be most welcome.</p>	these measures included in next draft of the Plan
13602	863	j morgan		81.152		20/03/2015 11:07:5	20/03/2015 11:07:54	<p>want the businesses on Archway road to be better promoted for the variety and scope of what they provide. Tree planting and events and open doors will encourage that. There is huge variety and we must build on it. Initiatives like one off markets, music at venues and food tastings would all help. Jacksons Lane and the Haringey Library are 2 large and useful centres from which to build.</p>	noted
13603	871	j morgan		81.152		20/03/2015 11:13:5	20/03/2015 11:13:59	<p>there are opportunities to join up more all the existing community groups so spread the load . Churches, Schools, Hospitals, Care Homes, Community centres , theatres, pubs, cafes, Lauderdale House, Waterlow Park, Highgate Wood and Libraries are all able to provide a hub and spread key information. We can build on the cultural heritage Highgate has to be more inclusive for all residents young and old.</p>	noted
13604	833	j morgan		81.152		20/03/2015 11:17:4	20/03/2015 11:17:44	<p>would like an east west bus route but otherwise enjoy transport links in Highgate. Really like Garden bridge idea from David S from Archway through Bowl to Village perhaps more of an Emirates Chair lift?</p>	ongoing talks with neighbouring communities on a hoppla bus connecting communities
13605	894	j morgan		81.152		20/03/2015 11:48:4	20/03/2015 11:48:40	<p>The Bowl detail as proposed is far too vague. We want this to be productive accessible open space from Harington Scheme through to garden centre space with paths and activities for all ages around the natural environment. Limited development of the businesses in the surrounding yards needs to be controlled due to lack of access.</p>	Bowl Vision now more detailed on Friends of the Bowl website

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13609	836	Jane Hill		78.146		20/03/2015 14:05:5	20/03/2015 14:05:57	The yards and corridors are a delight and there once were many more open ways into the Highgate Bowl, blocked up or obstructed or built in front of over the years but several of them visible from behind the High Street.	noted
13610	894	Sarah Cope		82.45		20/03/2015 14:16:4	20/03/2015 14:16:47	Summersby Road resident here. The wording within the plan is ambiguous and needs to be amended to show clearly that the site is the builders yard and does not include the current 5 blocks of flats on Summersby Road. Furthermore, the flats are viable homes for a diverse section of Highgate's Community and contributes well to the Neighbourhood Plan's core objectives and stated aims. There's consideration about tall blocks overlooking the houses on Muswell Hill Road, but not about how they may overlook the existing flats on Summersby Road, which is also alarming.	KS4 amended to make this clearer
13611	894	Edgar Whitley		158.14		20/03/2015 15:18:3	20/03/2015 15:18:34	Key Area 2: Former Highgate Rail Station The plan states: "Specifically, the aims are to reuse the vacant original station buildings to provide a business / knowledge centre, as well to provide links to the existing green areas on site comprising the woods and parkland walk, while enhancing the ecological value of the land. It is also expected that any new development will help improve access to the underground station." It continues by noting: "Any further buildings proposed on site must be modest in scale, respecting the wooded setting of the site and the conservation area, and should be of exemplary design, acknowledging the Charles Holden designed station buildings;". There is a risk that "respecting the wooded setting" will not mean that "It does not result in the removal of healthy mature trees" (OS1). It is unclear what is meant by the phrase "business / knowledge centre" or what physical form this would take. Is the intention that these would be vehicle accessible (if so, would this be via Priory Gardens or via the existing station car park (where it would conflict with TR3 - about proposals that "Provide inadequate sightlines for vehicles leaving the site"))? It is unclear which of the current access routes to the underground the proposals would seek to improve - access from Archway Road / Shepherds Hill will inevitably be steep whereas Priory Gardens access arises before the main site anyway. Would there be plans to demolish any of the existing station buildings? If so, how does this fit with "Proposals to demolish unlisted buildings that make a significant contribution to the setting and character of one of Highgate's conservation areas (either in a location that is within or visible from the conservation area) will only be supported if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated that outweigh the case for retention" (DH1)? CA5 talks about setting up "venues for people to meet, for example, a knowledge centre, culture hub and start-up business centre". There is no further reference to culture hubs in the entire plan and the only reference to a knowledge centre refers to KA2. Does this mean that there would be plans to include a knowledge centre in KA2? (Noting, of course, the close proximity of Jacksons Lane, amongst other local cultural centres).	Noted
13613	894	Edgar Whitley		158.14		20/03/2015 15:24:4	20/03/2015 15:24:43	Key Area 4: 40 Muswell Hill Road/Summersby Road It is unclear what exactly is being proposed here. "The main body of the site is currently in employment use as a builders' merchants" yet there is talk of "provision of new premises to accommodate the existing uses on site".	noted
13614	894	Edgar Whitley		158.14		20/03/2015 15:26:3	20/03/2015 15:26:30	Key Area 5: Goldsmith's Court I simply note that the plan states: "The junction at Shepherds Hill is extremely busy at peak times with traffic and pedestrian movements to/from Highgate Underground Station on the north side of the junction." and wonder how this will relate to the developments proposed in KA2	Noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13617	894	George Stern		87.112		20/03/2015 16:00:0	20/03/2015 16:00:00	I live next door to Goldsmiths Court. I know them as people who helped in the successful fight to stop the Archway Motorway Plan, a 25-year fight which we won in 1994. No-one has consulted me about Key Area 5 Goldsmiths Court, or any other part of the scheme. Much worse, no-one at Goldsmiths Court has been consulted. I attended the inaugural meeting of their association and this was clear. The residents have legal advice which shows that, should you go ahead, the Hornsey Housing Trust would, after a referendum which they are nearly certain to win, be entitled to demolish the block to rebuild and this would negate the security of tenure and secure rent levels they have had for many years. At best they might get a flat far away at a hugely higher rent, unaffordable to them. At worst they might just be left on the street to die. This was described to me as "social cleansing". I think it you should immediately talke out the part of your plan which refers to Goldsmiths Court. George Stern	see above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13621	894	Anne Bentham		92.9.6		20/03/2015 17:21:2	20/03/2015 17:21:20	<p>The following are my comments with regard to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. I have particular interest and concern about Key Area 4: 40 Muswell Hill Road/ Summersby Road and the implications for the 5 block estate, lying to the south of the builders yard, which is managed and owned by Haringey Homes. I am concerned that there is ambiguity in the wording on pages 85 to 87 with respect to the flats, and discrepancy between the site shown in the map on page 85, which is the builders yard, and the address given in the written description. The address of the flats should be removed from the title document and elsewhere when other ambiguous wording implies that the flats are within the development site. Also, the plans wider scale map on page 73, figure 20, shows the flats. I am very concerned that the flats on the estate be protected from any development that happens on the site and this should be more clearly defined within the development policy on page 87. The plan document says at paragraph 2 on page 87 that, "the scale and arrangement of the site would allow for a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the northern portion of the land", so that should be included within your list of principles for supporting development there. The ambiguous implication in the text that the flats are within the site would mean that the policy for development that you set down, which states that, "Any new development proposed on site should not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring residential uses either as a result of operations on the land or the scale of new development. New development should comprise a mix of 'good neighbour' uses and should make use of the relief of the land and appropriate heights to ensure that the built form is not overbearing in nature", would not apply to the Summersby Road flats as they would not be neighbouring the site but within it. However, the plan says at the top of page 87 that, "The site is sloping to the extent that the adjacent Haringey Homes residencies on land to the south of the site have visual prominence over the land which is the subject of this policy", thereby suggesting that the flats are not within the development site and would be affected visually by any development on the site (being the land adjacent to that occupied by the flats). Given that the plan states that, "The policies included in this Plan will be the starting point in the determination of planning applications in Highgate until 2029 (or until the Plan is reviewed)", these matters will be highly significant if or when a development proposal comes forward. Any larger site than the builder's yard would be a totally inappropriate large development for an important conservation area, with an unnecessary disruption to the wild life and fauna that exist within that area. The flats are unquestionable viable, contributing well to the core objectives and stated aims of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan. I will give some detail of the blocks as the only descriptive reference to them in the plan is a somewhat dismissive sounding phrase that they are, "four blocks of three and four storey flats owned and managed by Haringey Homes, which are in need of refurbishment investment". It may not have been meant like this but I feel it suggests a euphemism for "a council block of little merit or use and which is a drain on the public purse"? It would be welcome if the plan sought to redress some of the stereotypes that are prevalent about social housing. These are brick flats, solidly built in the 1930s. They were built with communities and public health in mind during a period with an ethos of building social housing for the betterment of people. In my view they provide a good density and are an appropriate visual and practical height for the site. They are accessible, they have open balconies and communal garden space, which the occupants tend to use, with mature trees, (No costly lifts and internal corridors.) Other residents tell me that they appreciate their internal space, and both tenants and leaseholders value these flats as homes, and over the generations have enjoyed living in them. They are and should be considered a worthwhile part of Highgate's heritage; a good example of a style of social housing built at that time (of which little remains) that continues to work well as homes. The flats are a mixture of sizes, including family sized accommodation and one and 2 bedrooms. Because they are a Council estate, both rent and lease purchase price are lower than many of the private blocks or the converted houses prominent elsewhere in Highgate. This enables 1st time buyers and the less affluent to purchase and rent, thus fulfilling very well the Neighbourhood Plans</p>	see above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
								<p>stated aims. Small scale, these 5 blocks do not represent the social housing mistakes of the past, which created vast estates and large areas of deprivation, but are an example of how to integrate small scale social housing into an affluent area. The statistics show that the estate does not add to the crime figures over any other area in Highgate and is not a problem for the wider community. These are the types of flats and in an environment where people like to live and remain, creating community. The Summersby Rd estate meets the need of all types, singles, families with children, elderly, young professionals and students. They have different occupations and backgrounds, and all get on very well. The estate offers a level of diversity in terms of its residency that is a welcome and a meaningful contribution to Highgate's population, which Haringey Council considers suffers from a monoculture – (which I think they mean is very white, affluent and middle class). The estate is an example of a mixed tenured and diverse residency with a strong community ethos between neighbours, of which Highgate should be proud. The architecture of the buildings, in dividing the blocks up with communal space in between, has helped to develop the community interaction. Many residents have been living on the estate for a long time, and a good proportion of the leaseholders are the original social tenants. In fact tenants have recently purchased the lease from the council. The flats are also a much needed social housing resource in supporting people with special needs in a city location; providing a relatively safe environment, where they can thrive and achieve independence in a none threatening and tolerant community. Both leaseholders and tenants have put their own money, time, energy and emotional commitment into making their flats decent homes. I should think that they have saved the council a lot of money over the years by taking on the maintenance themselves. I do not know what studies have been done on that issue but I strongly believe that this is no insignificant matter to be overlooked when local and central government shift the focus to the cost of social housing estates. The residents have been informed by Homes for Haringey of improvements that should take place, which includes exterior painting and change of windows. I have personally been told that these improvements were regarded by the council as a worthwhile investment, given the nature of the buildings, and will mean little being spent on them in terms of major repair for the next 25 years. Visually the flats sit very well in their environment as they are brick built, matching other 1930s or earlier buildings which surround the estate. Any visual impairment is due to neglected external decoration by Homes for Haringey. Work will be starting soon in one block. A full survey has been undertaken and the buildings have been found to be very solid and overall in good shape. I would like the Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Plan to be strong in expressing their commitment to and support of Highgate's Council housing estates, and protect them against the development massacre which is taking place at the moment in other parts of London with the focus on filling coffers regardless of the effects on existing residents and leaseholder, and on the ensuing social dislocation and dispersal of communities. Surely with the benefit of having a Neighbourhood Community Plan, Highgate has the opportunity to get it right. The Summersby Road estate is contributing to many of Highgate's core objectives and stated aim and deserves an acknowledgement of that.</p>	

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13652	894	John Spence	██████████	123.22		21/03/2015 03:29:3	21/03/2015 03:29:39	<p>Regarding Summersby Road, it's a great pity that the lovely and well-built housing estate was originally included on the plan for redeveloping the builder's yard and commercial premises. These solid 4 story buildings were constructed in the 1930's and continue to house a mix of families, young professionals and older residents in a friendly and safe environment. Given that 80% of Hornsey's housing had to be demolished after bomb damage in WW2, Summersby survived intact which says something about the quality of build. How sustainable is it to demolish such elegant buildings to make way for 100+ low-quality built properties? Not to mention the damage to Queens Wood, with its 28 species of breeding birds, nesting bats and other endangered species that a new modern estate development would cause. No Summersby residents were informed by the Forum that their estate would be included on the plan and their homes and futures would be threatened. The Neighbourhood Forum plan boundary has now been changed to remove the estate from the plan although in section 5, Figure 20, KA4 still contains the boundary which encompasses the estate in the redevelopment plans. The estate addresses of 1-44 Summersby are also included in various places in the plan. If the Highgate Neighbourhood forum is really committed to protecting the Summersby estate and residents' homes as it has said it is, these mistakes need to be changed in the plan. It would also help the residents' cause if the Forum would include information about the quality and sustainability of the estate in the plan, so that people of Highgate (and the Haringey planners) are aware of the importance of keeping this estate intact for the many years of life that are left in the buildings. I urge as many people as possible to post comments here and on Haringey's Local Plan for Site Allocations DPD before next Friday to protect this estate from the 'bulldozer' effect of Haringey's planning department.</p>	see above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13662	890	Sydney Charles		86.129		21/03/2015 08:20:1	21/03/2015 08:20:15	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate. Text within [] is comment. Where changes are suggested to existing text it is between ++ and ==. [Currently P68, but suggest immediately after DH1 to avoid separating out demolition policies, and to have a clearer title][please use subscript for CO2]Embodied energy ++and carbon footprint of demolition proposals==As part of the Forum's drive to ensure that Highgate is one of the most sustainable and energy efficient areas of Greater London, ++there was concern over the additional use of energy required by demolishing/rebuilding in Highgate compared with refurbishing an existing building.==The Highgate Neighbourhood Forum has liaised with the Building Research Establishment and a local architect specialising in sustainability and design to help inform the development of this policy. Investigation has confirmed that, currently, the initial demolition stage ++and the additional energy use of new build compared with refurbishment is not considered, when providing information to decision makers about the sustainability and energy efficiency of demolition/rebuild proposals.== Frequently the term 'embodied energy' is used for the energy used at the production stage of products or building materials, and 'energy' is used as shorthand for CO2 emissions. However, the level of CO2 emissions created in the production of any product or material varies considerably, depending on the type of fuel used to produce the energy. For instance, CO2 emitted when renewable energy is used will be considerably lower than where coal provides the power. British Standard BS EN 15804 has been launched which provides a structure to ensure that all Environmental Product Declarations (EPD) of construction products, construction services and construction processes are derived, verified and presented in a harmonised way. This can be calculated via accredited proprietary software and the ++standard provides== a clear framework that will help ++calculate the potential== carbon footprint of developments. It is therefore now practicable to require developers to assess scenarios comparing the effect on CO2 emissions of various development options. The latest Building Regulations Part L anticipates all new builds to be 'zero carbon' by 2019. The government is consulting for the next (2016) version on an 'Allowable Solution' i.e. a tariff for where developers cannot meet zero carbon ++and will be required to pay into a fund instead. The intention is that the new regulations will== allow less freedom for local authorities to require more stringent levels of energy efficiency than the national standards at that time. This policy, ++to include the consideration of refurbishment in terms of CO2==, seeks to build on the current London-wide drive for the reduction in CIO2 emissions and seeks to pre-empt the strengthening of this requirement in all developments nationwide.[material for accredited proprietary software to be hosted at 'Evidence' submitted separately] [Life cycle table should click through to EN15804 file and suitable software should click through to suitable software at Evidence]++Policy DH1A: Embodied energy and carbon emissions for demolition proposals==For Highgate, where a development is proposed, and there is a building already on the site, calculations should be submitted showing CO2 emissions for one scenario for the new development, including the demolition stage, and a second scenario for refurbishment of the building. It will be in terms of Global Warming Potential (as specified in BS 15804) i.e. in 'kg CO2 equivalent.' Applicants should refer to BS EN 15804 and the accompanying Life Cycle table that show the stages to be Mandatory in Highgate in yellow. The calculations and data sources used are to be ones considered as fit for purpose for calculations to satisfy London Plan 5.2 C. See 'Evidence' for currently suitable software. The tables ++are for a)= the proposed new building, the initial demolition stage, and ++b)= the scenario of refurbishing the existing building. Both scenario calculations must assume the same Code Level under the Code for Sustainable Homes or Target Emissions Rate ++(TER)= under Part L of the Building Regulations. The presumption is against demolition, so it is for the applicant to establish that in carbon terms it is beneficial to demolish and build new, or that other benefits clearly outweigh the loss ++of= an existing building.This policy applies where the proposal for new build is to be over 300sqm (including aggregated areas of, say, flats). Each assessment is to be based on a similar target level of thermal efficiency under Part L of the Building</p>	See above and exclusion of Summersby Road estate also agreed with Haringey re their site allocations

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
								Regulations, and the 'in-life' stage period is to be the same for both scenarios. (generally 60 years) Applicants will be expected to show in every case that products with the least embodied energy have been considered and they will be required to certify on completion that those products have been used.	
13666	885	Sydney Charles		86.129		21/03/2015 08:30:5	21/03/2015 08:30:51	<p>P47. One aspect that is not mentioned in Open Spaces is that, as well as 'Green Chains' (for walking and or cycling through open spaces) Highgate also has many open sites that are important for Nature Conservation that are not accessible to residents. (See below). The Major Open Spaces are mentioned as being significant to the 'character' of the area, and perhaps something could be added hereabouts about their importance to air quality and biodiversity as well. Suggest @p47 "In the main, it is a vital shared resource contributing to air quality, nature conservation and biodiversity. P48 It is not clear what the difference is between Major Open Spaces (Fig 9) and Local Open Spaces (Fig 10), or their relationship to the policies. P49 OS1 'Fringes of Open Spaces' makes sense as a policy, but not clear which categories of open spaces it refers to. The category at Fig 9 is of Major Open Spaces, so suggest calling OS1 'Fringes of Major Open Spaces' if it refers specifically to the sites in the Fig 9. The policy refers to "fringes of Highgate's areas of important open space, as defined on the proposals map" leaving room for argument as to which sites are covered. And is 'important' the same as 'major'? Or, if policy OS1 is supposed to cover all open spaces – major, local and reservoirs that should be stated. I think that the sites in Fig 9 Major Open Spaces are: 1. Hampstead Heath 2. Highgate Wood (ecological corridor) 3. Queens Wood (Nature Reserve) 4. Waterlow Park 5. The Golf Club 6. Parkland Walk (Ecological corridor and Nature Reserve) 7. Highgate Cemeteries 8. Pond Square (also listed as a 'Local Open Space') A key, such as used for the Local Open Spaces Fig 10, listing these sites would be helpful at Figure 9 too. I also note that The Bowl and Highgate School Playing Fields, mentioned as of importance to residents further up are not on this map. P51. The category at Fig 10 of Local Open Spaces is difficult to understand. Pond Square, the Peace Park and Park Rd are public spaces, but I think the rest (Holly Lodge Estate, Hillcrest, Southwood Lane Wood are for residents only). There are other private Spaces, such as the Highgate School cemetery, Churchyards, Coleridge Garden (that could be resited under KA5) other private grounds around flats, but not sure if this section is to do with public small spaces or not. If the reason for the list is to prevent building on them that should be stated, or if there is a desire to make the private and nature reserves accessible that should be stated. OS3 Local Open Space would be better not implying that these are the only 'pocket spaces' to be protected. The list is OK as examples, but suggest 'List of Local Open Spaces' is changed to 'Typical Local Open Spaces' and saying more about the characteristics that would be favoured would be helpful.</p> <p>Note: Transition Highgate has requested that Highgate School Churchyard is added. Additional information about Haringey's categorisation of green open spaces and initiatives. Haringey Biodiversity Action Plan Jan 2010 Ecological Corridors are relatively continuous areas of green space running through built up areas that allow the movement of plants and animals to other areas and habitats. In Haringey they largely follow the railways and rivers but they also link to larger open spaces such as Finsbury Park and Highgate Wood. Whereas the majority of Ecological Corridors in Haringey are inaccessible to the public, Green Chains are used for informal recreation providing walking and/or cycling routes through open spaces. Green Chains can also be Ecological Corridors such as the Parkland Walk Local Nature Reserve. There are currently 3 Local Nature Reserves in Haringey; The Parkland Walk, Railway Fields and Queen's Wood. Haringey has a total of 60 areas designated as SINC's [Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation] including woodlands and parks. Not all SINC's are Council owned and managed. They include private golf courses, operational railway lines and reservoirs.</p>	Noted - response as above

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13667	890	Sydney Charles		86.129		21/03/2015 08:32:2	21/03/2015 08:32:23	<p>Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate. Text within [] is comment. [suggested new policy preferably after embodied energy policy]Quality and Performance of new homes in HighgateCurrently the main method of evidencing the energy efficiency of a new home is by compliance with Building Regulations Parts L1A. These building regulations now require that a (potential) Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) is produced and lodged with the Building Control team, but do not require that these recommendations are followed. Some Local Authorities, including Camden and Haringey, additionally require a 'Code for Sustainable Homes' (CfSH) assessment. However the quality and performance of a building depends on more factors than those covered in EPC or CfSH assessments. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) now offer the 'Home Quality Mark' facility for new homes including dimensions such as resilience to flooding and overheating in a changing climate and digital connectivity. The Mark will have a 5-star rating and is therefore much simpler to understand than an EPC or CfSH, and is likely to supercede the CfSH. DH Quality and Performance of new homes in HighgateApplicants applying for planning permission for new homes will be required to confirm that they are committed to offering a 'Home Quality Mark' with the homes. This will include the standard categories such as impact on householders health and wellbeing, and the environmental footprint of living in the home, as well as additional areas such as digital connectivity, sound insulation, energy costs and daylight and air quality.Relevant sub-objectives:5.3Conformity: NPPF section 10 paras 95-97; London policies 5.2B, 5.2C, 5.2D, Camden DP22, Haringey SP4.1a)</p>	This is regarded as 'too restrictive' - neighbourhood plans cannot ask for more than national guidelines unless we can prove that Highgate is in some way different to the rest of the UK
13668	903	Sydney Charles		86.129		21/03/2015 08:35:2	21/03/2015 08:35:26	<p>Text within [] is comment. Where changes are suggested to existing text it is between ++ and ==. P93 COMMUNITY ACTIONS [probably renumbering will be needed][Social and Community]++CA3A Encourage biodiversity (in particular beneficial insects such as bees, other pollinators, butterflies and moths, and birds) by planting native trees, shrubs, and wildflowers in open spaces both large and small. (Sue Lees)==++CA3B Encourage residents to engage in "guerrilla gardening" in "Forgotten Corners" or neglected spaces, bringing pleasure to the passer-by, health benefits to the gardeners, and strengthened community cohesion. (Sue Lees)==[CA8 suggest remove Green Festival, as, if a group wanted to do one it would not benefit from being mentioned by the Neighbourhood Forum.][Economic Activity]++CA13A We would encourage a range of measures for retail businesses along the Archway Rd and in Highgate Village, such as permitting essential deliveries of stock at reasonable times, and requiring landlords of such commercial properties to maintain the properties to a high standard so that businesses are not adversely affected by poor premises. (Jackie Jones)==++CA13B We would also like to encourage new independent businesses by means of a suspension of business rates for the first 6 to 12 months of trading. (Jackie Jones)==[Traffic and Transport]++CA22A Make the case for a Programme to install signs that encourage walking to destinations, aimed at both tourists and people in Highgate. eg from Highgate Village to Hampstead, from Highgate underground station to Highgate Cemetery. (Sydney Charles)==++CA24A We would encourage the introduction of various measures to reduce the number of vehicles kept on local roads, such as the restriction of the number of parking permits to one per household, or a requirement that second (and subsequent) vehicles should be electric or ultra-low emission vehicles. (Jackie Jones)==[Development and Heritage].++CA35A Encourage local initiatives to increase the contribution of Highgate to the use of solar and wind renewable energy, particularly through local investment funding such as Power up north london.(Sydney Charles)==</p>	Included in Community Action Plan, where applicable
13671	765	Sydney Charles		86.129		21/03/2015 10:32:4	21/03/2015 10:32:49	<p>This is to bring attention to the likely new 'Allowable Solutions' that building regulations will introduce instead of the promise to have 'zero carbon' by 2016 (now 2019). Developers will be able to pay to have a lower carbon emission level and HNF may be in line to receive this. Maybe we could preempt this situation and be positioned to gather allowable solutions funds to pay for some of these CIL ideas.</p>	noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13674	894	Richard Bale		90.63.		21/03/2015 12:51:0	21/03/2015 12:51:07	Re: Former Highgate railway station.I am a resident of Priory Gardens but as I have very limited access to the internet for the next month I have to be brief. 1. I wish the former railway station to be included in the plan for Highgate.2. A constructive plan for the utilisation of this site should protect us from some monstrosity forced upon us by some greedy developer.3. I once heard a couple leaving Highgate tube saying that the exit must be the prettiest in all London. I firmly believe that it should stay that way.Yours sincerelyRichard Bale	support noted
13676	894	Lawrence Sima		92.1.1		21/03/2015 14:34:2	21/03/2015 14:34:22	I and my family are residents of Priory Gardens. The proposals from the forum regarding Key Area 2 have been well thought out and considered. There is potential for use of this land which is currently derelict, (including buildings) provided it is undertaken sensitively, sustainably, and with respect to the needs of local residents and the wider community. My family, and others who live in Priory Gardens would be particularly supportive of making greater use of the tunnels to join up the existing parkland walk, which is part of the London Ring. This could also connect existing public spaces and access-ways in Highgate Woods, Priory Gardens, and the Parkland Walk giving a much longer car and road free route stretching from Finsbury Park in the South through to Alexandra Park in the North. This would make an existing useful amenity into one that is fantastic for walkers and cyclists. It would be good if the bat habitat could also be preserved but if there had to be a choice my preference would be to benefit cyclists and walkers, including families and children, over bats.	support noted
13678	894	Philip Edwards		78.146		21/03/2015 17:57:0	21/03/2015 17:57:03	I am a leaseholder who lives on Summersby Road. I bought my lease as a first time buyer with the help of a mortgage. I have only been working in London for a few years. My family lived and worked in the area so I appreciated the opportunity to buy a lease on the Summersby Road estate as it was more affordable than other property in the Highgate area. It seems to me that the flats are giving people like me an opportunity to live in the Highgate community, which is exactly what the Neighbourhood Plan says it wants. To include the flats in a development site would throw a shadow over a future that I thought I had. I have already invested a lot of money, time and energy making it a decent home. The flats are really solid and the community is a pleasure to live in. They are viable from every point of view and they provide what is positive for the wider community. I endorse the amendment of the neighbourhood plan to remove any reference to these flats being part of the development site, and I feel that a specific statement supporting their protection should be made in the development policy.	See above re KS4
13688	863	Sydney Charles		109.14		22/03/2015 15:00:5	22/03/2015 15:00:56	Commenting on behalf of Transition Highgate P20 Economic Activity objectives. In the interests of a varied, sustainable and lively local economy with its own identity, and retaining money within the community, we would like to encourage and support independent, non-chain retailers and businesses to be successful in Highgate village and on the Archway Road.	support noted
13689	894	Paul Ennals		92.233		22/03/2015 16:17:5	22/03/2015 16:17:52	We own the house nearest to Highgate underground station cottage. We support the proposals for the sensitive redevelopment the overground station, and would be open to the thought of opening up the tunnels (though would not be so relaxed about the impact on the bats). Development of the scale proposed would hopefully retain the character of this beautiful corner of north London. Whereas TFL's proposal for five story development at the top of the hill sounds as if it would be quite out of keeping.	support noted

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13691	894	L Shanahan			86.180	22/03/2015 17:53:2	22/03/2015 17:53:24	I am a Summersby Road resident and have been for the past 10 years. I was therefore extremely concerned to hear about the possibility that homes here might be under threat, particularly as there appears to have been no consultation. At the moment there seems to be a certain amount of ambiguity as to whether or not Summersby Road is in fact included in the development plans currently being proposed for the adjacent Build Base site. Hopefully this will turn out to be an administrative discrepancy as it would be outrageous to dismantle a series of perfectly viable residential buildings, not to mention the long-term distress this would cause residents, some of whom have lived here their entire lives. As others have mentioned, Summersby Road is one of the few places I have lived in London that has such a strong community spirit and is a great example of successful social integration - I would like to see it stay that way for future generations to come and very much hope that any fears to the contrary will soon be allayed as a matter of urgency.	see above re KS4
13693	637	Kristian beale			82.45.	22/03/2015 20:15:3	22/03/2015 20:15:35	As a resident of summersby road I was recently given the shock of receiving the news that under plan key area 4 the estate seems to have been included in possible future plans for redevelopment. Apart from an ambiguous letter from Haringey council stating that summersby road may or may not be included, all other information has been kindly provided by one of my neighbours, notably the red ring fence around the estate. As I have just completed the purchase of my flat under the right to buy scheme along with a new 125 yr lease I am extremely concerned as to what may happen within the near future and can only urge the council to be more transparent with all future correspondence to all residents of summersby road regarding any development proposals and the mooted upgrade works.	See above re new wording in KS4 in next draft of Plan
13695	894	karen newton			77.103	22/03/2015 23:30:3	22/03/2015 23:30:30	Regarding Summersby Road, I have been a leaseholder here for over 2 years and really enjoy the location of being so central but surrounded by amazing woodland. I am shocked to hear the flats have been included in redevelopment with out any consolation with residents.Planning on demolishing such well built flats would affect the surrounding woodlands and the great community this area has.I am on the understanding the Summersby road area for development should have been taken off the proposal , so I also endorse the amendment of the neighbourhood plan to remove any reference to these flats being part of the development site.	Exclusion of Summersby Road made clear in next draft of the Plan
13699	885	Neil Perkins			92.25.	23/03/2015 11:13:5	23/03/2015 11:13:50	Pond Square is a much needed open space which should be preserved in its current form. It is used every day by people wanting to sit, read and meet with friends but also for occasional events, such as the summer fair and Christmas carols. Its unique character sets the tone for Highgate Village - please see photos above.	noted
13700	885	Suzanne Cave			81.151	23/03/2015 11:23:4	23/03/2015 11:23:41	I wholeheartedly support The Neighbourhood Plan and in particular the inclusion of The Hillcrest Estate in the OS3/Local Open Space policy. My family and I treasure this open land, particularly our 5-year-old daughter, and believe it is intrinsic to life here and the character of the Estate. It was the primary reason we bought here and the proposed plan to build additional blocks on this site has filled us with dismay.	support noted
13701	885	John Browning			92.25.	23/03/2015 12:19:0	23/03/2015 12:19:01	The peaceful and tranquil open space of Pond Square is unique. Its relatively informal and undesigned character is a major asset to the village which needs to be maintained with just some minor improvements – see PS plan above.	noted
13833	765	Jade Whitaker			86.168	16/05/2015 14:45:0	16/05/2015 14:45:02	A small playground for young children in the empty space on Parkland Walk by the Holmesdale Rd exit. This is a much needed facility for those living in the locality. Waterlow Park and Highgate Wood are just a bit too far for little legs. There was once a playground here and it would be great if it could be reinstated.	Added to CIL spending list

comme	comm	comment_autho	comm	comme	comme	comment_date	comment_date_gmt	comment_content	Forum Response
13732	781	mags oneill			81.109	30/03/2015 23:50:3	30/03/2015 23:50:35	I saw this invasion some years ago in Abingdon , Oxfordshire, we must find another solution - tonight the wind is reaching to about 35 mph and the bins are being scattered all over the place. A lot of older people live around here and will have to reclaim them in the morning. What was wrong with the old dust bin?!!!!	See above re Miltons bins
13249	885	Alphonsus Mod			87.113	12/03/2015 09:11:3	12/03/2015 09:11:35	I have been a resident in Highgate for over 35 years and the Hillcrest Estate has been a very important feature of my life. The beauty of estate is that the original architects did an outstanding job of balancing the space allocated to developing the apartment blocks and leaving adequate green space for residents to enjoy. It is also equally important that the children of the estate are able to play in a safe environment and not see their homes converted into a concrete jungle. I therefore completely support The Neighbourhood Plan that has been developed by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum.	support noted
12870	1037	Maria			146.90	01/03/2015 18:48:3	01/03/2015 18:48:38	The plan is of very poor quality, according to which St Joseph's Church on Highgate Hill is not in Highgate but Aylmer Parade is East Finchley is. Also, there has been a lack of any consultation. It seems that the same people were consulted repeatedly. The plan reads like a copy and paste of any suburb anywhere.~Presumably those who proposed that the council housing at 1-44 Summersby Close be demolished were not the council tenants living in those homes. ~The plan is also inaccurate. It states that that Hornsey Housing Trust owns Goldsmith Court but Goldsmith Court is owned by a very wealthy tax exempt Asset Trust called the Goldsmith's Trust as part of it's property portfolio. ~The plan is incoherent on the one hand it calls for suitable housing for older people and on the other it calls for the demolition of Goldsmith's Court. Goldsmith's Court is housing for older people on one level (with lift) with attractive accessible gardens close to the shops. Presumably demolition is proposed to provide a windfall gain to the landowner who will use the plan to gain planning permission, leaving the council to pick up the tab for rehousing the elderly who are evicted in the name of progress. ~Were these tenants whose homes you propose to demolish asked their opinion? Why have you not proposed that your homes be demolished? ~Even though I am registered with this website I have never received any notice of any consultation meeting. I have never seen any notice of any Highgate plan consultation meeting either at Highgate library or on the notice area outside even though I pass it some ten times a week.	See above - clarification on Summersby Road and Goldsmiths Court in next draft of Plan