

Response of Highgate CAAC to HGY/2023/0331 (Bidwells) Formal Screening Opinion re EIA.

Highgate CAAC considers that the screening opinion listed above is faulty in several major respects and must be rejected by Haringey.

The problems are set out below.

After much discussion between the Council, the School and representatives of local groups including HCAAC, the Highgate Society and Highgate Neighbourhood Forum, a SPD was agreed for the building projects desired by the school. This document set out clearly the principles which were to guide these projects and which should be clearly embodied in each individual application for planning permission. The requirement to follow these principles was one of the reasons for ALL the application to be made AT THE SAME TIME.

These principles are as follows:

Individual development projects will:

1. be highly sustainable;
2. be integrated within a coherent landscape setting;
3. have no adverse visual impact on townscape and historically significant views;
4. improve connections, routes, flow and movement within the site, with pedestrians as a priority;
5. make a positive contribution to the setting of the School through excellent contextual design;
6. recognise the history and culture of Highgate School whilst bringing it forward into the 21st century;
7. relate positively to existing buildings and to other possible future buildings;
8. provide good quality accommodation which meets the brief, and which is futureproofed (SPD)

Furthermore :

The Council recognises that Highgate School is an integral part of the overall character of Highgate, with an established global profile that promotes and enhances the image and community infrastructure of the Highgate neighbourhood and the wider North London area as a whole. And :

1. that development should preserve or enhance the appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area;
2. that development should preserve the setting of the statutorily and locally listed buildings on the site and neighbouring the school, having regard to their significance;
3. to have regard to Historic England's identification for potential significant archaeology
4. have regard to the objectives of the Highgate Bowl site on any properties that fall into this site allocation;

Unfortunately these principles have not informed the projects set out in HGY/20123/0331 Formal Screening Opinion and for this reason this must be rejected.

The Opinion does not take into account the nature of Highgate and the Conservation Area. This set out in the CA Appraisal and Management Plan 2013. It states that the character of the CA . “ is formed by the relationship of its historic pattern of development, its high percentage of buildings of architectural merit, its topography, its green open spaces and distant views”. (1.3.1)

The amount of development proposed by the School disrupts this relationship of which it seems completely unaware. Regarding the Landscape and Visual aspects of the scheme as a whole the opinion merely states:

LANDSCAPE & VISUAL (5.69 - 5.82)

5.82 Once the Proposed Development is complete and fully operational, the visual qualities of the school will be considerably improved from the current situation, specifically the Chapel Quad which is a public facing front of the school. The Proposed Development will also provide screening to sensitive receptors, namely those on Bishopswood Road and Hampstead Lane. Overall, significant landscape and visual impacts once the Proposed Development is operational are not anticipated and, therefore, would not warrant consideration within an EIA.

Only the effect on the School itself is mentioned. The effect on the CA as a whole is dismissed as not needing any discussion. This a clear breach of the SPD requirements listed above.

When individual aspects of the overall project are described there is a similar inadequate consideration of the wider effects on the CA.

For example Mallinson: (5.89) the new building is said to be “an enhancement to the CA’s “ character and appearance” despite its greatly increased bulk and the relationship of this to the new Richards Music Centre. This building is hardly an example of the “contextual design” , of “ modest scale” claimed . Rather than being ‘neutral’ as stated in the Heritage Statement the cumulative effect of these two buildings and the hard boundary linking them is to greatly increase the urbanization of Bishopswood Road the gently rural formerly character of which has already been much damaged by the overdevelopment of the Mills Centre, the new Junior School and the pre prep department. The CA appraisal describes how “the view over the playing fields or from between the buildings give the road an open and leafy feeling” despite the “somewhat industrial appearance” of the existing sports centre. The proposed changes despite the claims in the Formal Screening document do nothing to alleviate this harm and in fact have the potential to cause more harm to the CA.

The same can be said in regard to the proposals for the area known as the Orchard which have great significance in relation to damage to the bio diversity of the CA and the need for the wider area well beyond the CA itself to benefit from the existing green corridor .

This whole area , that belonging to the school to the north of Hamstead lane extending as far east as Far Field, seems to be regarded largely in respect of its potential for development with little understanding of its value to the wider community both as establishing the ‘village’ character of Highgate and its widely acclaimed ‘leafiness’. What began as a modest school for local children has now become something of a ‘cuckoo in the nest’ which threatens to change the CA for the worse by overdevelopment and the consequent urbanization.

The projects proposed for the island site in the village core present a different problem but are equally not fully compliant with the principles in the SPD. The screening document claims that the proposals for the science block and for Dyne House “will be consistent with the existing hierarchy and character of the existing site and will form a sympathetic addition to the setting of the surrounding heritage assets.” It further states that “the overall impact to the Conservation Area is considered to be neutral while the impact to the setting and significance of the listed buildings is also considered to be neutral.”

Futhermore, it is suggested “the sensitively designed proposals which respond to views from the junction to the south, as well as north south views towards the Highgate Bowl, are considered to be sympathetic and complementary. The proposals have considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and have taken opportunities to enhance it where possible. The overall heritage impact of the proposals is considered to be neutral and would preserve the significance of all heritage assets identified .”

In fact the Almshouses, the least changed group of buildings in the whole Conservation Area, will be adversely impacted by the increase in the height of the Science block and the number of items on its roof and by the extension to the rear. These plans are not sympathetic to one of the most significant group of listed buildings in the Village. The extension into the Science Block adversely affects the neo-Baroque façade as seen from the South. Similarly the almost casual mention of the Bowl is not an adequate response to the requirement to “have no adverse visual impact on townscape and historically significant views.”

In conclusion we do not find that these proposals obey the requirement that any ‘development should preserve or enhance the appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area’. Taken in their entirety the overall effect on the Highgate Conservation Area will be to the detriment of its essential character by overdevelopment and increased urbanization destroying the delicate balance between the various elements in the landscape a very important feature of the locality. The ‘sense of place ‘ has been nationally identified as an essential in any planning; by over-emphasising the demands of the school in relation to those of the village and its CA these proposals cause damage to both and must be resisted.

HCAAC has already submitted an objection to HGY/2023/0316 (Far Field) in which *inter alia* we state that the introduction of a synthetic surface on MOL fails to meet Sport England's policy and guidance. Our comments therein apply to the other synthetic pitches proposed.

We note that all the sites except the Science Block fall within ecological Corridors set out in Appendix 3 to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan. Forty-eight mature trees are destined to be felled over and above the many trees felled over the last few years with consent. This would be a devastating loss not compensated for by the planting of some 'garden trees'.

We also note that across most of the sites information required under recent GLA policy that BRUKL calculations must be submitted. Some have been provided but one results in a 'fail' and there is missing or no information for most if not all the applications. None of these applications achieve compliance with Haringey's policy that requires "all new non-residential development shall be zero carbon from 2019."

Taking all the above together, Haringey must conclude that a Formal Screening Opinion re. EIA is required.

This document has been drawn up prematurely and in haste because the deadline for this application is not co-terminus with all the other planning applications submitted by Highgate School. HCAAC may therefore find that it needs to submit further evidence on this application.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee notes the GLA and Building Regulations now require submission of a BRUKL at planning stage

/0313: JUNIOR FIELD PLAYING PITCHES:

From Decant - Energy and Sustainability Statement.pdf

SP 4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey Over the local Plan's life, reducing energy use in buildings and working towards a low-carbon borough will be one of Haringey's key challenges. The Council will promote the measures outlined below to reduce carbon emissions from new and existing buildings. 1) 1. In line with the London Plan policy, the Council will promote and require all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction, and occupation by incorporating the following measures: a) From 2011 onwards, all new residential Development will achieve a minimum 25% reduction in total (regulated) CO2emissions in line with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 energy standards and should aim to achieve Level 6. All new residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2016 onwards; and b) From 2011 onwards, all new non-residential Development shall be built to at least BREEAM "very good" standard and aim to achieve BREEAM "excellent" or the current nationally agreed standard. All new non-residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2019.

BREEAM: Not provided
BRUKL : Not provided
MISSING INFORMATION: - BRUKL
- BREEAM

/0315: RICHARDS BUILDING:

BREEAM: Not mentioned

BRUKL :

(1) Appendix A - 2022-10-03 RMC GLA 2022 emissions spreadsheet

Address of project and Certifier not provided.

Achieves target

(2) Appendix B.2 - RMC lean 2021_brukpdf

Address of project and Certifier not provided.

FAILS TO ACHIEVE TARGET

(3) Appendix C-2022 0826RMC Part L202021report-issue.pdf

THIS APPENDIX ONLY ENCLOSES APPENDIX A

MISSING INFORMATION:

DAS Part 8 (p 37); Appendix B: empty/ information missing
Appendix C: L2A report - sections empty/missing?

Appendix D: Correspondence with heat pump manufacturer empty/missing?

Appendix E: Overheating Risk Analysis: empty/missing?

Appendix F: Planning policy review: BRUKL not mentioned

- BREEAM

- BRUKL B2 missing from Appendix C

- Redesign required.

/0317: SCIENCE BLOCK

BREEAM: Very Good (conditional on further appointments/information)

From Science - BREEAM Pre-assessment.pdf

3.2 Pre-Assessment estimated score and rating **This assessment is based on a full refurbishment Part 1-4 scope of works.** The generated Pre-assessment Stage assessment score and rating must not be used as an absolute figure, but as an indicator of the anticipated score. **Assessors have no jurisdiction over the BRE nor can be responsible for the BRE changing the weightings and calculations, which may result in a possible change of the estimated assessment score.** The score is tabulated below and indicates a current targeted score of 67.5% which would give a **BREEAM rating of ‘Very Good (≥55%)’ subject to appropriate evidence being made available by the respective stakeholders.** This rating is therefore based on a conservative view of the development meeting the credit requirements, and **some anticipation of works yet to be appointed including those still to be confirmed by the Client.** Assumptions have been made and previous project experience has been used to determine credit scores, where insufficient information currently exists. This estimated score is a conservative indication and does not guarantee any specific score will be achieved. Some credits that are considered to currently be ‘out of project scope’, or unknown, have been identified in Scenario 2 indicating an increase in the scope of works, further clarification is required, external consultant appointments are needed or there is a possibility of higher credit scores being achieved based on the project team’s performance etc. If all these credits in Scenario 2 were targeted and achieved, the score could increase up to 77.79%, which would give a BREEAM rating of ‘Excellent (≥70%)’. **Further documentation has been requested from the team in order to confirm if these credits can be targeted based on available evidence. Please also note that some of these credits are based on requirements that need to be carried out/completed before end of RIBA stage 2. These credits may be at risk unless required appointments and activities have already been carried out.** TB+A recommended that a ‘buffer’ of at least 4-5% is targeted over any rating threshold in order to mitigate the risk of credits being lost during the assessment, construction or withheld by the BRE as part of their Quality Assurance procedures.

BRUKL : Not provided

MISSING INFORMATION:

- BRUKL
- Full refurbishment information required
- Too much other information still required

/0328: DYNE HOUSE

Information submitted:

Dyne - Energy Statement Appendix A GLA Carbon Emission Reporting

Dyne - WLC Appendix A GLA Reporting Template

These documents use a bespoke spreadsheet which seems to be very un-user friendly. They do not appear to meet current policy requirements.

BREEAM: None found

BRUKL : None found

- MISSING INFORMATION:**
- Wrong form used?
 - BREEAM
 - BRUKL

/0338: MALLINSON

Text copied from 'Highgate School MSC 4 Phases Energy Assessment' submitted with Application

SP 4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey Over the local Plan's life, reducing energy use in buildings and working towards a low-carbon borough will be one of Haringey's key challenges. The Council will promote the measures outlined below to reduce carbon emissions from new and existing buildings. 1) 1. In line with the London Plan policy, the Council will promote and require all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction, and occupation by incorporating the following measures: a) From 2011 onwards, all new residential Development will achieve a minimum 25% reduction in total (regulated) CO2 emissions in line with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 energy standards and should aim to achieve Level 6. All new residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2016 onwards; and b) From 2011 onwards, all new non-residential Development shall be built to at least BREEAM "very good" standard and aim to achieve BREEAM "excellent" or the current nationally agreed standard. **All new non-residential Development shall be zero carbon from 2019.** 2) 2. The Council will promote low- and zero-carbon energy generation through the following measures: a) Requiring all developments to assess, identify and implement, where viable, site-wide, and area-wide decentralised energy facilities, including the potential to link into a wider network; b) Establishing local networks of decentralised heat and energy facilities by requiring developers to prioritise connection to existing or planned networks where feasible; c) c. Working with neighbouring boroughs and other partners to explore ways of implementing sub-regional decentralised energy networks, including the potential in the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area; and d) Where viable, all new developments are required to reduce predicted carbon dioxide emissions by 20% from on-site renewable energy regeneration, including connections to local sources of decentralised renewable energy.

The GLA Carbon reporting tool calculates the electricity carbon emission using a fixed factor. The new building regulation considers the seasonal variability of the grid-supplied use of renewable wind energy. It applies the monthly variable factor as shown in Table 8 2021 new month carbon emission factor (June 2022). The GLA method increases the carbon above the BRUKL report and substantially increases the carbon offset payment compared with the building regulation method. The GLA carbon reporting tool 2022 and the Be Seen reporting tool. It is provided as separate documents.

The design team will consider design flexibility as the BREEAM assessment process requirement.

- **For example, adding a mezzanine floor to the sports halls could create additional classroom space. The sports hall is already designed as a multifunction space.**
- **For example, a sporting arena to have alternative uses for performance and theatre arts, school gatherings and assemblies and an examination room.**
- **The north block floorspace is essentially an open plan structure and can be subdivided to suit alternative uses. Gyms and studios can be easily repurposed.**

BREEAM: the only mention of BREEAM is in the introduction to the paragraph above. BREEAM targets do not appear to have been set.

BRUKL : Application appears to meet GLA criteria but HGY/2023/0331 Formal Screening Opinion flags up issue of noise from air source heat pumps for neighbour at no. 27 Broadlands Road.

MISSING INFORMATION: - BREEAM

/0390: SCIENCE BLOCK LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION

BREEAM: - Not provided

BRUKL : - Not provided

MISSING INFORMATION: - No information on any carbon reduction measures
- See /0317

/0679: DYNE HOUSE LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION

Text copied from 'Dyne House Planning Statement.pdf' submitted with Application : Policy SP4: 'Working Towards a Low Carbon Haringey': - "Over the life time of the Local Plan, reducing energy use in buildings and working towards a low carbon borough will be one of the key challenges facing Haringey" - "From 2011 onwards all new non-residential development shall be built to at least BREEAM "very good" standard and should aim to achieve BREEAM "excellent" or the current nationally agreed standard. All new non-residential development shall be zero carbon from 2019."

"5.14 In relation to forthcoming applications at Dyne House and the Island Site, the SPD states that refurbishment and development proposals should have regard to the following:

- ensure buildings are highly sustainable with a target of BREEAM 'Very Good' aiming for 'Excellent' where feasible.;"

"7.80 In accordance with local planning policy, the development has been assessed against the BREEAM methodology and it is shown that the project will achieve Very Good and a pathway to achieving Excellent is noted. Again, the School is committed to striving for BREEAM excellent at the detailed design stage of the project."

BREEAM: Apart from the above quotations no information about what level of BREEAM would be achieved is provided

BRUKL : There are no references to BRUKL in the above document

MISSING INFORMATION: - BREEAM
- BRUKL
- Presumably the tunnel and basement area should be evaluated

/0316: Far Field

Please refer to the objection submitted by Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

From Summary in /0331; In view of the above, a suitable drainage strategy has been developed to mitigate the risk of flooding at the Proposed Development site. Overall, it can be concluded that consideration of these matters as part of an EIA is not required.

HCAAC does not agree with this assessment.

/0331: FORMAL SCREENING OPINION re. EIA

BREEAM

5.225 Mallinson: very good, could achieve excellent

5.227 Richards bldg: very good

5.228 Science Block: very good

5.231 Dyne House: very good

5.232 Decant: none

5.233 Far Field: none

5.234 Summary: "As mentioned above, the Proposed Development includes measures to respond to the climate emergency and **will improve the performance and resilience of the estate as far as possible**. The School has also developed their own Sustainability Strategy and Environmental Policy with aspirations to be as sustainable an institution as possible and are committed to making a positive impact by planning for and achieving **outstanding** environmental sustainability performance. **Overall, climate change effects are not considered to be significant, and an EIA is, therefore, not required for this element.**"

BREEAM:

- see individual planning applications

BRUKL :

- see individual planning applications

MISSING INFORMATION:

- see individual planning applications

- the climate effects do not meet current policy, are hardly aspirational and certainly do not achieve 'outstanding environmental sustainability performance' as claimed in paragraph 5.234. Therefore the assessment that 'an EIA is, therefore, not required' is in our opinion deeply flawed.

HGY/2023/0331: HIGHGATE SCHOOL Formal Screening Opinion re EAI

APPENDIX 2: Stewardship, Sustainability and Archaeology

The project applications covered by the Formal Screening Opinion re. EIA will have a significant effect on the environment of Highgate. The Conservation Area Appraisal Statement of Significance states:

“The character of the Highgate Conservation Area is formed by the relationship of its historic pattern of development, its high percentage of buildings of architectural merit, its topography, its green open spaces and distant views.”

Stewardship

Highgate School is the largest landowner in Highgate with large areas of open green spaces contiguous with Hampstead Heath, Kenwood Garden and Park both of which connect via Far Field and the large gardens of Courtenay, Compton and Sheldon Avenues to Highgate Golf Course and Highgate Allotments.

The fact that certain areas can be described as ecologically insignificant with poor bio-diversity, is more a reflection of ongoing management, than an indication of potential.

Sustainability

The landscaping analysis of Farfield makes no mention of the proposed artificial turf. That in itself will have a significant effect to the detriment of biodiversity, soils and sustainability.

We do not find it credible that no evidence for bats (Mallinson) has been found and we would expect to have sightings of rather more birds and varieties of birds than mentioned. Of course the taller trees are home to forest songbirds. They will disappear when smaller, ‘garden’ trees are planted as replacements.

There is no mention of whether the new sports area will be grass or artificial grass. Although the existing grass surface is of low quality, scoring 0.4 for Urban Greening Factor, this could easily be improved by better management rather than reduced to 0.1 for a ‘permeable surface’.

The old field boundaries, with their trees, that can be seen on the 1870 OS 25 inch map, can still be seen today. The proposal for yet another sports field, will destroy that historical link. The proposed Sports Pitch Flood Basin cuts through these old boundaries with an oval structure, totally altering the current landscape.

Information on recycling is covered in the application but there is nothing about reduction in waste.

This application states the intention to use standard materials but surely Highgate School should be aiming to use more sustainable materials.

The emphasis seems to be on minimum compliance with recent or out-of-date regulatory frameworks but not to achieve compliance with the Environment Act 2021 and guidance, The London Plan 2021 and guidance, the emerging Haringey Local Plan.

It is difficult to see how these projects, taking many years to implement, would 'future proof' the school for decades to come as there is no ambition to achieve Zero Carbon by 2030 let alone 2050.

Archaeology

From the 'fields to the North of Hampstead Lane', where Farfield was set in a wood to the '19th century development of Highgate', there is little or no reference to the history of Highgate from mediaeval times until the 19th century. Far field was a field set within the woods, clearly shown on the Roque map of 1746. It is intriguing why this clearing should be there and there could well be archaeological remains of interest.

Louise's comments

The EIA required if the project will have a significant effect on the Environment of Highgate. That is surely characterised by the Conservation Area Appraisal Statement of Significance,

“The character of the is formed by the relationship of its historic pattern of development, its high percentage of buildings of architectural merit, its topography, its green open spaces and distant views.”

Although the Conservation Area is noted in the applications, there is no detailed reference to the Character appraisal, let alone any detailed analysis of the appraisal or the effect of these large projects upon the Conservation Area.

Given that the history of Highgate School is so intertwined with the history of Highgate and given that Highgate School is the largest landowner in in Highgate and is prominent in the built environment of Highgate, it is difficult to see how this ambitious project, designed to ‘future proof’ the school for decades to come and taking many years to implement, cannot require an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The emphasis seems to be on minimum compliance with recent regulatory frameworks rather than engagement with new thinking in the Environment Act 2021 and guidance, The London Plan 2021 and guidance, the emerging Haringey Local Plan. As for any aspiration above and beyond these frameworks, there is none.

Environment Aspect As has been said, these applications cover a substantial part of land in Highgate. All, apart from the science block, are part of the proposed Ecological Corridors in Highgate (Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, Appendix 3). However the proposed surface for all the sports fields is artificial turf. This looks ugly, witness the junior sports field, and is an environmental disaster at all levels. .

The environmental assessments are limited. It is astonishing that no evidence for bats has been found and one would expect to have sightings of rather more birds and varieties of birds than mentioned. Of course the taller trees are home to forest songbirds. They will disappear when smaller, ‘garden’ trees are planted as replacements.

There has been little work done on invertebrates, insect life and the cryptogam and rhizosphere, which contributes so much to bio-diversity.

The fact that certain areas can be described as ecological insignificant with poor bio-diversity, is more a reflection of ongoing management, than an indication of potential.

Haringey’s Conservation Officer; the Environment Officer and the Tree Officer, should all make an independent assessment of the application as it pertains to their own area of expertise.

Here are bits and piece

Rubbish and Waste

This section is all about recycling and nothing about reduction in waste

Materials it says they are using standard materials but surely they should be aiming to use more sustainable materials. (I have just read an article about recycling concrete by mixing it into new concrete using concrete from Syria.)

Traffic and Transport This is likely to be a nightmare. But the assessment is based on quality CMP's and no increase in school pupils. We would question that but If they say that's their intention, we can't call them out.

On the other hand they might have to cast their nets wider to get the pupils. If the pupils and staff come from further away, they will generate more traffic and the resultant traffic jams and pollution. They need to have more details of timings and amount of works traffic, before any assessment of its effects can be made.

Archaeology This is so full of holes that it's untrue. From the 'fields to the North of Hampstead Lane', where Farfield was set in a wood; to the '19th century development of Highgate', with little or no reference to its history from mediaeval times until the 19th century.

These are a few notes on the individual sites.

Dyne House

There is no obvious improvement to the environment and no attempt has been made to compare the Urban Green Factor Score of the existing bio-diversity and a UGF score for the biodiversity for the Landscape Proposals.

- Formal landscaped entrance on Southwood Lane This exists already and proposed area is less than existing
- Green roofs to assist pollinators;
- Rooftop planting to soften the building profile;
- Outdoor roof terrace study areas; These three are different formulations for the same thing. There needs to be a formal UGF assessment for all the roofs
- Courtyard spaces for pupil socialising It is unclear how they will enhance the environment
- New surfacing to Parade Ground; It is unclear what surfacing will replace existing. It is unclear by how much it will enhance the environment
- Extensive border planting; Again this replaces existing planting.
- New emergency and maintenance vehicle ramp.

Richardson Building

There is no significant improvement to the ecology and it encroaches on Metropolitan Open Land. The building is overly large and it is unclear why drama has been linked to sport.

Mallinson Centre

Many mature trees to be felled. These will not be mitigated by planting the same number of relatively young trees. Highgate School have already felled trees in this area with no indication of any significant replacement trees being planted. There is no mention of whether the new sports area will be grass or artificial grass. Although the existing grass surface is of low quality, scoring 0.4 for Urban Greening Factor, this

could easily be improved by better management rather than reduced to 0.1 for a 'permeable surface'.

There is an assertion that the proposal will, 'enhance the streetscape and improve visual amenity', with no supporting evidence.

The old field boundaries, with their trees, that can be seen on the 1870 OS 25 inch map, can still be seen today. The proposal for yet another sports field, will destroy that historical link. The proposed Sports Pitch Flood Basin cuts through these old boundaries with an oval structure, totally altering the current landscape.

There is an implication that it will act as an 'attenuation tank' for probable flooding in the area, but there is no supporting evidence given for its efficacy for this role.

Farfield

The landscaping analysis of Farfield makes no mention of the proposed artificial turf. That in itself will be a significant effect to the detriment of the environment and the Conservation Area. Far field was a field set within the woods, clearly shown on the Roque map of 1746. It is intriguing why this clearing should be there and there could well be archaeological remains of interest

Dyne House

5.97 Dyne House itself has been assessed as possessing an overbearing appearance on Southwood Lane disrupting the hierarchy and domestic scale of the buildings to the east side of the Road. It presently makes a minor negative contribution to the setting of the surrounding listed buildings and Conservation Area. How can an even bigger structure make a more positive impact? 5.104 says that most of the Dyne House site historic developed in 19th century - but the 1746 Roque map shows a building on the site