

Response of Highgate CAAC to the Haringey DPD.

We have had some difficulties in formulating our response since the reproduction of the maps is so poor that the legends are illegible and the colouring seems very erratic and inaccurate as to its location. Our response is as follows.

1. DM5 and 2.27 tall buildings; it seems that 2 locations in Highgate are deemed suitable for tall buildings. These seem to be a location at the Wellington roundabout and another on North Hill. It is our considered opinion that NO site in Highgate is suitable for tall buildings. The Wellington site is not suitable for anything over three storeys taking into account the context, the views up the wooded slope of Highgate Hill and across to Highgate Woods. The North Hill site is unclear; is Highpoint intended. If this is so this is a grade 1 listed building and no alterations can be contemplated. The idea of landmark buildings is also not acceptable.
2. DM6 local views and vistas. Again the map is inadequate but as far as we can see no views out from or into Highgate are included on it. These are all included in the Conservation Area management Plan which should be consulted. Since Highgate is the highest point in the borough it is clearly an important 'viewpoint'. WE would suggest that the view of the Highgate Ridge from Alexandra palace, the view down the High Street to the City, the view from Kingsley Place over east London are particularly noteworthy.
3. DM12 Management of the Historic Environment. Paragraph B a(p.21) contains wording which we feel is in contravention of the relevant clauses of the NPPF and which will lead to harm to heritage assets. It is not within the NPPF to suggest that affordable housing opportunities are of such significant public benefit that they can outweigh the loss of a heritage asset.
4. Similarly (paragraph c . p.22) the idea that the issue of options for adaptive reuse being unachievable can be a matter of merely producing documents during the validation process is far too vague and ill-defined. It is an invitation to would-be demolishers of heritage assets to produce such evidence with no element of consultation or control.
5. Paragraph C; it is hard to see how the 'subdivision of plots, infill and backland development' can EVER preserve or enhance the significance etc. of a heritage asset. AS you know the curtilage of a listed building is as protected as the building itself and the preservation of the setting of heritage assets has been a major concern in recent decisions in the courts.
6. WE would support much of the rest of DM12 and the explanations given in 2.74-2.94 but it is essential that these policies are enforced consistently. The future of heritage assets in Haringey is largely dependent on this.

Susan Rose Chair Highgate CAAC.