



FOR HIGHGATE  
HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

## Response from the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum to Haringey Site Allocations DPD February 2015

### For information

#### All sites in Highgate are in N6, not N8 as stated in the draft document.

The Highgate Neighbourhood Forum welcomes the statement on p 115 “For the avoidance of doubt, the requirements of both the future Allocations in this document when adopted, and the guidance provided in the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum Plan should be taken into account when bringing forward development proposals.”

#### SA42 460-470 Archway Road

This site corresponds to the Forum site KA1.

Views from Highgate Wood should be considered as part of any planning application on this site and there should be no greater impact than that of the present buildings. Therefore any new buildings should be no higher than the existing ones, i.e. a maximum of 3-4 storeys. Furthermore, any concerns raised by TfL re overlooking of the Northern Line control hub should be taken into account.

The Forum supports the preservation of the ecological corridor and, subject to the agreement of the Corporation of London, the possibility of a new entrance into the Wood.

Any future development should help to protect residents from noise and air pollution on Archway Road.

In the long term, the Forum would not rule out the possibility of building on the adjacent TfL hub should it be decommissioned.

#### SA43 Former Highgate Rail Station and Gonnermanns Antiques Site

The Forum has major concerns about the inclusion of the Goldsmith's Court/Gonnermanns Antiques/Coleridge Gardens site within this designation. This element of the Haringey site corresponds to KA5 in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and following the Forum's consultation will be subject to much revision and possible elimination.

The owners of Gonnermanns Antiques wish to redevelop their own part of the site, retaining their retail premises and building flats above.

The leaseholder at Goldsmiths Court, Hornsey Housing Trust, has yet to agree terms with its freeholder, the Goldsmiths Company, and has not fully consulted the residents in Goldsmiths Court. In view of this, the Forum is working with the residents of Goldsmiths Court to try to reach an agreement acceptable to all parties. We ask that until such differences are resolved this element of the site be dropped from Haringey's site allocation.

Should the Archway Road facing Gonnermanns site be developed, any new building must be set back to the current building line. We would support the planting of more trees both to protect the amenity of new residents from noise and air pollution on Archway Road, and to continue the green corridor. This currently extends from the opposite corner of Shepherds Hill, north along Archway Road adjacent to Highgate station, and beyond along the boundary of Highgate Wood as far as the Wellington gyratory. An echo of the pocket park on the corner of Muswell Hill Road and Archway Road would be most welcome. Any development



**FOR HIGHGATE**  
HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

should respect the scale and context of the conservation area and must be subordinate to the listed building, Jacksons Lane Arts Centre, diagonally opposite, and should respect the scale of buildings in neighbouring streets.

The ownership of Coleridge Gardens, which is not registered with the Land Registry, is another hurdle to inclusion of this site but the Forum is keen to resolve this anomaly and include it in its Open Spaces designation so that the street scene may be improved and the green corridor continued.

The second element of the site, the Highgate Rail Station, corresponds to the Forum's policy KA2. The Forum's aims for this site are outlined in detail in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and Haringey's site allocation seems to support these aims.

However, to avoid any confusion, the Forum would not support residential development on any part of this site, including the car park, but would welcome the exploration of possible community use on the car park such as a Farmers' Market.

The Forum supports the exploration of the opportunity for linking the Parkland Walk to the Wood to join up the Capital Ring.

### **SA44 Highgate School**

The Forum welcomes the exploration of how school facilities can be enhanced while benefitting the local community. Comments on the future use of the former Parade Ground are included under SA45.

### **SA45 Highgate Bowl**

This site corresponds to the Forum policy KA3

The Forum welcomes the creation of a core green space with improved public access though we understand there have been some technical difficulties in the alignment of the green area and red area shown on the map. The Forum wishes the green line on the Village side to be the subject of review in particular to reflect the most recent Appeal decision on the Garden Centre. We understand further investigation is being carried out to ascertain the viability of access points.

We wish to see the retention of existing employment use in the yards while recognising there could be some intensification and possibly new residential development above workshops and offices.

The future of the Highgate School parade ground should be given serious consideration to complement both the needs of the School and the aspiration for the open space of the Bowl including the currently poor access from Southwood Lane.

We do not support the inclusion of any part of the current Harington Scheme in the area outlined for possible intensification. This is an agricultural tenancy including the land on which the educational buildings stand. The Harington Scheme is certainly not in Retail Use as Savills' submission on behalf of NHS Estates suggests. The Harington scheme is much valued by Haringey as an educational resource for adult learners and this is recognised by NHS Estates. The optimum viable use with its recognised associated public benefits for the whole of the land occupied by The Harington Scheme is not a mixed use development but use solely by The Harington Scheme.

The Forum supports the aims of the Highgate Bowl Action Group.



FOR HIGHGATE  
HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

### **SA46 Summersby Road**

There are two main elements to this site: the Builders Merchant, and the blocks of flats of the Summersby Road estate. The Builders Merchant element corresponds to KA4 in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan.

In the course of the last year the Forum has modified its site allocations and removed the Summersby Road flats from its initial site. Unfortunately a line of text and a map in the draft Neighbourhood Plan were not amended and show the Summersby Road flats as being included in the Forum site. This is an error and will be rectified following the Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

During the review process the flats were judged to provide an excellent example of a mixed community, with around a 50% social housing element. Also, although there had been a history of neglect of the buildings by Homes for Haringey, the planned investment from the Decent Homes programme will provide homes for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

We understand that the council has committed to spend £800k under Decent Homes, with initial works having commenced. The Forum sees this as an eminently more sustainable and economically sound response than the demolition of the flats, millions of pounds of compensation for leaseholders, and the loss of at least 20 social housing units with absolutely no guarantee of their replacement, or even of truly affordable homes, under any new scheme.

For these reasons the Forum asks that the Summersby Road flats be removed from SA46.

On the adjoining Builders' Merchant element of the site any future development should be low rise to respect the conservation area and the extremely important setting adjacent to both Highgate and Queens Woods. We do not support removal of any trees in this SINC area and while we acknowledge the council's intent to take into account the impact of the slope on the site, we are of the view that the site would support an absolute maximum of four storeys in part, mostly three, and not seven as stated.

### **SA47 Hillcrest**

The Forum does not support any intensification on Hillcrest as it does not recognise any potential sites for development on the estate. Of the sites proposed by HfH, two are SINC's, one provides parking for the estate and is already over subscribed, and the fourth is a local amenity/children's play area.

None of the residents at Hillcrest has private amenity space, to take away the communal space is simply not acceptable. Hillcrest is not within 400m of any other amenity space.

Any new build on the car park would have to provide enough spaces to compensate the loss, plus extra to accommodate new dwellings. This would almost certainly require a double storey basement under any new building – an incredibly costly option.

The open spaces at Hillcrest are listed in the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum policy OS3. The Forum intends to extend protection for the spaces at Hillcrest (and others in the Forum area) by submitting them for designation as Local Green Spaces with the support of the community following our Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

Rachel Allison  
Chair, Highgate Neighbourhood Forum  
March 2015



FOR HIGHGATE  
HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM