

APPENDIX 2: CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highgate Conservation Area (no. 1) Character Appraisal

Public consultation - 16 December 2012 to 11 January 2013

Consultation comments, Council response and actions

September 2013

Prepared by: Nairita Chakraborty, Principal Conservation Officer

The consultation was widely publicised: details were included in Haringey's consultation calendar on the website, emails were sent to a large number of consultees on the Planning Policy consultation database and hard copies were sent direct to groups and individuals.

The character appraisal consultation questionnaire included nine questions. Questions 1 to 7 asked if consultees thought there were any factual errors in the seven sub areas: no. 1 the Village Core, no. 2 Highgate Bowl, no. 3 Archway, no. 4 Miltons, no. 5 Shepherd's, no. 6 Gaskells and no. 7 Bishops.

Question 8 asked if consultees agreed that the existing boundaries of the Highgate conservation area should remain unchanged.

Question 9 asked if consultees would like to see any improvements to the public domain in the Highgate conservation area.

Responses by individuals/residents: 23.

Responses by statutory consultees: 2. English Heritage (provided comments) and Natural England (no comments).

Responses by borough groups: 3. Comments were provided jointly by the Highgate Society and the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the Joint Conservation Areas Advisory Committee and Highgate School.

Total number of consultees: 28.

Key below: Highgate CAAC = Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee, for review and comment. Note that the content of the seven sub area sections was prepared by members of the Highgate CAAC.

Summary of responses:

1. The comments indicated some factual errors indicated in the report, relating to addresses or description of the buildings.
2. General response from individual residents included comments regarding the harm caused by parking issues, traffic congestions, replacement of historic lamps, pot holes, dog fouling and location of bins within front gardens and entrances.
3. Concerns were also raised regarding the incremental effect of paving of front gardens for parking on the conservation area.
4. There were also concerns regarding the vacant shops along Archway Road that, in their opinion, detracted from the conservation area.
5. There were some requests regarding the consideration of the conservation area boundary and possible extensions.
6. Comments were also received regarding the future development management within the conservation area and the need for consistent development control policies.
7. Some suggestions included more landscaping and re-instatement of cobblestones.
8. There were concerns raised regarding the structure of the questionnaire and the consultation methodology.

English Heritage comments included the need for a Supplementary Planning Document to address the management issues raised in the Appraisal. They also suggested the need to include key views within each sub-areas. Further clarification on how the document related to the National Planning Policy Framework was also suggested.

Comments were also received from the Chair of the Joint CAAC. These included the lack of illustrations, detailed maps and a development management strategy that could guide future planning applications and public realm improvements.

Highgate School commented on the Appraisal and suggested some minor alterations to the text. They also suggested that the boundary of sub-area 1 (Highgate Village) is revised to include the school sites currently under sub-area 2 (The Bowl).

The Highgate CAAC and the Highgate Society have worked very closely with the Council's conservation officer to re-write large sections of the appraisal that were indicated to be too descriptive.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
	INDIVIDUAL CONSULTEES				
1	Mrs Sydney Charles	Q4 (Miltons)	<p>Various issues relating to identification of buildings: 6.79 mentions Southwood Avenue and 'Kingsley Place', but should say Southwood Lane and Kingsley Place. 6.80 has the same errors 6.83 discusses the former Southwood Hospital, previously The Limes. The homes there are currently identified by numbers 70-82 (though I have docs that show that Southwood Park was 74 Southwood Lane prior to construction). 6.83 implies that the 'blocked gateway' in 'locally listed wall' is part of the 'Hospital' site. In fact the unused gate, that says 'Southwood Court' above it, adjacent to the plaque with the damaged coat of arms' is part of the wall of Southwood Park estate, mentioned in the following paragraph. However the wall and gate are not mentioned in any of the appendices listing listed items and cannot be found on the Haringey 'Register of local listed buildings of merit' - so is presumably not listed. 6.84 covers Southwood Park and mentions a Victorian pointed arch once providing access to Southwood Court. This may be the same feature as covered in the previous para, but I have the 1963 Southwood Park plans that show that this was for pedestrian access. The vehicular access at that time was further down Southwood Lane and a wall was built at that time to remove access from Southwood Lane. 7.40 Southwood Park was included by Pevsner as Brutalist blocks in the manner of Louis Kahn. As well as the two entrances to the lower blocks mentioned there is a long drive up to the tall blocks with an Porters Lodge (not designed by Douglas Stephen and Partners) at the main entrance on Southwood Lawn Rd. The Statutory listed buildings mention Southwood Hospital as 58-64 even, but 6.83 mentioned number 70, and the highest number is 82.</p>	Refer to Highgate CAAC for review and comment. Draft to be amended, as appropriate.	A lot of these have been corrected in consultation with the Highgate CAAC

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
2.1	Dr Michael Mottram	Q6 (Gaskell)	Various issues relating to identification of buildings: If this applies: point 6.134 refers to 123/125 and 127/129 are two semi detached Edwardian cottages. This is incorrect. 123/125 are well preserved Georgian workers' cottages as are 127/129, but the latter pair have been updated.	See officer comments in response to 1.	See officer comments in response to 1.
2.2	Dr Michael Mottram	Q8	Boundaries: Boundaries should be expanded to include whole village.	Council is not undertaking boundary review at present.	N/A
2.3	Dr Michael Mottram	Q9	Traffic issues: Traffic calming is appalling. Vehicles regularly ignore pedestrian lights on crossings and speed up and down North Hill at over 50mph.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal and will be forwarded to LB Haringey Highways.	N/A
3.1	Susan B Chinn	Q1	Correction: Name of United Reformed Church needs correcting.	Noted.	Draft will be corrected.
3.2	Susan B Chinn	Q9	Style of lamps: Heritage style lamp standards	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
4	Adam Garfunkel	Q3	Correction: Correction to number of listed buildings. Paragraph 8.58 on page 67 of the draft appraisal says there are 2 Grade 2 listed buildings but then lists 3.	Noted.	Draft will be checked and corrected.
5.1	Francis Oeser	Q9	Bus stand: Remove bus stand beside Pond Square, off the High Street.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
5.2	Francis Oeser	Q9	Parking: CONGRATULATIONS on your parking policy in Highgate High Street. Short stays help us oldies a great deal! (Camden side is a disaster).	Noted.	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
5.3	Francis Oeser	Direct general comment	Development Management: There is always the problem of FLEXIBILITY in Planning. For instance, Highpoint (where I live) was certainly an intrusion into low-rise residential development in 1936, yet these days fits well into North Hill and contributes in a variety of ways to Highgate village. Sometimes 'unacceptable' development does turn out OK and it's a risk worth taking. I do hope you have the staff and the management structure to support 'risky' decisions about planning matters. This is as important as prudent ones, surely? You and we should not be ruled by the backward-looking 'thinkers' (and speakers) trying to manage development in the village – a necessary if unintended consequence of community involvement.	Haringey's Local Plan (adopted in March 2013), SP11 Design, notes that all development shall ' <i>Be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity.</i> '	N/A
6.1	Oliver Gandy	Q9	Wheelie bins: Wheely bins look hideous, although they are necessary.	No action necessary.	N/A
6.2	Oliver Gandy	Q9	Dog fouling: Dog poo continues to be problematic.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal and will be forwarded to LB Haringey Street Enforcement.	N/A
6.3	Oliver Gandy	Q9	Pot holes: Pot holes continue to be problematic.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
7	Ronald Ostwald	Q9	Development Management: A more robust response from the planning department when dealing with developers who flout the objectives of a conservation area.	Noted	A chapter on Management has been included

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
8	Christopher Riley	Q9	Lamp posts: Old lamp posts replaced with heritage style posts.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
9.1	Nick Clements	Q9	Lamp posts and tree planters: Lamp posts and tree planters in street need attention,	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
9.2	Nick Clements		Bins: Some sort of facility to keep bins off the streets.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal and will be forwarded to LB Haringey Waste and Recycling.	N/A
9.3	Nick Clements	Q9	Dumping: A lot of dumping in the Miltons.	See officer comments in response to 6.2.	N/A
10.1	Jill Gavaghan	Q9	Bins: Fortnightly change to fortnightly waste collections has led to a huge amount of bin clutter.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	N/A
10.2	Jill Gavaghan		Roads, street lighting and investment: Roads and street lighting in Miltons area not maintained. No investment in this area.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
11.1	Marika Shoshan	Q3	Street clutter: Archway road is messy, has a cluttered and unsafe feel. Messy roads due to bins on the street.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	N/A
11.2	Marika Shoshan	Q4	Road surface and lanterns: Archway Road surface very bad and lanterns need replacing.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	N/A
12	Boris Bronfentrinker	Q9	Lamp posts: Replacement heritage style lamp posts in the Miltons area.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	N/A
13	L Potter	N/A	N/A (No comments were made).	N/A	N/A
14.1	Luba Chmil	Q9	Lamps: Replacement heritage lamps.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	N/A
14.2	Luba Chmil		Bin collections: Need more frequent bin collections.	See officer comments in response to 9.2.	NA

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
14.3	Luba Chmil		Windows: Force residents in Miltons sub area to reinstate sash windows to street frontages.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal. The Council has no powers to oblige residents to change windows, unless they are in breach of planning consents.	N/A
15.1	Denise Green	Q3	Boundaries of conservation area: Include garages and land to rear of properties in conservation area.	Council is not undertaking boundary review at present.	N/A
15.2	Denise Green		Tree removal: Trees removed without permission.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal. For trees, breaches of consent should be reported to Planning Enforcement. No details of the trees were provided, so no further action is possible.	N/A
15.3	Denise Green	Q8	Boundaries of conservation area: Include garages and land to rear of properties in conservation area.	See officer comments in response to 1.	N/A
15.4	Denise Green	Q9	Development Management: Lack of consistency in DM control. Unauthorised extension to a locally listed building.	See officer comments in response to 7. No details were provided about the unauthorised extension, so no further action is possible.	N/A
16	Lucy Bradshaw	N/A	N/A (No comments were made)	N/A	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
17.1	Henriette Maren	Q8	Boundaries of conservation area: Conservation area should be extended.	Council is not undertaking boundary review at present.	N/A
17.2	Henriette Maren	Q9	Planting: More green planting where possible.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
17.3	Henriette Maren	Q9	Parking meters: More parking meters.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal and will be forwarded to LB Haringey Parking.	N/A
17.4	Henriette Maren	Q9	Farmers' market: A farmers' market on Pond Square.	This is beyond the remit of the conservation area character appraisal. Application to hold events may require a licence. Information on licensing can be found on the Council's website, www.haringey.gov.uk.uk .	N/A
18.1	John Batten	Q9	Street furniture: Street furniture de-cluttering as proposed.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
18.2	John Batten	Q9	Lorry controls: Lorry controls on Hornsey Lane.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
19.1	Tony Rybacki	Q3	Addition: Add details of new homes on Tile Lane, of architectural interest.	See officer comments in response to 1.	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
19.2	Tony Rybacki	Q9	Cobblestones: Cobblestones should be restored and more used. Structure of questionnaire limited. Appraisal skewed towards historic buildings.	Refer issue of cobblestones to LB Haringey Highways. Questionnaire was designed to be easy to complete.	These have been identified in public realm sections of the Appraisal
19.3	Tony Rybacki	Q9	Questionnaire: Structure of questionnaire limited.	The structure of the questionnaire was carefully considered, to give consultees the opportunity to make comments, within the limits of what is covered in a character appraisal.	N/A
19.4	Tony Rybacki	Q9	Historic buildings focus: Appraisal skewed towards historic buildings.	The content of the seven sub area sections was prepared by members of the Highgate CAAC, in conjunction with the former conservation officer, Mortimer MacSweeney.	The Appraisal has been re-written as per guidance given by English Heritage. Each sub-area includes an analysis of public realm, key views and trees and landscaping.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
20.1	J. McLeod	Q9	Vacant shops: Empty shops on Archway Road detract from conservation area.	Noted	A chapter on Management has been included
20.2	J. McLeod	Q9	Refuse collection: Refuse collection complaints.	See officer's comments in response to 9.2	N/A
21	Jill Boswell	Q9	Paving over front gardens: Residents should not be able to pave over front gardens. Concern about impact of new basements upon water table.	Noted, however both these are within permitted development rights	A chapter on Management has been included
22.1	Chris Mason	Q9	Streetscape maintenance: Haringey streetscape should be as well maintained as Camden.	See officer comments in response to 2.3.	N/A
22.2	Chris Mason	Q9	Consultation process: This is a shockingly restricting and very bad consultation method designed to minimise input.	The consultation method has followed Haringey's procedures and has allowed consultees the opportunity to provide comments. The Highgate CAAC has been extensively engaged with, during the whole process.	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
23	Alan Poole	Q1	<p>Corrections and additions: Highgate High Street, Highgate Hill, North Road, Castle Yard, Southwood Lane, North Hill Avenue, Baker's Lane, part of North Grove, Bramalea Close, Hillcrest. <i>NO MENTION OF NORTH HILL</i></p> <p>6.13 The Gatehouse and Highgate School stand at a level of 129.7m on the top of Highgate Hill. At this point, North Hill turns south east into the High Street, <i>NORTH ROAD YES BUT NOT NORTH HILL</i></p> <p>6.131 The streetscape continues..... The Kingdom Hall of the Jehovah's Witnesses, is a plain nineteenth century former chapel. It is followed by no. 35, a Victorian villa, with an unusual double width front bay. Nos. 37 and 39 date from the late 1970s and are on the site of a former builder's yard the office of which was 41: this has a plaque claiming that a building dated 1690 was refurbished in 1926. It appears from the street to be a 1920s house with a reproduction Tudor frontage.</p> <p>THEN APPEARS A PICTURE DESCRIBED AS 47 and 48 North Hill WHEREAS IT SHOULD SAY 43 TO 51 OR MAYBE 47 AND 49 (DEFINITELY NOT 48 AS THIS IS THE ODD NUMBER SIDE OF THE STREET)</p>	See officer comments in response to 1.	A lot of these have been corrected in consultation with the Highgate CAAC

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
23 cont.	Alan Poole		<p>6.132 Nos. 43 and 47 to 57(odd) are all grade II listed and have group significance. No. 43 (incorporating no.45) is a two storey cottage dating from the early eighteenth century. It is clad with red facing brickwork and is two windows wide to its parapet level. Nos. 47 and 49 are an early eighteenth pair of town houses. They are three storeys with a basement and are clad in red facing brickwork. All the sash windows are segmental headed. They have matching Georgian doorcases, with cast iron front railings and steps to the front doors. 43 DOES NOT HAVE A BASEMENT, 45 (3 STOREY) WAS THOUGHT TO BE SERVANTS QUARTERS OF 47. No. 45 HAS REMAINS OF DOORWAYS THROUGH TO 47 ON GROUND AND FIRST FLOORS.</p> <p>6.231 No.51 is an early eighteenth century house with alterations. It is three storeys high and has a stuccoed frontage. It features a trellised canopy with a hipped lead roof over a first floor terrace with a front wrought iron balcony above a projecting ground floor. ACCORDING TO PEVSNER 51 WAS A PROJECTING WING OF 47 & 49 (45 WAS THE OTHER) SO NUMBER 51 SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO 6.132 AS IT IS PART OF THAT GROUP. TO SUPPORT THIS IT HAS MATCHING BRICKWORK WITH THE GROUP.</p>	See officer comments in response to 1.	A lot of these have been corrected in consultation with the Highgate CAAC

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
	STATUTORY CONSULTTEES				
24	Natural England		No comments made.	N/A	N/A
25.1	English Heritage		Management plan: We note that this document is intended to provide only an appraisal of the conservation area's character (section 1.5) Following the adoption of this character appraisal it will therefore be crucial to address the management issues it raises through the production of SPDs containing management strategies and policies, as proposed in paragraph 1.5 of the document. We look forward to reviewing these in due course.	Noted	A chapter on Management has been included
25.2	English Heritage		Views: We welcome the identification of views in each sub area. It would be useful if these could be marked on the plans provided at the start of each sub area description.	Noted	Townscape analysis maps included
25.3	English Heritage		Section 13 - National Planning Policy Framework: (Page 122). For clarity we suggest setting out the relationship between the character appraisal and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular, under paragraph 137 local authorities have a duty to 'look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas...to enhance or better reveal their significance'. Under paragraph 138 elements that positively contribute to the conservation area's character warrant greater protection over those that don't.	Noted	The relevant section has been re-written
25.4	English Heritage		Section 14: We welcome this summary of the key planning issues which face the conservation area. A key issue for many conservation areas which isn't discussed here is the possible impacts of renewable energy and energy efficiency infrastructure on the conservation area, for example, the application of solar panels or double glazing could affect its character and appearance. It might be useful for any such issues to be recognised in the character appraisal in order that they can be addressed in future management strategies	Noted	Included in the Management Plan

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
25.5	English Heritage		<p>Involvement of conservation officer: We hope that these comments prove useful in finalising the draft character appraisal for the Highgate conservation area. English Heritage would strongly advise that the local authority's conservation staff are involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the appraisal, as they are often best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities; sources of data and consideration of options relating to the historic environment.</p>	Noted	The conservation officer has had extensive meetings with the consultees and most of the document has been re-written keeping in mind the current issues in historic environment.
25.6	English Heritage		<p>Future advice from English Heritage: Finally, it must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not affect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the draft character appraisal and which may have adverse effects on the historic environment.</p>	Noted.	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
	BOROUGH GROUP CONSULTTEES				
26.1	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>I write in my strategic role as I have seen the consultation draft of the above and frankly, I am appalled.</p> <p>As you know the embryonic Highgate Neighbourhood Forum was encouraged to assist with the development of a part finished draft that when completed would assist greatly in the work of (possibly) developing a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) if the forum were to be created (which it now has). I understand it was the lack of an appraisal noted during the Highgate Bowl Inquiry that actually caused the work to start.</p>	Noted	N/A
26.2	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>I was at a meeting with the Neighbourhood Forum convenor about 10 months ago when a number of people arrived to join it, fresh from another meeting with one of your staff at the time and they were clutching the 2005 English Heritage (EH) guide on how to do appraisals. The group offered labour and time to assist in completing the work. This was done enthusiastically, but I hear from various people that a lot of the input was ignored and the draft publication went out without including a lot of this hard-won work. 'Completing' the appraisal was notionally given high priority, as it was seen to be the essential part of the evidence base for a Neighbourhood Plan. It is, of course, needed to identify where change the community and, particularly the Neighbourhood Forum, may want and can best take place. In a sensitive area, this is best done on the back of an appraisal, so change is directed towards the sites that detract and avoid the sites that contribute to a well-loved and historic area.</p>	Noted	All comments incorporated

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.3	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>It is well known that your predecessors commissioned a 'batch' of appraisals about ten years ago from Nathaniel Litchfield (NL). They were all 'wordy and academic' in the descriptions but were 'light' on analysis and any material that would assist in the future management of the area. Not all have progressed to adoption and some are still 'on the shelf'. It is suspected that this started life as one of the batch, or was drafted to the same format. About three years after that batch was drafted, EH produced two booklets; the first on how to draft appraisals and how then to progress, using the second, to the second document for an area, which would be a Management Plan. Slimming down of advice has happened, not only with the NPPF but, ahead of that, EH had undertaken a similar task with its guidance and combined appraisal techniques and management issues into one, slimmer booklet called 'Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management'. This is current guidance although anything produced between 2005 and 2011 should have been based on the best practice in the slightly fuller, earlier versions. It now expects, in Part 3, an approach to managing change and regeneration strategies to be included in the document.</p>	Noted	The entire document has been re-written following English Heritage guidance and a Management Plan has been incorporated.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.4	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>The appraisal was brought forward for the purposes of being an evidence base for a Neighbourhood Plan that might be produced by the Neighbourhood Forum, the clustering of buildings of merit and the detractors (the potential redevelopment locations) are not presented graphically. I have received a lame excuse, when I questioned whether there was a print error, that the mapping person could not map them. If that is the case you should dismiss the mapping person and employ someone competent. Mapping is the bread-and-butter of a planning department and if it can't be done, the situation needs to be managed better. If management failed to commission the work and not to order the restructuring of work to comply with best practice – now at least seven years old, then it is the manager responsible that should be re-trained, retired or dismissed.</p> <p>Haringey has, unfortunately, not modernised and has stuck to the old and outdated Nathaniel Litchfield formula that it should have ditched years ago. Thus the Highgate appraisal can be summarised as 'old format with poor graphics'.</p>	Noted	Only positive contributors have been incorporated. Detractors have been described in the text.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.5	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>Community involvement is also expected by EH at every stage. Highgate appear to have contributed more than EH probably ever expected, but I am concerned that both the need identified by the community and input from it have, to date, been partly ignored. I worry that the 54 pages of corrections that are on their way to you after hours of diligent proof reading and research, may be swatted away as a nuisance. That was my experience with another conservation area three years ago. It does make a mockery of the logo on the front cover “Get involved – Have your say” – there is a remark going round that the next line should be added to say “... and as usual, we will ignore it”. I do hope that you can start a cultural change to actually work with the volunteer labour that has already toiled hard to make it a more sound document.</p> <p>Turning to the EH guidance; ‘Understanding Place’ (for short), this sets out the benefits and purpose. Perversely, in a sentence designed to constrain input, your web site stresses what it sees as the purpose of appraisal and casts it very much more narrowly requesting factual correction and address errors!</p>	Noted	All comments and where applicable incorporated
26.6	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		Paragraph 2.1.5 of Understanding Place is particularly important, but the Council’s document is severely lacking in graphical presentation. Not mapping the ‘merit’ and ‘detracting’ buildings makes it virtually useless for Neighbourhood Plan purposes. Other graphical devices such as illustrating viewpoints and vistas in diagrams are also not present. The EH guidance suggests that appraisals should not be long but it should then progress to management of the area (leading to conservation techniques and enhancement where these are possible).	Noted	Extensive photos and maps have been incorporated

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.7	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		I see very little of what EH suggests, indeed it is effectively a short local history and then a long-winded catalogue of buildings (102 pages out of 140). Whilst this is useful reference material, it is not analysis of townscape character, an assessment of public realm, trees, advertising, artefacts of interest (such as Borough of Hornsey ironwork). The building descriptions, one-by-one, are paragraphs that could form a learned appendix. What is even more worrying that local people have corrected it, and the corrections are so extensive that they run, as noted, to 54 pages.	Noted	The entire document has been re-written following English Heritage guidance and a Management Plan has been incorporated.
26.8	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		Section 14 is derisory and should be a significant part of an appraisal. Section 15 is similarly scant with the important matter of shopfronts in an historic village given four standard paragraphs. The Forum has been critical in the differences between management in Camden (generally regarded as good) and in Haringey where there is a muddle of inappropriate or utilitarian paving materials, street clutter and patching. The former Borough of Hornsey commissioned interesting lamp columns, polygonal bollards with a BH logo and other ironwork and there is a tradition of granite setted crossovers with ribbons of granite for prams to traverse more smoothly. These are identified briefly in an appendix right at the back – almost in passing and easily missed.	The Appraisal has been re	written as per guidance given by English Heritage. Each sub

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.8	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>I am most impressed with the extent and detail of the observations from the community to correct the many inaccuracies. Having that detail is useful for reference and I will not decry its worth, but I do worry that the point of appraising an area gets lost if there is no framework for future management; if the faults in an area are not analysed and the essential 'best bits' brought to the fore in a succinct overview. The descriptive detail should be put to appendices on each sub-area so the character assessments are not swamped.</p>	<p>An appraisal is a technical document and should include the architectural descriptions of important buildings.</p>	N/A
26.9	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>Boundary review is expected, but this is dismissed in two sentences, but reference back to Crouch End appraisal noted that the boundary was ragged at Stanhope Road. Now the Forum boundary runs down the middle of this road, following an old ward boundary at that point, and also the parking zone boundaries, if nowhere else there would appear to be a case for rationalisation here. On Archway Road there are some modern warehouses and an ugly garage and at Shepherd's Hill there are some modern blocks of flats that do not warrant designation, so if NPPF guidance is followed, the boundary in at least three places should be reconsidered.</p> <p>Thus I have to conclude that the work has not resulted in the sort of document the Forum will need and in its own right it is not sound or fit for purpose when compared with the content and output expected by English Heritage and the NPPF. From the strategic point of view this is not new, as I have criticised the similar format for Crouch End and Hillside.</p>	<p>The Council does not wish to undertake boundary review at this stage.</p>	N/A

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
26.10	Chris Mason, Chair of Joint Conservation Area Advisory Committee (JCAC)		<p>I strongly urge the Management Team of your Directorate to get a grip of the mapping and presentation issues and commission revision to this work to keep the good work but make it accessible by having a main section that is succinct and effective. It should not hold back from criticising poor public realm management. Its aim should be to steer work to a better result in the long run. It is noted that it was rushed by a member of staff heading for retirement and the new, temporary replacement was in no position to influence change, so responsibility for this poor work must rest with the management above, ultimately, I fear, stopping at your door.</p> <p>I suggest that the changes will be sufficiently extensive that it will need a further period of (re) consultation to avoid challenge. Better to get it right than to live with the consequences of an inadequate methodology.</p>	Noted	Extensive photos and maps included
27.1	Highgate School		<p>Paragraphs 2.2.22 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in second sentence “Dyne House five storey Highgate School arts block in a” with “Dyne House, the Highgate School five storey and basement teaching building with auditorium, in a”. <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual errors and to clarify the history of the building.</p>	To be considered and the text amended, as appropriate.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.2	Highgate School		<p>Map of Highgate Conservation Sub-Areas</p> <p><i>Comment:</i> As confirmed in the telephone call with Gwyn Jones, one of the School's Capital Projects Managers, I understand that this map is being redrawn in accordance with the comments in our previous letter of 11 January 2013 so that the whole of Dyne House, the teaching building, old gymnasium used as a drama studio and the redundant open air swimming pool at the rear of Dyne House now all form part of sub-area 1 Village Core and not sub-area 2 Highgate Bowl. To assist and for clarification, I attach a large scale OS map showing in red the detailed area of change.</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> The boundary of the Highgate Bowl sub-area has been drawn running through Dyne House, splitting the school auditorium and recital room from the rest of the building. This line runs through the curtilage of Dyne House and then isolates the associated existing built development at the rear that comprises part of this site. The boundary should be redrawn at the edge of the Parade Ground to define the core area of the Highgate Bowl to reflect its character as "largely open land" and appropriately exclude built development more closely associated with Southwood Lane and the Village Core sub-area 1. Importantly, this would accord with Supplementary Planning Guidance 3.5: Highgate Bowl Area – in Highgate Conservation Area (June 1999), which only includes the Parade Ground at the rear of Dyne House as part of the Highgate Bowl, the western edge of which is otherwise defined by the drama studio and gymnasium building (SPG 3.5-page 8 site 9) which are excluded from the identified area.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.3	Highgate School		<p>Page 33 <i>Comment:</i> Delete 'High' from title of second photograph. Title should read "Highgate School, c1905". <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct error.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.4	Highgate School		<p>Paragraphs 4.4.3 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in first sentence "through 1948 memorial gates" with "through 1947 memorial gates" <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error and to align with the 1947 date already in Paragraph 4.4.41.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.5	Highgate School		<p>Paragraphs 4.4.4 <i>Comment:</i> Recommend in first sentence "the imposing "Big School" hall was part of" with" the imposing "Big School" hall, also restored in 2013, was part of". <i>Reason:</i> In order to clarify that both the Chapel and "Big School" were restored in 2013.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.6	Highgate School		<p>Paragraphs 4.4.42 <i>Comment:</i> Replace at end of second sentence "and again during the 1980s" with "and in the Edwardian period, 1928 and again in 1983". <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual errors and clarify the history of the development of the School along North Road.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.7	Highgate School		<p>Paragraphs 4.4.43 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in first sentence "constructed (2013)" with "constructed (2012)". <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.8	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 4.4.86 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in the first sentence “interrupted by Dyne House a five storey brick and concrete block designed in 1967 by Ansell & Bailey” with “interrupted by Highgate School’s Dyne House, a five storey and basement teaching building with auditorium, constructed in brick and concrete and designed in 1965/66 by Ansell & Bailey and opened in 1967”.</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error, clarify the history of the building and align the opening date of 1967 with paragraph 2.2.23.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.9	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 4.4.87 <i>Comment:</i> Replace second sentence, “The building is currently in use as a Highgate School library” with “The building was formerly in use as the Highgate School library”.</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> New library was opened in September 2013 within Big School.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.10	Highgate School		<p>Page 56 <i>Comment:</i> Replace the title on the top photograph “Rowlands Close, Southwood Lane”, with “Dyne House, Southwood Lane”.</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.11	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 4.4.97 <i>Comment:</i> In first sentence, replace “Highgate School Hall” with “Highgate ‘big school’ hall”.</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> In order to align with terminology in paragraph 4.4.4.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.12	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 4.5.4 <i>Comment:</i> In second sentence, remove reference to front 'garden' to Dyne House. Final section of sentence should read: "...opened only by the entrance gates to Highgate School and the front to Dyne House." <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.13	Highgate School		<p>Heading to paragraphs 5.4.23 and 5.4.24 <i>Comment:</i> Replace the heading "Buildings and Land behind Dyne House (part of Highgate School)" with "Land adjacent to Kingsley Place (part of Highgate School)" <i>Reason:</i>. The revision to the boundary of sub-area 1 and 2 so that all of Dyne House and the buildings at the rear of it are in sub-area 1 Village Core, results in no buildings being included in this part of the sub-area and the reference to Dyne House being confusing.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.13 cont.	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 5.4.23 <i>Comment:</i> Change second sentence to read: "It is known as the Parade Ground, having been used by the school cadet corps for that purpose, and is now....." <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct factual error.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.14	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 5.4.24 <i>Comment:</i> This paragraph should be deleted. <i>Reason:</i>. The revision to the boundary of Sub-area 1 and 2 results in this paragraph being irrelevant.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.14	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 10.4.10 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in the final sentence “Caenwood Hall a small former gymnasium now used for other purposes” with “Caenwood Hall a small former swimming pool now used for various educational purposes” <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct a factual error and clarify the history of the building.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.
27.14 cont.	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 10.4.32 <i>Comment:</i> Replace in the third sentence “These have a somewhat industrial appearance and are not well maintained.” with “These have a somewhat industrial appearance and the cladding and roofing materials are weathering badly due to their age.” <i>Reason:</i> The buildings are fully maintained, but the cladding and roofing materials used are now old and weathering badly. <i>Comment:</i> Remove the final sentence “The Junior School is under threat of demolition..... open leafy character of road” <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct a factual error as Planning Approval for a new Junior School was granted on 20 February 2013. See also the following paragraph.</p>	The maintenance includes cladding and all exterior materials	Corrected where appropriate

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.15	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 10.4.33 <i>Comment:</i> Replace the third and fourth sentence “Beyond this lie a number of school buildings of varying merit. Cholmeley House is an attractive.....and a good example of its style.” with “Planning Approval was granted on the 20 February 2013 for the replacement of Cholmeley House with a contemporary style new Junior School which will link into the adjoining Ingleholme which will be restored and refurbished as part of the project.” <i>Reason:</i> In order to correct a factual error as noted in the paragraph above. <i>Comment:</i> Replace the fifth sentence “The pair of Victorian villas beyond this now known as the Mills Centre.....are of considerable interest in red brick.” with “Further north along the road is the interesting red brick building now known as the Mills Centre. It was purpose built for the School in 1880 as a combined Head Master’s House and Boarding House. After the Head Master moved and later boarding ceased it had a number of educational uses and then was repaired, restored and extended in 2004/2005 for teaching and other use.” <i>Reason:</i>. In order to correct a factual error and clarify the history of the building.</p>	<p>Cannot include planning details.</p> <p>Description of Mills centre need not include details or staff members</p>	Corrected where appropriate
27.16	Highgate School		<p>Page 140 <i>Comment:</i> Replace the title on the third photo down “Field House, Bishopswood Road” with “Grindal House, Highgate Pre-Preparatory School” <i>Reason:</i>. In order to correct a factual error.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.17	Highgate School		<p>Paragraph 10.9 1</p> <p><i>Comment:</i> Replace the fifth bullet point “Poorly designed non-residential buildings including the sports buildings in Bishopswood Road and the Highgate School Armoury in Broadlands Road” with “Poorly designed non-residential buildings including the School sports buildings along Bishopswood Road and the School two storey educational building adjacent to no 24 Broadlands Road.”</p> <p><i>Reason:</i> In order to remove for security reasons any reference to the building being an armoury for which the MOD have responsibilities.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
27.18	Highgate School		<p>Generally</p> <p>In the original document we received there were a number of drawings and schedules related to Listed buildings within the conservation area. For example, the map originally on Page 20 showed the statutory listed buildings in sub-area 1. This map indicated that the Highgate School Chapel on North Road, the Old School Building on North Road/Southwood Lane and all the adjoining school buildings on the site immediately to the north (enclosing Science and Garner Quads) are all statutory listed buildings. This is incorrect. The National Heritage List for England (English Heritage) specifically indicates in the relevant list entries (2 December 1994) that it is only the Highgate School Chapel and Old School Building (known as Big School) which are listed at Grade II, with no reference to other adjoining school buildings to the north. Other school buildings should not, therefore, be indicated as listed buildings on the map.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> The adjacent Sir John Woollaston’s Almshouses at 13-37 Southwood Lane are statutory listed buildings in their own right (19 March 1951).</p> <p>We would appreciate confirmation that this map, if it is going to form part of this revised document, has been amended to show that only the School buildings listed in National Heritage List for England are shaded as statutory listed buildings.</p> <p>As an aside, I note reference to a Haringey Council produced ‘Streetscape Manual’ (paragraph 11.5.2) – I would be grateful if you could advise as to how I could obtain a copy of this document.</p>	Agreed.	Draft will be amended to reflect this request.

No.	Name of consultee	Question	Area of comments/details of comments	Officer comments and agreed actions	Outcome
28	Highgate CAAC and Highgate Society		The comments provided by the Highgate Society include a report that was omitted from the draft consultation document and other points. It is too large to summarise here – please see the published data.	The character appraisal will be amended to include the data, as appropriate, including further consultation with the Highgate Society.	Draft to be amended.