

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Hilary Laurie		10/02/2016 12:48	Congratulations!! I have read this with great interest, and admiration for everyone involved. What a labour, and how very well done. Bravo!	Support noted. No further action required.
Tony Baker		08/02/2016 18:37	COMMENTS FROM TONY BAKER ON HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN P39- add a general prescription against crossovers as permanently removing more on-street car parking space than they provide occasionally for one car (although the point is made on P43). P43 – could you say more about the adverse effect on visual amenity if a large number of households opt to park their cars in their front gardens? P48 – should we be more proactive on trees? For example, on North Road/North Hill, where the pavement trees contribute so much to visual amenity, should we plant new trees where there are gaps, and think about the long-term replacement of the existing trees, ie plant between them when they are coming towards the end of their lives? P52 or P57 – where the introduction of CPZs has eased on-street parking pressures, should residents be encouraged to restore front gardens which are used for parking back to green spaces? P57 – mention that external roller shutters attract unsightly graffiti? P66 – would any development require protection from air pollution too - with tree screening? P84 – mention the Pond Square toilets under Facilities?	Front garden crossovers and trees are already covered in the Plan. Other points noted but too detailed to be covered.
Tony Baker		08/02/2016 11:03	COMMENTS FROM HARINGTON SCHEME P20 - We are pleased to see Core Objective 1 for Social and Community needs. We believe that Harington makes a major contribution towards helping "Highgate develop and maintain a strong and sustainable community which works to minimise social deprivation and exclusion". P 22 – can Harington be shown on the map – as a school perhaps? P29 – mention the charity shops, including Harington's? P70 – the latest draft of Haringey's Local Plan shows all of the site occupied by Harington as within.. the SLOL. We would like to see this map mirroring that in Haringey's Site Allocations document. On the map "nursery" is mis-spelt. Could it show the Harington site? Where existing policy descriptions are described – above Fig 18 – could you mention our "horticultural/educational" designation in the latest draft of Haringey's Local Plan? P71 – para II - substitute "must not have a detrimental effect on the Harington Scheme" for "the skills....Harington scheme". P71 – para V – while we welcome visitors to Harington, our learners are quite vulnerable and we are nervous about encouraging people to walk through our site, especially out-of-hours when we have experienced vandalism. On the other hand we favour restoration of access to our site from Duke's Head Yard. May we please discuss the whole question of access with you? P71 – para VI – could we add in "must not have a detrimental effect on the Harington Scheme and " before "...must maintain"? P71 – please note that no part of our site has ever been part of the yards. That is one reason why we are keen to amend the map (see above). If the map was amended as we wish, we would still like to see some declaratory statement against any commercial or residential development on our site P78 – we think Harington too should have a monitoring role for the Highgate Bowl. P80 – add Harington under "Who?" in box 1. We use volunteers at the Scheme and in our shop.	Harington added to Fig 3 map. Spelling of 'Nursery' changed by Haringey on new Bowl map. Other comments re KS3 noted and incorporated where compatible with Councils' requirements for this policy.
Dan Stranescu, Cha		08/02/2016 00:21	The Neighbourhood Forum has our full support for its thoroughly revised Plan and realistic, deliverable strategies for a better Highgate. Goldsmiths Court residents are reassured by the genuine respect shown to the current generation's needs, in the process of planning sustainably for the benefit of future generations. HNF has been effective in devising safeguards for elderly and vulnerable residents and in influencing Haringey Council to adopt similar strategies, with support from our local Councillors and Member of Parliament. Redevelopment proposals by Hornsey Housing Trust, put forward without residents' consultation and rejected by an overwhelming majority, will now have to conform to a process which recognizes local democracy and local needs, including the need to avoid unnecessary disruption to residents' lives. We support the Forum's policy KS5 objectives and would like to see improvements to the Goldsmiths Court environment while ensuring, at the same time, that the private character of the grounds over the railway tunnels is maintained as much as possible. Tranquillity and recreational value are important to many residents who have mobility issues and would find it hard to replace such a familiar and welcoming environment.	Support for KS5 noted. No further action.
Sydney Charles		07/02/2016 20:23	Diesel (and petrol) vehicles are increasingly recognised as causing major health problems in urban areas, and contributing to global carbon dioxide emissions. Ideally vehicles should be charged with zero carbon electricity, wherever possible, and therefore enabling Highgate residents to charge electric vehicles wherever possible should be encouraged. Technologies for electric cars, charging networks and solar generation as part of buildings/outbuildings are all progressing at speed, and together these can contribute to improving the air quality in London and reducing carbon emissions, whilst addressing the issue of intermittency of solar and wind. These moves to low carbon living are being supported as part of the initiatives agreed in the Paris Climate Change Conference, so new policies should anticipate their use as normal, rather than just addressing the problems of traditional vehicles and electricity sources eg pollution and parking stress. In particular: • By expanding TR3 V11 (off street parking for new developments) to also cover 1) changes to existing properties, 2) to require renewable electricity provision and 3) to require electric charging points, would align with TR4 V11 (expecting car charging points). It would mean that residents of new developments in Highgate would be allowed to have a car (electric) as it would not add to pollution or parking stress. • TR5 (dropped kerbs) is supported. A fifth clause is suggested that allows applications where an electric charging point is required and the dropped kerb is needed to give access to it. This would enable many more residents of Highgate to use an electric car, even though the current restrictions regarding permeability of car-standing, suitability of access and whether a parking space would be lost, would still apply.	Traffic and Transport policies substantially rewritten in Submission Draft of Plan and these suggestions taken account of where possible.

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Stephen Robinson	s [REDACTED]	07/02/2016 18:59	<p>Comment : The general direction of this basement policy is very sensible, it perhaps just needs some clarification in certain matters which are explained below after each policy statement. Policy DH8 Basements Applications for basement development will be supported where they meet the requirements set out within this policy.</p> <p>1. Enhanced Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) requirements:</p> <p>I. A pre-application BIA questionnaire should be sent to neighbours. This should ask for any concerns re drainage, flooding and construction, and highlight any prior knowledge that could impact on the application.</p> <p>II. Applicants will be required to sample soil along boundaries with neighbours to a depth of 6m and to monitor ground water for a minimum of 3 months prior to submission in conjunction with meteorological data to establish a realistic model of existing ground water regime.</p> <p>Comment: Perhaps it needs to be made clear that an applicant can still seek pre-planning guidance from the Council without consulting neighbours at this stage, but if the applicant decides to proceed then neighbours need to be consulted ahead of the hydrology work starting, assuming this hydrology work is required to be submitted at the same time as the planning application. It is better that this issue is clearly resolved at the planning stage rather than leaving it to be resolved after planning is granted.</p> <p>Is s definition of neighbours required ?</p> <p>2. Protection for Neighbours:</p> <p>I. Notwithstanding existing provisions under the Party Wall Act that may or may not apply, a Schedule of Condition survey will be required of neighbours' properties up to a distance of twice the depth of the basement from the point of excavation. The Applicant will cover costs.</p> <p>Comment: Is the definition of neighbour - a distance of twice the depth of the basement. This may work but may also need a minimum distance as well - as per the definition in the party wall act.</p> <p>II. A suitably qualified engineer will be appointed by the applicant to oversee the development of basement proposals on behalf of the affected neighbour(s) from their perspective, beginning with the planning stage right the way through to the construction phase and thereafter up to 3 years after building works have been completed. The Applicant will cover costs.</p> <p>Comment: It says the qualified engineer should be appointed by the applicant. This will not work. If the engineer is appointed and paid for by the applicant, then the neighbours will not trust the advice of the engineer because of a real or perceived conflict of interest. It should follow the same procedure as the party wall act so adjoining neighbours can decide if they want to appoint the engineer to act on their behalf or not, but the engineer should be paid for by the applicant. Affected neighbours would all have to agree on one engineer. Also, how will this work, if a party wall agreement has to be put in place anyway, this should not duplicate or restrict the role of affected neighbours in appointing the party wall surveyors under the party wall act, because surveyors have specified legal responsibilities.</p> <p>Definition required of affected neighbour- is it the same definition as party wall act or a wider definition. This definition may be necessary if the party wall act does not apply- for example a basement being built in a detached house in Kenwood in large grounds- who is an affected neighbour as there probably would be no requirement for a party wall act agreement.</p> <p>III. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be required at planning stage to ensure construction noise, vibration and dust are kept to a minimum and HGV/LGV movements do not significantly increase traffic congestion placing unreasonable stress on local residents given that works can take up to 2 years to complete.</p> <p>Comment: Sensible.</p> <p>IV. A Basement Construction Plan (BCP) will be required at planning stage to ensure methods of construction are tenable.</p> <p>Comment: This is essential. The construction method for a basement can also be a reason for objecting to a planning application for a basement. It is better to have this information early so such issues can be addressed at the planning stage and not after planning has been granted. Neighbours need to see these documents so they have an opportunity to comment on them.</p> <p>V. All BIA, CMP and BCP issues must be resolved to the satisfaction of the local planning authority prior to determination.</p> <p>Comment: Agreed - is it to the satisfaction of just the local planning authority or can neighbours be included too (or is the Council acting on the neighbours behalf)</p> <p>3. Limiting Environmental/ Ecological Impacts:</p> <p>I. Any basement development must allow for a minimum of one metre of permeable soil above any part of the basement beneath a garden to support biodiversity and larger trees/planting. This depth should be greater if necessary to preserve landscaping consistent with neighbouring properties.</p> <p>II. Where CiL is not applicable the applicant must pay a CMP Levy of £3/m3 of excavation volume to be used specifically to repair local roads and pavements adjacent to the development site.</p> <p>Comment: Sensible.</p> <p>The HNF plan includes a commentary on Basements in Highgate, as follows:</p> <p>Basements</p> <p>There is considerable concern in Highgate regarding the effect of proliferation of basement developments. This policy seeks to ensure that full consideration is given to the potential impacts of basement developments at application stage. Any assessment has to be full and informed and should cover:</p> <p>I. The effect of subterranean development on the structural stability of adjacent properties and associated damage caused. Around 45% of all insurance claims nationwide that involve impact from adjacent basement works relate to failure at design stage;</p> <p>II. Irreparable damage to the local water regime both in terms of ground water diversion and surface water flooding. Specific concerns were raised around the effect on a decrease in rainfall catchment for Highgate and Hampstead ponds;</p> <p>III. The individual and cumulative impact of developments on the character and biodiversity of gardens and adjacent open spaces, particularly in designated conservation areas and those areas designated Private Open Space adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land (on the Fringes of Hampstead Heath); and</p> <p>IV. The general loss of amenity to both existing and future residents caused by over development on site.</p> <p>At the time of the production of this Plan Haringey has draft policy DM18, and Camden emerging policy A5 in their draft Local Plans. The Forum's Plan seeks to build on both Camden's and Haringey's emerging policies and ensure that applications for basement development across the Plan area are considered in a consistent and robust manner. The Forum would encourage Haringey and Camden to work together to produce a model basement application. This should ensure all parts of an application are in order, that a BIA, BCP and CMP have been completed satisfactorily in advance of the application, inform both applicants and neighbours, take up less officer time and provide transparency for all parties in what can be a fraught process. Pro-forma BCP and CMPs would help this process.</p> <p>Comment: All this seems pretty sensible, however, should this section reflect the diverse nature of basement applications. There an interesting comment about understanding the context of basements in the "Basement Development in Westminster SPD" see below;</p> <p>6 BASEMENT DEVELOPMENT: UNDERSTANDING THE CONTEXT</p> <p>6.01 Basement development in Westminster tends to be concentrated in certain high-value residential areas, in particular Belgravia, Knightsbridge, Mayfair, Bayswater and St John's Wood. The townscape of these areas is dominated by Georgian and Victorian townhouses, mostly laid out in terraces but with a concentration of villas set in large gardens to the north of Westminster, mixed in with later mansion and flat blocks from the Edwardian era and later 20th century.</p> <p>6.02 These different parts of Westminster raise different challenges. The type and age of a building, whether it is a terrace,</p>	Basement policy substantially rewritten

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
			<p>villa or a flat will determine the size, layout and character of the garden or amenity space, as well as the accessibility of the site, all of which have a significant influence on the location and extent of excavation which is acceptable, and how construction work should be managed.</p> <p>6.03 All basement development will need to be appropriate to its site and context. In some cases where large basement extensions are proposed, the resulting intensity of basement use may affect the domestic scale, function and character, in particular in smaller scale streets and mews. Applicants should ensure the development responds to and is appropriate to its site.</p> <p>6.04 The other main issues which will be considered by the council when assessing planning applications for basement development are set out in this section. This includes further advice on relevant adopted policy and details of information requirements in relation to specific issues. Is it appropriate for the HNF Plan to adopt and adapt the above commentary for Highgate and include it in the Plan- i.e. in effect it says that depending on the property and area where you live, some basement construction is much more damaging than others i.e. in terraced houses. If Haringey Council produce an SPD, it should reflect this approach as well.</p>	
Simon		07/02/2016 16:40	<p>CPZs Islington Borough should be commended on the production of a thorough Parking Policy Statement: https://www.islington.gov.uk/publicrecords/library/Transport-and-infrastructure/Business-planning/Policies/2011-2012/(2011-07-15)-Draft-Parking-Policy-Statement.pdf I would hope that the Forum can encourage Haringey to develop such a statement and for it to be as consistent as possible with Camden and other surrounding areas. That aspiration and some of the themes below could be mentioned in the Plan. In reviewing parking for the Highgate area, the forum might like to state that it will bear in mind some of the Islington policies such as:</p> <p>2.16 London's air quality is the worst in the UK, and is particularly poor in inner London, and along main roads. By limiting the amount of parking that is available to non-priority users, the Council can reduce the level of traffic travelling through the borough and hence emission levels.</p> <p>2.36 The Council first seeks to meet demand for parking space from disabled people and residents. If parking space in an area is adequate to meet these needs, then any on-street space that is left over is allocated to meet the needs of priority users including pedestrians, cyclists, local businesses, suppliers of goods and services including trades people, business customers and shoppers, residents' visitors.</p> <p>2.38 Given the constraints on space, and the Council's obligation to manage traffic volumes and congestion in the borough, policies are designed to reduce certain types of parking use, such as: people who park within the borough, but continue their journey on foot or by public transport to a destination outside the borough (including 'park and ride' in streets around rail and tube stations); parking by residents of adjoining boroughs in order to avoid controls in their own streets; parking by people who commute into the borough by car for work.</p> <p>3.2..... by discouraging certain groups of non-residents from parking in an area, a CPZ increases the likelihood that a resident can park close to their home. Many of the themes are mirrored in the Camden's document: http://www.camden.gov.uk/com/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=1615935 Notably, on page 20, objective no 8: "To make adequate provision for residents and short stay parking requirements, while reducing the provision for long-stay commuter-based car parking and complementing the objectives of congestion charging." This is emphasised on page 21: "The Council does not encourage non-essential car use, and therefore will make no provision for car-borne commuting". I hope that the forum will put an end to Highgate's residents and businesses being handicapped by having a less lenient policy than the neighbouring boroughs.</p>	Parking policy addressed in Submission Draft
Salvator Roberto A		07/02/2016 16:37	<p>Overall, my compliments for a well-mastered effort to make the Highgate neighbourhood area a better living place. Regarding the parking issues, I strongly recommend that the area of Cromwell Avenue, Winchester Road and nearby be included in an extension of the parking restrictions. There's a definite risk otherwise that an overflow will take place from adjacent areas already extending their parking limitations, and that visitors to services in the area will add to the parking stress. In the last years we already noticed quite a deterioration in the parking availability, mostly during the day, but also at nights during week-ends. Please note that the above-mentioned area would become even more appealing to in-commuters: it's few metres away from three hi-frequency bus lines in Archway Road. In more detail:</p> <p>1. Week-ends should be included (at least partially) in a CPZ hour extension: people stop here when they come to the many parks around us or for events in nearby venues. I understand that one should not discourage people from spending some time in the open air, but a little more restrictions could possibly help.</p> <p>2. Motorbikes: dedicated (but not huge) spaces would help preventing them to take more than one bay (they are often parked few metres from one another, and residents don't dare parking close to motorbikes, resulting in at least two bays wasted). Equally important, regarding the access to the Highgate reservoirs (CA31), I would vote against, or at least suggest very great caution: there are enough green areas and parks around where I live without the need to open new private lands to herds of visitors. This could entail unpleasant modifications to the land and the vegetation and bring over the construction of new concrete paths and service buildings, not necessarily a good idea in areas naturally subject to subsidence (not to mention the inevitable nuisance to nearby residents, certainly a concern for anyone trying to improve or preserve the quality of life in Highgate).</p>	See above re parking. Reservoir policy deleted.

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Simon		07/02/2016 14:23	I have two comments about the Bowl section, 4.5 - about the map and the public aspiration. First, I think the red and green lines on the map on p70 of the Bowl, KS3, could be drawn to be more intuitive and consistent with the text (and be labelled). The "story" would then be easier to understand. Section 4.5 refers to "centre of the Bowl", "the bowl", "overall Bowl site", "the central area of the Bowl" and "the main body of the site" without being clear about what is meant. Others will know better than me but should the "overall Bowl site" be larger site (the red line) and "the bowl" refer to the inner core (the green line)? The question then is where to draw the lines. Does the (core) bowl comprise the nursery site, the Harington Scheme and the woods? It seems as if the yards should be in the gap between the two lines, but what else? 4.5.1 seems to say that "private gardens" are also in the overall bowl site but are not, as it stands, within the boundary drawn by the outer line. It seems odd to have the school parade ground in the green line but not the red - and presumably it should be the reverse? Second, the Plan describes the bowl as a "prominent and distinctive local landscape feature" but does not state that is neither visible or nor publicly accessible at the moment. Many people will not know of its existence or have visited - and certainly not be aware of its potential. It might thus be better to start the whole section with the para beginning "the Bowl comprises an area of land with potentially significant community value" to emphasise the value to Highgate not just to those living next to it. Various minor points I note the text says that development should "not create a dominant feature which would substantially damage the views from the High Street and/or Southwood Lane" (KS3, iii). There are no views from the public spaces of the road, and it's hard to imagine a building being built there of that scale, so should that refer instead to damaging the views from the properties on those two roads? Should the wording allow for the possibility (probably very remote but I do not know) that the Harington scheme ceases to be located in that area or conduct activities of the sort it does now? Presumably planning rules have influence over land use not the existence or location of a charity? (This is clear in KS3 vi but not always in the text.) Presumably the admirable and desirable aspiration of "public access throughout" can only ever be expected to apply to the garden centre component and new pathways, and perhaps should say as much? Finally, if KS3 refers only to development on "the fringes of Highgate Bowl", what governs development over the whole site, be that back gardens or other plots in the centre?	New Bowl policy text and map agreed with Haringey Council
Gail Waldman		07/02/2016 13:01	TR1 & DH 8.2I would like to propose, from personal unfortunate experience, that this should be added :Risks to neighbours' personal safety and property as well as the safety of people and vehicles in public areas must be evaluated in all CMPs including but not limited to risks associated with storing excavated material and building materials; removal and delivery of materials; and routes and parking of vehicles. In addition copies of CDM Plans must be provided to neighbours before work commences on site. CMPs must be required for every application and consulted upon. HSE advice states : " Health and safety is relevant to all businesses. So, if you are an employer – or are self employed – you are responsible for the health, safety and welfare of employees and any others who may be affected by what you do. This includes employees, casual or part time workers, trainees, customers, neighbours, sales people and members of the public."] http://www.hse.gov.uk/construction/new-health-safety.htm This checklist should be formalised into a format to be used for all planning applications.	New provisions added to policies where regulations allow
Simon		07/02/2016 11:39	I will submit by email another parking survey to add to the evidence page. It sets out the facts such we know them about parking stress, which is a concept mentioned in several places. It shows that there are various types of parking status on Highgate's roads:1.Highgate has many private roads or roads where parking in not otherwise allowed. 2.There are some roads that have parking space pretty much all the time. 3.Largely clear at night, full by day. 4.Constant medium pressure. 5.Full by night but space during the day. 6.Some roads are full by day and full at night. Parking policy needs to be changed and different solutions are required to solve the problems and exploit the opportunity existing on different streets. Conclusion•Most Highgate residents can park near their homes at night but some can't.•The in-commuter parking during the day causes very real problems on many streets when CPZ hours do not apply. For some residents it has reached crisis point.•Using a car to come to shop or use a service in Highgate involves driving around looking for parking. This is polluting and damages retail and commercial viability. •There are streets where kerb space is under-used and there could be more parking. I think it would be useful to articulate these types of road in the preamble to the transport section, and to explain/justify the relevant actions in the final few pages of the Plan.	Parking surveys added to Appendix1: Evidence
Ian Henghes		07/02/2016 10:43	Section 5 DH: Assuming we cannot have a statutory requirement that new build is to high energy efficiency standards, can we add something like the following >> Work with Councils and developers to promote high building standards especially in the area of energy efficiency, and encourage the use of the Home Quality Mark http://www.homequalitymark.com <<	Superceded by revised regulations - NPs can no longer address these issues
Ian Henghes		07/02/2016 10:42	Section 5 TR: It would be good to be more proactive in trying to reduce traffic and pollution. Suggest - >> Promote reduced car ownership both through development of public transport and encouragement of car share and club schemes and electric vehicle charging points <<	Addressed in Submission Draft in new CA26

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Louise Lewis	[REDACTED]	06/02/2016 11:01	<p>IntroductionHighgate's unique past could include an allusion to the tale of Dick Whittington, Pepys journey to Lauderdale house where Lord Brouncker's carriage needed 6 horses to get up the hill and the various famous people who have lived here including Francis Bacon, Andrew Marvell and Coleridge. The phrase 'affordable housing' should be replaced by the phrase, 'genuinely affordable housing' throughout the plan. The interpretation of the word 'affordable' when related to housing, has been utterly changed in recent years. Social and Community Needs There is an emphasis on the number of schools in the area, but it should be pointed out that anyone who cannot afford public school fees or would prefer their child to go to a state school has no secondary provision within the HNF area and there are 'black holes' in the state provision covering the HNF area. It should be an aspiration that any resident who wants their child to go to a local state school, should be able to. Traffic and Transport The first 3 sub-objectives to Core Objective 3: Traffic and Transport have been completely changed since the first draft plan of January 2015. That draft had sub-objective 3.1 The amelioration if the harmful effects of moving and stationary vehicles on the environment. 3.2 An improved streetscape to make it safer and more accessible to move around Highgate. 3.3 Greater connectivity throughout Highgate which have been replaced by SO3.1 To manage the movement of heavy goods vehicles SO3.2 To minimise the longer term impact of new traffic arising as a result of development SO3.3 To leave unaffected, or improve – the parking provision for Highgate The emphasis seems to have shifted from improving traffic flows and managing the traffic environment for the benefit of the entire community, to limiting the impact of traffic arising from development and maintaining current conditions for the cars of residents. Although 60% of people in the area have cars, or access to a car, by implication, that means 40% of people don't. They are equally if not more affected by the heavy traffic flow and policies for traffic and transport should take their perspective into consideration. There are circumstances where parking needs to be restricted eg the High Street and particularly the southbound bus stop outside Brooksby's. I cannot agree with SO.3 "To leave unaffected, or improve – the parking provision for Highgate" without adding something along the lines of, "other than in exceptional circumstances." It seems to me to there is an overemphasis on parking when we are talking about traffic and transport. One aspiration should be to improve the use of public transport. While we may not have good eastward links into Haringey, it should be mentioned in the background notes that we have very good bus links to the City, the West End, to Hampstead and Barnet. We have 2 buses terminating in the core village, 2 that go through the village, 3 that go along Archway Road and two that go along roads bounding the HNF area. In addition we have a tube station within the area. We should be encouraging people to use these public transport links rather than their cars. When we first started consulting about the plan, there was a lot of talk about improving and developing footpaths such as Tile Kiln Lane, Park House Passage, Park Walk and so on. This appears to be lost though the aim expressed on page 43 "making it easier for people to follow desire lines even across previously privately owned land, for example providing an element of pedestrian access to or across the "Bowl" area..." is welcome. I would like to add "and to develop pedestrian footways, for example The Bank, where a road already exists." Development and Heritage Applications within the area should have a Flood Risk Assessment attached whether that risk be from surface water or subterranean water. There is a risk assessment template within Haringey's Strategic Flood Risk assessment report: http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/2014s1700_haringeycouncil_sfra_v4_0_issue.pdf All applications should have a BREAM environmental assessment rated at Excellent or Outstanding. http://www.breem.com/index.jsp The Code for Sustainable Homes should be implemented within the HNF area despite being withdrawn by the current government.</p>	Comments noted and where appropriate acted on. Re Flood Risk Assessment: this has been superseded by revised regulations - Neighbourhood Plans cannot address this
John Deas	[REDACTED] m	05/02/2016 18:10	With regard to Traffic & Transport Policy TR 19, the review of parking regulations, should include an examination of whether the hours of CPZs should be extended as the current 2 hour period is ineffective in preventing commuter parking. Additionally Traffic & Transport Policy should examine whether there should be an increase in number in Highgate Village of dedicated loading bays for commercial vehicles.	
Stuart Bull	[REDACTED]	05/02/2016 17:16	KS3 - Parking. A well known adage - "the number of cars seeking a parking space will always grow disproportionately to the space allocated." Highgate is blessed by extremely good public transport services. Blessed with the cleaner air of Highgate, let's not be polluting slaves to the selfish car.	
Tom Allen	[REDACTED]	05/02/2016 13:43	My comments relate to section SO2.1. I completely agree with Michael Wieder's comments above, about what's missing from the plan for Archway road. I don't think anyone wants to see Archway road turned into a facsimile of Highgate High Street (overwhelmingly estate agents and coffee) but there is a real shortage of places for the residents of the surrounding streets to eat, drink, shop and socialise. I am afraid I disagree with the plan's statement that Archway road "has a high number of pubs and eateries and serves as a local leisure destination". This is certainly not the case with respect to sections 1 and 2, and I think many of the businesses in these sections counted as A3 are more accurately A5 takeaways. I agree with the plan's observation that most of the businesses in Archway road are very much the sort of SME establishments that the community wants to encourage and support. However, there are more than a few premises that are either vacant, mysterious or have obviously been converted into flats. A sound place to start would be for the plan to explicitly require that A4 premises in Archway road remain as such and not be eligible for conversion to residential. Look at the tragic situation of the Winchester, where an avaricious developer keeps bullying the council in effort to convert the entire building to luxury residential units. The second suggestion I would make would be specific requirements disallowing the imposition or replacement of roll-down steel shutters that completely obscure the shopfronts. Thirdly, perhaps we could encourage some of our multitude of local estate agents to recruit a few tenants interested in operating restaurants suitable for family dining that would cater to the neighbours? I very much appreciate the persistent hard work that has gone into the creation of this plan. We are very lucky to live here amongst such talented and passionate neighbours.	Comments noted and applied to Archway Road section where possible but mostly beyond the scope of neighbourhood plans

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Simon Briscoe		05/02/2016 11:43	Bowl policy KS3. I think there needs to be an additional policy component for the Bowl area - relating to parking. The Plan as it stands does not seem to acknowledge the very considerable role played by the area in providing car parking. I estimate roughly, but cautiously, that it can/does contain over 100 cars (60 Townsend, and 30 each in Dukes and Broadbent). This is all private land under various and many ownerships but it clearly meets a very considerable demand for parking. (Not that we know who parks there.) That is probably more cars than park in Pond Square, on South Grove and on the HighStreet. Development should at the very least preserve the existing parking provision but could also expand it to allow for parking by the public and service users. This would boost the economic viability of the village core. Charges made for parking could help fund other projects in the area.	To include a separate policy on parking just for the Bowl is superfluous. The Forum considers policy KS3 and the transport policies set out in Chapter X are sufficient. No further change required.
James Parsons		04/02/2016 22:21	Hi We lived in Cromwell Place (N6 5HR) for 24 years but moved 2 years ago to Sussex Gardens (N6 4LY). when we were in Cromwell Place we sometimes had to park over half a mile away from our home. The off-street parking that we have now partially compensates for leaving such a wonderful area. Anything that Haringey can do to make parking better around Cromwell Avenue would be good.	The policy approach to parking included in the draft NP has been agreed by both Councils and the Forum has worked closely with the Councils on this issue.
Michael Wieder		03/02/2016 21:19	HelloAfter reading the plan I just have a general comment.The tone of the plan seems to imply that the lower rent/less attractive nature of the archway road shopping area is somehow a good thing, primarily because it promotes diversity of retail establishments. Whilst I agree that we do want diversity of shopping outlets, I'm very surprised that there seems to be a tone of cheerful resignation about the Archway road. Of the entire area covered by the plan, this locality has the most potential for transformative regeneration through a long term development plan and I'd like to see more thought about how the area in general as well as retail/restaurant/entertainment services could be made more comprehensive and attractive for residents and visitors.Michael	Comments noted - issues addressed where possible within remit of neighbourhood plan
Robin		03/02/2016 13:51	I am writing with regard to section 3.3.4 on page 44 of the Neighbourhood report, specifically point CA19: "Review parking regulations to improve access for those wishing to shop or visit, and ensure that the streets that suffer from parking stress cease to be a haven for commuter parking."We live in Cromwell Avenue and over the past 11 years have noticed a steady deterioration in the overall parking situation. This is particularly the case at the end by the junction with Hornsey Lane/ Highgate Hill. The current operation of a 2 hour system (10am-12pm) is totally insufficient in controlling parking. I would observe the main causes of problems: school pick-up in the afternoon; weddings and events at St Josephs on weekends; evening parking by people who then exit Cromwell Avenue on foot - presumably to Hornsey Lane/ Highgate Hill/ Whittington hospital and beyond; general weekend parking from Friday afternoon to Sunday night. St Jospeh's and the hospital should be providing their own parking for users of those services and not relying on lax restrictions in neighbouring roads. Similarly I understand there are permits issued to residents of Hornsey Lane, which seems illogical. All of the above means that for residents (paying significant permit amounts) there is very limited benefit. We have 3 children and over the years this has caused the significant issue of parking at the other end of Cromwell Avenue (400+ yards away), which presumably has a knock-on effect there. We also lost 2 valuable spaces when Haringey decided to allow dedicated places for car share schemes.If one compares the 2 hour CPZ scheme with other neighbouring areas (Islington and Camden), it is completely insufficient and offers very little value. I would encourage the relevant authority to bring the system in line with these areas, namely 9am-6pm throughout the week (and at least half the day on Saturday). Parking stress is evident in selected areas (Cromwell Avenue, Highgate Hill, Bisham Gardens etc) - all of which would benefit from these changes.	Parking stress has been addressed in considerably amended Transport and Traffic section of the Plan
Sydney Charles		02/02/2016 16:55	A suggestion at the first draft stage was for QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF NEW HOMES IN HIGHGATE, requiring developers to join the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Home Quality Mark scheme and provide the result to prospective buyers/renters. This was not included in this second draft, but the reasons were not mentioned in the Council response - so possibly it was not dealt with, but Highgate Society Sustainable Homes group believe that this would be particularly advantageous for new homes.The proposed policy would be: "Applicants for planning permission for new homes will be required to confirm that they are committed to offering a 'Home Quality Mark' with each home. This will include the star rating and an assessment of HMQ factors affecting running costs and wellbeing including environmental footprint of living in the home, as well as additional factors such as sound insulation, flood mitigation and daylight and air quality."Relevant sub-objectives:5.3 Conformity: NPPF section 10 paras 95-97; London policies 5.2B, 5.2C, 5.2D, Camden DP22, Haringey SP4.1a)As background, Camden and Haringey policies require a 'Code for Sustainable Homes' assessment, but CFSH has now been discontinued by the Government, leaving no quality standards for Highgate (or the rest of the boroughs). BRE has now launched registration for its new Home Quality Mark, which is essentially a more holistic sustainability mark for homeowners.http://www.homequalitymark.com/what_is_the_mark.html Good developers are likely to sign up for it, but others might prefer to draw a veil over their quality and there is no reason to believe that this would be onerous or expensive in the context of building new homes.If this policy were adopted it would strengthen the claim in the SEA that the Plan has Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience as an objective (SEAp8) and that the HNF Plan policies will make a significant difference to Climate Change Adaptation (SEAp23).Leaving the use of the HMQ as optional leaves Highgate with the risk of poorer quality homes being built, and high energy usage, for instance, being inbuilt for the lifetime of the home.	This proposal would be regarded as "too restrictive" because it goes further than national guidelines. We would have to prove that Highgate is different from the rest of England and Wales.

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Sydney Charles		02/02/2016 15:39	<p>A suggestion at the first draft stage was for QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF NEW HOMES IN HIGHGATE, requiring developers to join the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Home Quality Mark scheme and provide the result to prospective buyers/renters. This was not included in this second draft, but the reasons were not mentioned in the Council response – so possibly it was not dealt with, but Highgate Society Sustainable Homes group believe that this would be particularly advantageous for new homes. The proposed policy would be:</p> <p>“Applicants for planning permission for new homes will be required to confirm that they are committed to offering a ‘Home Quality Mark’ with each home. This will include the star rating and an assessment of HMQ factors affecting running costs and wellbeing including environmental footprint of living in the home, as well as additional factors such as sound insulation, flood mitigation and daylight and air quality.” Relevant sub-objectives: 5.3 Conformity: NPPF section 10 paras 95-97; London policies 5.2B, 5.2C, 5.2D, Camden DP22, Haringey SP4.1a) As background, Camden and Haringey policies require a ‘Code for Sustainable Homes’ assessment, but CfSH has now been discontinued by the Government, leaving no quality standards for Highgate (or the rest of the boroughs). BRE has now launched registration for its new Home Quality Mark, which is essentially a more holistic sustainability mark for homeowners. http://www.homequalitymark.com/what_is_the_mark.html Good developers are likely to sign up for it, but others might prefer to draw a veil over their quality and there is no reason to believe that this would be onerous or expensive in the context of building new homes. If this policy were adopted it would strengthen the claim in the SEA that the Plan has Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience as an objective (SEAp8) and that the HNF Plan policies will make a significant difference to Climate Change Adaptation (SEAp23). Leaving the use of the HMQ as optional leaves Highgate with the risk of poorer quality homes being built, and high energy usage, for instance, being inbuilt for the lifetime of the home.</p>	as above
Helen		02/02/2016 11:30	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I write with regard to section 3.3.4 on page 44 of the report, specifically point CA19: "Review parking regulations to improve access for those wishing to shop or visit, and ensure that the streets that suffer from parking stress cease to be a haven for commuter parking." I live on Highgate Hill, which unfortunately has become a haven for commuters and non residents to park due to the extremely limited nature of the residents parking hours. The parking bays outside the home of myself and my neighbours are routinely made inaccessible because they are used extensively by visitors to the Ghana High Commission; and by private hire vehicles or executive car service vehicles collecting pupils from Channing School and by non-resident parents collecting children from the school. I have two children under the age of 3 and every day I struggle to park within walking distance of my home. Surveys have shown that there are areas of parking stress in the neighbourhood, notably Highgate Hill, Bisham Gardens and parts of Cromwell Avenue and Cromwell Place. I would respectfully urge the authority to introduce full day CPZ hours to relieve the parking stress and to make these family neighbourhoods the preserve of the community and not commuters. With regard to point CA20, I would urge the authority to open a robust dialogue with schools in the village to ensure they do very much more to reduce "school run" traffic; far too little, if anything, is being done at present.</p>	Parking stress has been addressed in considerably amended Transport and Traffic section of the Plan. In addition, we continue to work with Councils and schools on these matters
Stuart Bull		30/01/2016 10:20	<p>Supplementary to earlier comments 24th Jan. re: KS3 - the creation of an URBAN EDEN in The Bowl - there would be proposals for Disabled Parking and Bicycles on site.</p>	Noted
Richard Parish		29/01/2016 13:28	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the revised Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Highgate. The Government through the Localism Act (2011) and Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012) has enabled local communities to take a more pro-active role in influencing how their neighbourhood is managed. The Regulations require Historic England, as a statutory agency, be consulted on Neighbourhood Plans where the Neighbourhood Forum or Parish Council consider our interest to be affected by the Plan. As Historic England's remit is advice on proposals affecting the historic environment our comments relate to the implications of the proposed neighbourhood plan for heritage assets. Accordingly, we have reviewed your document against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its core principle that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Having reviewed the draft document we can offer the following General comments: Historic England commented in detail on the initial draft of the Plan (letter to Camden dated 20 April 2015). In our letter we raised a number of issues in respect of the design and environmental policies which, in our view, required clarification and revision. Those points are now clearly addressed by the revised draft and the document offers an exceptionally clear vision for a sustainable neighbourhood. We are of course pleased to note that Highgate's rich historic environment is clearly recognised in the core objectives and we welcome the submission of the Draft Plan. It must be noted that this advice does not affect our obligation to advise on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this request and which may have adverse effects on the environment.</p>	Support noted.
P. Hodgson		28/01/2016 12:56	<p>I strongly support DH1-11, measures to retain the character of the buildings in the Highgate area and prevent inappropriate development and design. However, DH8 in respect of planning consent for basement development does not adequately reflect the danger to the geology and water tables in the area nor the effect on neighbouring properties. Planning controls should be much more stringent, with a presumption of no approvals. EA1, relating to Highgate Village High street, should be stronger on the importance of core shops, such as basic grocery and chemist's shops and the problem to less mobile residents of the lack of a Post Office. TR4 on transport makes no allowance for older residents who may not be disabled but cannot walk or cycle long distances or uphill and where the lack of public transport makes accessing open spaces or visiting shops or a Doctor highly problematic. There needs to be specific provision in the policy for parking to meet these needs.</p>	Policies amended where possible within remit of neighbourhood plans

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Cara Jenkinson	[REDACTED]	27/01/2016 21:24	On behalf of the Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group I suggest that the following is added under the Introduction, Section 1.4.10 Sustainability "A key aspect of sustainability is the energy demand of our buildings. One of the challenges in Highgate is to make buildings more energy efficient without compromising character. This plan encourages changes to existing buildings to enhance energy efficiency, providing that character is not prejudiced". and under Section 3.5.2 (Core proposal 5) add this paragraph after the paragraph on Article 4. "The Forum encourages alterations to existing buildings to enhance energy efficiency, provided that the character of the building is not prejudiced and the risk of long-term deterioration of the building fabric or fittings is not increased. Where applicants intend to invoke the energy efficiency exemptions allowed in Part L1B for historic and traditional buildings, they must explain how they have followed the English Heritage guidance that the regulations say they 'should take into account'".	Noted
Sydney Charles	[REDACTED]	27/01/2016 18:45	Again on behalf of the Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group. We were disappointed that the suggestion at the first draft stage for QUALITY ANDPERFORMANCE OF NEW HOMES IN HIGHGATE did not appear in the second draft and no conversation had taken place regarding this.It is to require developers to join the Building Research Establishment Home Quality Mark (HQM) scheme that provides a simple score to prospective buyers/renters. This was not mentioned in the Council response – so possibly it was not dealt with.The proposed policy would be: "Applicants for planning permission for newhomes will be required to confirm that they are committed to offering a'Home Quality Mark' with each home. This will include the star rating and anassessment of HMQ factors affecting running costs and wellbeing includingenvironmental footprint of living in the home, as well as additional factors such as sound insulation, flood mitigation and daylight and air quality."Relevant sub-objectives:5.3 Conformity: NPPF section 10 paras 95-97; Londonpolicies 5.2B, 5.2C, 5.2D, Camden DP22, Haringey SP4.1a)As background Camden and Haringey policies require a 'Code for SustainableHomes' assessment, but CfSH has now been discontinued by the Government,leaving no quality standards for Highgate (or the rest of the boroughs). BREhas now launched registration for its new Home Quality Mark, which isessentially a more holistic sustainability mark for homeowners.http://www.homequalitymark.com/what_is_the_mark.html Good developers arelikely to sign up for it, but others might prefer to draw a veil over theirquality.If this policy were adopted it would strengthen the claim in the SEA thatthe Plan has Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience as an objective(SEAp8) and that the HNF Plan policies will make a significant difference toClimate Change Adaptation (SEAp23) - despite there being no objective tocontribute to the reduction of carbon emissions. There is also a statementin the SEA that "there is little to suggest that the delivery ofwell-located and designed measures will be precluded or overly restricted"(SEAp22), and one in the Plan at p53 that says "Any new developments shouldbe socially, environmentally and economically sustainable". Currently thePlan has no policy that addresses the environmental aspect of carbonemissions. However, if this policy were adopted, it would be something thataddressed carbon emissions, as well as the many other sustainability andquality objectives for new homes. Leaving the use of the HMQ as optional leaves Highgate with the risk of poorer quality homes being built, and high energy usage, for instance, being inbuilt for the lifetime of the home.	Covered by Haringey DM21
Sydney Charles	[REDACTED]	27/01/2016 18:38	The first draft of the Plan included EMBODIED ENERGY AND CARBON FOOTPRINT OF DEMOLITION PROPOSALS, but there was the need to make the meaning of the policy clearer. A replacement wording was submitted online saying:For Highgate, where a development is proposed, and there is a buildingalready on the site, calculations should be submitted showing CO2 emissionsfor 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 CO2equivalent.' 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 forpurpose for calculations to satisfy London Plan 5.2 C. See 'Evidence' for currently suitable software. The tables are for a) the proposed newbuilding, the initial demolition stage, and b) the scenario of refurbishingthe existing building. The presumption is against demolition, so it is for the applicant toestablish 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 Regulations, and the 'in-life' stage period is to be the same for bothscenarios. (generally 60 years) Applicants will be expected to show in everycase that products with the least embodied energy have been considered andthey will be required to certify on completion that those products have beenused. There was a response from the councils to the first draft wording, but seemingly not to the suggested improved version, and it has been removed as at the second draft.However some of these points do not seem applicable to the amended versionand/or don't seem to explain why this policy should not be included.1. the comment that planning permission is not normally needed to demolish a building does not recognise that almost all of the HNF area is in a Conservation Area, so almost all demolition proposals would indeed require planning permission.2. The council response implied that they were being expected to hold a database of embodied carbon and to use software themselves to make the comparison. This second version was very specific on the industry standard software and databases that would be used. The software (eg Impact) would be used by the architects not the councils, and the architects are used to using such software.3. The council points out that the London Plan 5.2C relates to operational CO2 emissions. That is true, which is why this calculation of refurbish v demolition/new build is desirable for the pre life stage, using BS 15804 principles.4. The councils pointed out that the references to Code for Sustainable Homes and Target Emission Rates were not applicable and this is correct –hence removed above.5. The Haringey comment that planning authorities should only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material implies that Highgate is not entitled to address unnecessary carbon emissions at the pre-life stage. Is this the case?6. Haringey mentions that this topic may be included in their emerging SP4. This is not visible or in force at the moment, so is not a reason to drop this policy (and will not cover Camden)	This cannot be included in the Plan because regarded as "too onerous" by relevant regulations

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Sydney Charles		27/01/2016 18:31	I am inputting some issues on behalf of the Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group, with one issue per entry. But firstly I'd like to congratulate everyone involved in producing this Plan. Having been involved with it at an earlier stage I am well aware of the difficulty of making such a complicated, ambitious plan look professional and worth people voting 'yes'. The item SC2 in the Social and Community Infrastructure Project Table is excellent, but we are not quite sure how it will work in practice: "SC2 - Seek out opportunities for environmental improvements, such as projects encouraging renewable energy, energy efficiency and low carbon schemes." It also mentions KS3 at this point, which is the Highgate Bowl, but not clear why. Catherine Budgett-Meakin has covered the role of renewables at the Key Sites, and all the Key Sites could be included here. The Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group is mentioned as a 'Who' here and is willing to work with others on this topic, across the HNF Area, so would like to know more of about this. Some of us, and members of Transition Highgate have already contributed to the setup of the Community Energy working group and are keen to continue with this as and when it has potential schemes.	Noted and KS3 included because community proposals for The Bowl include renewable energy projects
Simon		25/01/2016 22:13	I think that these lines from para 1.4.8 deserve some emphasis: "It is not the intention of this plan to duplicate or repeat what is already said in existing or emerging planning policy. The purpose of this plan is to add value to these existing policies, ensuring new policy is locally distinctive and specific to Highgate. As such, some of our policies are designed to build on and clarify the Boroughs' policies, and others to provide more cohesion between them." Getting more common policy in both the Haringey and Camden parts of Highgate is important as is bringing these policies to the attention of residents and businesses. Hopefully the clear statement of the policies will mean that the (perceived) large number of times that the boroughs wave through permissions which are against the will of the community, and detrimental to the area, will be fewer. Most obviously this would be the case in DH8, regarding basements.	noted
Parkland Walk (Friends of)		25/01/2016 10:01	KS5 - Friends of the Parkland Walk welcome the concept of improving the linkage from Shepherds Hill to the walk near the Holmesdale Road entrance, provided it does not result in loss of allotment land or habitat, but OBJECT to the notation used in Fig 20 on page 75 (and other smaller reproductions of the site boundary in other maps and figures). The 'red line' of site includes the 'bowl' in front of the tunnel entrances and implies that it is part of the development site. This should be re-drawn to confine the Key Site 5 boundary to just the area intended for redevelopment. The last sentence of KS5 (iv) notes the uncertainty of the route and the Friends suggest that the linkage be shown by a different notation (such as a dotted line between the points to be connected) Posted by Chris Mason, Secretary FPW.	The red line means it's a site specific 106 to create linkage, not part of the development itself. There is no intention of any development on Parkland Walk
Stuart Bull		24/01/2016 17:12	Congratulations to all for producing a very comprehensive second draft. The following constructive comments relate exclusively to Policy KS3 - Highgate Bowl. Three Critical Assumptions - 1. Freehold/Long Leasehold acquired through the now registered charity - Friends of The Bowl. 2. Any vision for the future of The Bowl must be self-funding/commercially viable/revenue generating to at least cover costs. 3. Needs a BIG IDEA that instantly captures the imagination of all. Detailed plan sent to HNF in separate email to justify and explain the creation of an URBAN GLOBAL EDEN in Highgate, whilst safeguarding the open aspect, historical, horticultural history of The Bowl, supported through 2 Planning Appeals - 2012 and 2014. Topics covered in full email - must offer more than current local community open spaces - go global, showcase environmentally important plants from around the world - mutual synergy with The Harington Scheme - revenue generating ideas - no additional traffic - sustainability - feasibility study with help of Eden organisation - Eden Branding - design assist from Joe Swift, Patron of Harington Scheme - business plan - Fund raising.	Noted but outside scope of neighbourhood plan
Christopher		21/01/2016 17:40	I have requested that the refurbishment of one Victorian cast iron lamppost of particular interest situated in the planter on Hornsey Lane Gardens be considered for CIL monies.	Added to CIL spending list
Catherine Budgett-Meakin		20/01/2016 10:24	I am submitting this on behalf of the Highgate Society Sustainable Homes Group: Requiring renewables on developments at the Key Sites. One of the suggestions at the first draft stage was for developers of the Key Sites to include generation of renewable energy. The SEA says that the Plan has Climate Change Mitigation and Resilience as an objective (SEAp8) and that the HNF Plan policies will make a significant difference to Climate Change Adaptation (SEAp23) - despite there being no objective to contribute to the reduction of carbon emissions. There is also a statement in the SEA that "there is little to suggest that the delivery of well-located and designed measures will be precluded or overly restricted" (SEAp22), and one in the Plan at p53 that says "Any new developments should be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable". Currently the Plan has no policy that addresses the environmental aspect of carbon emissions, and requiring developers to include renewables at the Key Sites would address this. The proposed policy for each Key Site was: "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."	The HNP should be read in conjunction with both Camden and Haringey's strategic policies. The issue of carbon emissions and renewables is adequately addressed by Haringey's DM21 and repeating the policy intent is not appropriate for inclusion in a neighbourhood plan. No further action required to the draft HNP or SEA.
Stephen Robinson		19/01/2016 06:52	The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan is a very important and necessary policy document that is designed to encourage good development within Highgate and prevent poor quality or inappropriate development taking place. Highgate contains important Conservation areas and this document aims to protect and preserve key heritage features that Highgate residents can all enjoy. Such features can easily be lost and once gone can never be replaced. Developers, residents and Haringey & Camden Councils should all recognise the importance of this policy document and the Councils planning departments, should place considerable weight on these policies when considering planning applications in the area. The Development and Heritage policies cover many areas and some vital policies for local residents that I would highlight are: basement development (this is becoming a major issue for terraced houses); side and rear extensions; roof and roofscapes and backland development. If these policies are not followed, neighbours could be blighted by very poor planning proposals. Well done to everyone involved in producing this document.	Support noted.

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Catherine Budgett-		13/01/2016 09:46	I think you've all done a great job. Congratulations. The Sustainability group will be making separate comments but I wanted just to highlight a comment which isn't quite accurate: Page 28 - about the bus turnaround in the Village. The text says "The Highgate community has been campaigning for many years for the relocation...." It was the Transport Group of the Highgate Society which has worked so hard and tirelessly on this and I think they should be credited explicitly.	Noted but the group working on the 271 bus turnaround has been Richard Webber from the Highgate Society, Simon Briscoe from the Forum + local councillor so the description of 'community' seems accurate
Tony		11/01/2016 13:49	Yes - part of a bigger problem. The whole of Section 4 seems to tacitly endorse the Council's plans for high rise blocks at the Key Sites. Because the plan says that new development heights for these sites should reflect the "2015 Highgate Urban Character Study". But the "Study" (by Haringey Council) seems to propose a raft of 5,6 and 7 plus storey apartment blocks for the sites. The HNF plan's lack of openness on this key development issues may invalidate the consultation process, because people will not have grasped the HNF draft plan supports Haringey ambitions for high rise development in Shepherds Hill, Archway Road and right next to Queenswood. And the park in Archway Road (Coleridge Gardens) is also to be sold off and built over... As drafted, Section 4 of the HNF plan guarantees the final destruction of the area's unique character. Three storey new building limits must be made clear and all existing conservation area green/public space must be given special designation and protection. Other than that, I'm sure it's a great plan.	Key sites section has been amended but both the Councils and the Forum would take issue with your assertions. Both refute your assertion about 'the final destruction of the area's unique character'.
James L		11/01/2016 10:13	With reference to item 4.4 Key Site 2 - Former Highgate Underground Station. As I've previously noted before, Policy KS2 does not mention the welfare / respect of neighbouring residents in terms of proposed design / access and usage. If the introduction of a cultural / educational or any other development is considered, it will have a severe impact on the logistics, security and overall ambiance of Priory Gardens which residents currently enjoy. The policy has not made mention of this in any way.	Only one local resident - yourself - has responded to this Consultation (despite leaflets being delivered to every household) which would suggest that other residents don't share your views.
Isabelle		06/01/2016 13:49	Congratulations to all the plan is very thorough. Regarding the conservation area and keeping the character of the architecture and restrictions on extensions etc I live near the Murugan temple. I would like to know how the tower extension and the additional features, paint colour scheme etc that are not the same as in the planning permission, fit within the conservation zone and if this could be improved-mentioned?	Support noted. Details of planning permissions granted to the Murugan Temple are outside the scope of the Plan.
Tony Rybacki		01/01/2016 12:06	Surely a good plan but with one major defect: it seemingly accepts/endorses emerging plans for new tall apartment blocks everywhere east of Archway Road.. Section 4 of the plan says repeatedly that new building heights at each Key Site should confirm with/reflect the 2015 Highgate Urban Character Study. This Study (by Haringey) includes proposed "maximum building heights" of five, seven storeys and more... (p.19, http://bit.ly/1ODXZje). Local people think Highgate is protected from the damaging re-development. But, as drafted, the HNF plan would allow many new five & seven-plus storey blocks (in Shepherds Hill, along Archway Road and Muswell Hill Road) while failing to make plain to the reader just how tall these buildings will actually be. This must be a flaw. If the document remains unchanged, it undermines the fairness of the consultation process. The HNF previously wrote to Haringey to put on record that it seeks a default maximum three to four storey height on any new development. The plan should restate clearly this three/four storey maximum limit still applies at all future sites KS 1-5 (and also to the others). If the policy has changed, where is the support coming from? Unlikely to be anyone local who would be affected by the many "Key Site" high rises. One other question on HNF policy switching - why does the HNF plan now actively promote the redevelopment of the only pocket park on Archway Road (Coleridge Gardens) for new high-rise apartments? This unique park was always due to be designated as irreplaceable Local Green Space and therefore protected in the local plan. Its loss to the developers would be to the detriment of residents and the neighbourhood. It just needs the benches back and a bit more maintenance.	as above
Nick Brown		21/12/2015 10:35	UPDATE: Having read in further detail, I can see there is plenty of good, strong commitments towards pedestrians in the rest of the plan. As such it seems appropriate to have walking given higher status and prominence in the sub-objectives.	see below
Nick Brown		21/12/2015 10:05	A very thorough plan, thank you. My concern is with the absence of any explicit commitment to pedestrians in any of the sub-objectives. There are implicit commitments to 'access' and 'promotion' etc. but no clear statement supporting the needs, priorities and wishes of people walking in Highgate (ie everyone!). Could the plan perhaps take a stronger, clearer, position on the needs of pedestrians? Along the lines of 'priority should be given wherever possible to pedestrians', or 'development should not discourage walking'.	The NP contains a sub-objective on how the needs of pedestrians are being catered for.
Sally Payton		16/12/2015 16:25	Is there any possibility that part of the Highgate Bowl could be used as a 'pay and display' car park for people using the village facilities, ie shops, restaurants and businesses? This could be made environmentally friendly with trees and bushes, and would alleviate the parking problems on the streets closest to the village.	Noted but outside scope of neighbourhood plan
Susan Rose		16/12/2015 15:27	Policy DH1 demolition is rendered very weak and in truth possibly worthless by the statement that 'exceptional circumstances' allowing demolition of listed buildings or those described as 'positive contributors' to the CA if demolition would allow the 'ability to deliver significantly against policy SC1. This includes all forms of affordable /social housing sheltered housing etc. Any demolition which led to an increase in the number of units to be erected on the site could possibly be included in this policy. 'Deliver significantly' MUST be more tightly defined and the linkage to exceptional circumstances might be made to be explicitly that in the NPPF otherwise as I have said this policy would provide little if any protection against a determined and savvy would be demolisher.	The NP policy on demolition has been reworded following discussions with Camden and Haringey. The Forum considers the policy provides sufficient protection.

comment_author	comment_autho	comment_date	comment_content	Action
Richard Clarke		15/12/2015 18:00	<p>Hi, Congratulations on a very thorough Neighbourhood Plan - I feel the preservation of Highgate is in good hands. The one issue I would like to raise is with regards to CA31 - the plan to secure access to the covered reservoirs. I appreciate that this is listed as a low priority item, but my request is that this item be dropped from the plan all together. My property is adjacent to the Hornsey Lane reservoir and (being on the second floor) level with the top of it. Any increased access to the reservoir would seriously affect my privacy, as my living room and bedroom windows face the reservoir and only a few metres from it. Any planting on the site are likely to increase the number of insects and levels of pollen, which are already a serious problem in summer, as opening these windows is the only means of ventilation. Further to the lose of privacy, there is the prospect of increased noise that will be detrimental to neighbours of the site. Finally, there have been several incidents this year of trespassers using the reservoir to gain access to adjacent private gardens and opening the site to the public would heighten the security risk to these properties' occupants. Ultimately, I do not believe that there is a high level of community demand for these changes, not least because Highgate is already exceptionally well served for accessible green spaces. Indeed, Waterlow Park is less than 3 minutes walk from the Hornsey Lane reservoir site. In my opinion it would be unfair to pursue a small, putative benefit (the genesis, demand and realisation of which is unclear) at the expense of the genuine concerns of those closest to the site. I believe if this consultation is to be seen to be conducted in a fair and open way, then concerns like these need to be impartially weighed and I do not believe a strong case for CA31 (with regards to Hornsey Lane reservoir at least) can be made.</p>	CA31 on access to privately held tracts of land eg reservoirs has been removed from the Plan.