

Our Autumn 2022 report, detailing the major failures in Haringey planning, was read, we understand with some shock, by their Chief Executive, who asked for a meeting with our Chair William Britain. We had hoped that, as a result, there would be an improvement in relations and in co-operation between us. To our dismay, the situation has worsened, with yet more inexplicably bad decisions which undermine good planning in Highgate. This, we should hasten to point out, is not always due to failures on the part of individual planners, with some of whom we work well, but to an underfunded department which clearly cannot give due consideration to the more complex and dangerous applications, and possible political pressure to allow anything which brings money to Haringey's depleted coffers, however damaging.

On March 30th we met Haringey planners to discuss many ongoing issues of concern, including:

- **Pre-application Discussions and Community Engagement:** Experience shows that, once applicants have paid for pre-application advice, the outcome is a foregone conclusion, even before any public consultation, and our perception is that the Conservation Officer's comments are not listened to (unless they support the application). Some developers even state that they have 'consulted' with the Highgate Society when they have simply presented us with a fait accompli, as at Mary Feilding House and the equally damaging application at 44-46 Hampstead Lane which, we are dismayed to report, Haringey planning committee passed unanimously on May 11, disregarding a raft of policies and setting a precedent which seriously undermines future efforts to protect the Conservation Area.
- **Inconsistent Conservation Reports:** While Haringey take a strict line over smaller applications, they appear unable to stand up to larger developers, letting the larger and more damaging projects through. For example, the conservation report on Townsend Yard made no mention of the listed Shepherds Cottage, even though its setting will be fatally compromised, while the Mary Feilding report actually described the development as an enhancement while the 44-6 Hampstead Lane report eulogised this appalling development as something to enhance the Conservation Area. As long as the community is effectively excluded from discussions on large developments, we can only maintain this view.
- **Haringey's Planning Committee's** performance so far has been disappointing, at best, and 3 minutes is not enough time for objectors to get their points across, when the developer is allowed much more time. In the Mary Feilding and 44-6 Hampstead Lane cases, members did not appear to fully understand the issues and did not take up affected residents' concerns.
- We have lost all confidence in Haringey's "**Quality Review Panel**" of paid "experts", whose judgments on the design of schemes seems always to overrule ours, resulting in appallingly bad design being approved. It used to comprise experienced local volunteers with experience of the area, and worked well. We have asked to meet the panel and have invited them to a walkabout in Highgate to learn our concerns first-hand.
- There is now sufficient information on **the impact of basements for** Haringey to commission a report to enable them to make more informed decisions in future.
- We were alarmed to note that in a recent case, Haringey had outsourced a Conservation report to a consultant based in Essex, who had recommended refusal without even visiting the property.
- **Enforcement** remains a worry, with an apparent reluctance to prosecute in cases such as the many breaches of condition at Townsend Yard. Haringey assured us early in the year that they were "moving to take direct action", but have done nothing.
- **Paving over front gardens** and allowing parking over tree roots is against policy but, inexplicably, being permitted.
- A long-term lack of control over development in the Archway Road - part of the Conservation Area - is relentlessly undermining it. That Haringey now have a Town Centre Manager for the west of the borough was news to us, and we have asked to meet them to discuss the Village and Archway Road. We have heard nothing as yet.
- **The revised Local List of Buildings of Interest** has failed to appear after six years. The Society and the CAAC did a vast amount of work on this for Haringey which we passed to them in *October 2017*. Nothing

has happened, other than a first draft omitting a number of important buildings, which we have demanded must be reinstated. The failure to produce it is seriously hindering any ability to secure good planning in the Conservation Area.

- Similarly, we await the long-promised revision of the now seriously outdated **Conservation Area Appraisal**, and developers are cynically exploiting its weakness. We were told that the Conservation Officer will review the draft and they will then consult on it.

- Despite the production of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan in 2017, there is still no liaison with Camden on planning, transport or other issues. Of particular concern is that there is now an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights to turn shops into housing on the Camden side of the High Street, but not on the Haringey side.

As the situation on the multiple **Highgate School planning applications** changes almost daily, anything printed here will quickly become out of date; therefore please see our recent email newsletters and website for current information, including details of public meetings and for our detailed letters of objection on each.

These comprise nine applications on seven sites which will take up to 10 years to complete and have generated great concern across the community, not least from the Society. We engaged with the school during the pre-application process, but few of the concerns we raised have been addressed; this is disappointing, as we worked well and constructively with the School on their Junior School project.

We pointed out to Haringey that the statutory three week period to submit comments on nine immensely complex application was a completely impossible target for community groups, and have been told that comments will be accepted up to the time that decisions are made, possibly in June. Concerns cover the architectural impact of the new and extended buildings on the Conservation Area; the impact of the works on the village and its residents, making it essential that the detailed construction management plans are part of the approval process, not left as a detail after approval has been granted; and justification of the need to develop these sites on such a massive scale. The individual applications are:

(1) Highgate School Science Block, Island Site, 4 and 3 storey extensions, basement, additional plant space at roof level. Our main concerns are overlooking and overshadowing of two Alms Houses; overlooking from the proposed roof observatory; the duration and impact of the work which, together with Dyne House, will take up to 5 years, 5 ½ days a week with 3000+ construction lorry movements in the Village. Historic England have accepted our argument that a full archaeological assessment is necessary as it is in an area of known archaeological potential and have requested a strong archaeological condition.

(2) Dyne House, Southwood Lane: refurbishment, extension and basement works and substantial redevelopment of the rear of the site. Our main concerns are adverse impact on the Conservation Area from the scale of development; the disappointing redesign of the Dyne House frontage, which even the 20th Century Society have criticised; impact on neighbours and hydrology of new deep basements; impact of construction traffic on the village; overlooking by new classroom windows; coverage of much more of the site by the new buildings to the rear; and impact on the Bowl area, the setting of adjoining listed buildings and residents' amenity; loss of mature trees; the ground floor foyer, currently serving as a foyer to the lecture theatre and regularly used by the local community for events, is to be a sixth form common room and it is unclear whether it will remain a community asset; new roof terraces will be accessed by pupils, leading to loss of privacy for neighbours, and new open amenity spaces for the pupils will be generally close to the boundary with the Kingsley Place houses. There is also mention of the Parade Ground as a holding ground for the construction works, possibly meaning construction traffic using Kingsley Place.

(3) Richards Music Centre Redevelopment, Bishopswood Road: this picturesque, if now somewhat impractical, structure will be demolished and replaced with a much larger basemented building, the design of which is immensely disappointing, resembling more a car showroom than a landmark building for Metropolitan Open Land.

(4) Mallinson Sports Centre, Bishopswood Road - part of the existing structure, squash and fives courts will be demolished and replaced with a basement, double height sports hall, classrooms etc. and – critically -

new basemented outdoor fives courts and, in the ecologically important “Orchard”, a new sunken sports pitch, claimed to serve as a floodwater catchment in high rainfall events. This will radically reduce the ground water flow to the important ancient hedgerow, with its veteran oaks, which runs between the Mallinson Centre and the Orchard playing field. It is shown on the 1869 Ordnance map and is the last surviving pre-development hedgerow in the area. Moreover, as there is an active spring next to the Orchard,, the water will either be diverted into the main field or adjoining gardens or will simply flow into it and create a semi-permanent pool which will make it unusable as a playing field. Ecologically it will also seriously diminish the value of the Orchard, which is currently a valuable ecological area which the school should be using for educational purposes.

Other concerns include: increased major local congestion from delivering pupils by car - recently the bins in Broadlands Road were not emptied as the lorry could not gain access; it is unclear how the loss of Metropolitan Open Land will be made good; the application states that the area has a low level of service from Public transport, yet concludes that the impact would be acceptable. Finally, we fear that the basements and sunken playing field involved will cause major ground water diversion problems which have not been adequately addressed or taken account of the complex local hydrology and geology. Recent work on nearby sites shows that there are significant groundwater flows close to the surface, associated with springs which flow in many directions, resulting in one case in abandoning plans for a basement. Even the consultants’ report acknowledges that, should there be an increase in surface water runoff, the local drainage network might be overwhelmed, flooding nearby properties.

(5) Far Field, Hampstead Lane opposite Kenwood – it is proposed to replace the grass sports pitch with Astro-turf, surrounded by “biodiversity margins”. However it is now recognised that artificial pitches cause long-term microplastic pollution and that no biodiversity can survive beneath them.

(6) Use of Junior School Field for temporary classrooms for up to 10 years we are making only limited comment on this, other than to question how the loss of sports facilities will be addressed.

(7) The school have asked Haringey to confirm that an **Environmental Impact Assessment** is not required for all these applications. However we consider that there are a number of serious environmental impacts arising and that an EIA is essential.

There is still little more to report on the **Townsend Yard development**. Breaches of the Construction Management Plan by the developer continue. It has always clearly been impossible to implement the original permission and the scheme probably cannot be built without breaking its terms, as we pointed out in our original objection; it is increasingly clear that Haringey erred disastrously in granting permission in 2020. These breaches are continually reported to Haringey’s planners, and although they served the developer with a Breach of Condition Notice on 2 December 2022, they have inexplicably failed to take any enforcement action. We continue to work behind the scenes, together with other outraged groups, to demand that the scheme be revised, since even the London Fire Brigade concede that they cannot turn their vehicles in the yard – which is a requirement for access to it – and, should the scheme be built as unwisely permitted by Haringey (despite our 18-page letter of objection written by a leading planning barrister, giving them, at no expense, all the legal and planning reasons they needed to refuse it – another example of their disregard for community engagement), it will not only be in breach of fire regulations but will result in the historic Listed 18th century Shepherd’s Cottage being unreachable by the Brigade in the event of a fire.

A fundamental problem is that the approved plans did not show enough detail to alert the London Fire Brigade to the issue, resulting in planning permission being granted without any provision for considering that fire risk. This has now come to light now and it is clear that the consent must be reviewed in the light of fire safety of 36a. The remit of the developers’ Approved Inspector, with whom we have been in long correspondence, is only to consider the development itself, not the fire safety of 36A. We have therefore advised Haringey that they must and that it is essential that they contact the LFB directly so that they can require whatever modifications may be required. Despite Haringey’s claim that they cannot do so, section 97 of the Town and Country Planning Act provides for modifications to planning permissions.

We have also written to the Principality Building Society, lender to the developer, highlighting that the developer appears to be proceeding with construction without building control approval, pointing out all the

above problems and warning that, if the developer proceeds without building control permission, they may be required to demolish the houses and that, even if they do not, the houses would be unsaleable as mortgage lenders would be unlikely to advance loans against properties built without the necessary approval.

We have time and again expressed our willingness to help achieve a solution which we could support as compliant with building control and fire regulations, but Haringey seem frozen like rabbits in the proverbial headlights, and we have invited the developers to meet us several times, without any reply.

Please see our petition for general background and other documents: <https://www.change.org/p/haringey-must-act-now-to-protect-historic-listed-cottage-in-highgate>

“When troubles come, they come not single spies, but in battalions”. Another major battle, on our fringes but nevertheless critical, is the proposed 36-storey tower block on the site of the **Archway Campus** at the bottom of Highgate Hill, a designated Conservation Area. After buying the old hospital buildings in 2014 for £23m, Peabody Ltd failed to progress any development and have now leased the site for £38m to private developers Seven Capital, who proposed demolishing the southern part of the Conservation Area and building a 36-storey tower for student housing (which incurs no CIL payments) on its site, gutting the Victorian buildings for 125 private units, and building six 10-storey blocks on Highgate Hill for social and ‘affordable’ (rented at approximately 80%) housing units.

Apart from the significant overshadowing it would cause over a wide area locally and adding to the wind blight caused by the Archway Tower, a 36-storey tower block would have a disastrous impact over a very wide area of Islington and Camden and by clearly visible from Highgate (see out reconstruction drawings on our website).

Since the value of the site did not increase by the percentage increase apparently paid over that period, we are concerned that Seven Capital have significantly overpaid for the site and that this is driving the tower block. Sometimes developers argue that they cannot keep to local policy as they would make a loss; but, Islington have established in the High Court that overpayment cannot be taken into account as a factor to justify giving planning consent.

While details are vague, the units planned seem to be small. Archway already has an oversupply of small flats, and research shows that those built in the area are not selling well. Still less is there any need for student housing (which is very profitable - hence it is assumed that the aim is to make it pay for the affordable housing). Islington’s own policy strictly limits student housing, noting that all too often it is used as undersized accommodation for non students.

We are campaigning against the current proposals with the Better Archway Forum and the Islington Society – see the campaign website <https://www.savearchwaycampus.org/> for details. Our most urgent task is to get the historic Infirmary buildings Listed, since the Conservation Area was only designated because of their presence; an application has been submitted to Historic England. A local publicity campaign is also under way.

On May 11, Haringey Planning Committee made yet another catastrophically damaging decision – to allow the demolition of two original arts and crafts houses at **44-46 Hampstead Lane**, at the junction of Courtenay Avenue, and directly opposite the Ken Wood Estate, and replace it with a deeply basemented 60+ bedroom private dementia care home; though demonstrably against Conservation Area policy, they gave permission on the patently nonsensical grounds that it would relieve pressure on the NHS.

We objected strongly to the application, and permitting it has set a disastrous precedent for the rest of the Conservation Area. Other objectors include the Highgate CAAC, Highgate Neighbourhood Forum, English Heritage, owners of Kenwood; Friends of Kenwood; and angry residents of Compton and Courtenay Avenue. Despite the importance of the current houses, Haringey’s sadly out-of-date Conservation Area Appraisal does not identify them as more than “neutral contributors”; but the interpretation put on neutral contributors in this area, that they can be demolished, is utterly wrong and these two houses contribute fundamentally to the

character of the area. The new building will be a gross overdevelopment: the floor area is four times that of the two houses. It is no exaggeration to say that the damage that will be caused to the conservation area by setting this scale of increase as an acceptable precedent sounds a death knell for this part of the Conservation Area. Worse. Indeed, we see increasingly little reason not to revoke the Conservation Area status of this part of Highgate, since there is nothing of architectural merit in these new mega-mansions, or what is left in the area, to justify it.

In addition, the site is directly opposite the Grade 1 listed Kenwood Estate and the Kenwood North Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and may impact on the Estate and on views from within the wood. The extensive additional lighting may also have an extremely adverse impact on the wildlife in the wood, and the deep basement may have a huge impact on the ancient woodland opposite through diversion of groundwater.

Here again we have once more been disgracefully let down by Haringey's Quality Review Panel, who accepted the artistic impression submitted with the application which makes the development look far more innocuous, smaller and hidden by trees, and in character with the area, and unaccountably failed to understand that the scale is completely different to anything else along Hampstead Lane.

We have also been dangerously undermined by the Haringey's Conservation Officer positively eulogistic approval of this dreadful development, which it is necessary to quote at length:

"The original character of the Bishop's area has substantially changed over the last decades due to the replacement of several original buildings with new houses of various scale, style and design quality which have complemented to varying degrees of success the original character of the area.

"The scale and proportions of the new development are indeed consistent with the progressive increase in built scale of this area, and very desirably retain the front and rear gardens with their amenity value as key features of the site.

"The new scheme is elegantly contemporary yet complementary to the prevailing Arts and Crafts original character of the area and succeeds to express in an imaginative way the suburban, domestic character of the area through fluid, well-articulated masses, heights, traditional roof forms and materials.

"The site layout and plan form of the proposed scheme, the articulation of mass and height, the architectural expression, boundary treatment and landscape design altogether positively respond to the Conservation Area context, preserve the generous, now unified, rear garden feature, retain the established distance from property at No 1 Courtenay Avenue and the landscaped character of adjacent sites, and substantially help the new development to settle into its evolving heritage setting."

One less charitable might consider them delusional; we will be kinder and simply suggest that they may have been inspired by George Orwell. Indeed, in view of the series of disastrous planning decisions made of late by Haringey planners, some are questioning whether there is any point in engaging with them in future. There is a general feeling among local groups that the quality of decisions being made by Haringey's planning department is at a nadir, and we are at a loss to find any rational explanation.

Well might Haringey's new motto be taken from a line by one of our greatest poets, Shelley: "Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair."

We noted a board outside the former **Newstead** nursing home site on Denewood Road, where a block of flats was permitted several years ago, offering the site for sale. We do not know whether to expect a new – and, inevitably, larger – application, or whether the site will remain vacant.

We were supported by Historic England in securing an archaeological condition for the redevelopment of **Branksome, Courtenay Avenue**, within the historic Mediaeval Park only a short distance from the mediaeval Bishop's Lodge, which the developer's archaeological consultants misplaced in the north of the

Park, whereas the outline of its moat is still visible on the 12th green of Highgate golf course, quite close by. Their report indicates that they found a substantial layer of organic remains, of possibly early date, yet did not undertake any analysis of their palaeobotanical potential. As a result of the Society's recent efforts, the whole area is now designated as an Archaeological Priority Area where excavation is required; but through Haringey's failure in past years to require archaeological work within the area, despite our continual urging, little is known of the archeology of the Park. As a major mediaeval agro-industrial complex, it must have contained a range of habitats and environments relating to agriculture and forestry, and pollen and plant remains preserved in this layer could have given us the best picture to date of the local environment at the time; yet this was not done, and despite our own submission to Haringey, the archaeologists did not contact us, which is unfortunate, because we could have given them considerable further information. In its assessment of the area's prehistoric potential, the report omitted to mention the substantial prehistoric evidence, from Mesolithic to Bronze Age, found in the Highgate Wood pottery site excavations to which it refers, or the Bronze Age feature found on Parliament Hill in 2017. It also seemed unaware of the several detailed articles on the mediaeval Park by local historian the late Malcolm Stokes, published in the Hornsey Historical Society newsletters. Historic England have observed that, had they been told of the discovery of the organic layer, they would have recommended analysis of it.

Similarly, the scheme of investigation for archaeology on the **Cranwood** site in Muswell Hill Road suggests that there is only "limited evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age" - surprisingly omitting any mention of the substantial prehistoric finds directly on the other side of the fence, in Highgate Wood. It further states that "Evidence of Late Iron Age and Romano-British occupation in the area of Muswell Hill is almost entirely related to industrial activity, predominately the procurement of clay and use in the manufacture of pottery. The lack of settlement evidence during these periods has led to the theory that the 'clay ridge' was on the periphery of settlement, only visited periodically to gather resources." However, evidence for Roman occupation in the area has been found in the form of a pit containing pottery in Southwood Lawn Road in c.1970, a hoard of coins found close by in Cranley Gardens in 1928, and a reputed early 19th century find of a coin hoard in Shepherds Hill. As for the statement that "the area is known to have been under dense woodland from early prehistory"; there is currently little evidence for or against this. Again, it would have been helpful if the archaeologists had had the courtesy to make contact with us beforehand.

We supported neighbours objecting to an application for a certificate of lawfulness for a separate structure in the garden of **2 Woodside Avenue** which it was feared would end up in the creation of a separate self-contained dwelling, rather than ancillary to the main house as proposed. A similar application was refused on appeal in 2020 and the reasons for dismissal remain valid, yet the application ignored them. The very scale of the application means that it cannot be allowed as a means of bypassing the normal planning process. Haringey correctly refused it, but the owners have appealed again.

As we wrote, work has commenced on the former Le Pain Quotidien at **86 Highgate High Street** premises by the Northern Union Pub Company, who will be reopening the premises as a pub; this is welcome, and we have asked that they restore the historic name of The Rose and Crown. Northern Union also own the Winchester in Archway Road, successfully reopened last year.

More frustration with Haringey, this time at **30 Grange Road**, where a large, ramshackle and still, after two years, uncompleted shed has been erected on the Broadlands Road frontage, with very negative impact on the Conservation Area streetscape, from which it is highly visible. Whereas a mere layperson would assume it was in the front garden, facing a main road, and therefore needing planning permission, Haringey maintain that the garden fronting Broadlands Road is not the front garden of the property, since the entrance door to the house is on Grange Road, and that it therefore is permitted development and does not need permission.

Yet more frustration over Haringey's proposals for mainly affordable housing on the highly polluted and dangerous **Wellington Gyratory**. We have explained our concerns to Haringey's team at Zoom meetings.

Once again, the Haringey Quality Review Panel has undermined us by expressing their approval of the deplorably office-block design. Although the location is a highly dangerous one, Transport for London TfL have declined to talk to Haringey about improving conditions for pedestrians. The new development will also loom over adjoining neighbours' gardens. With the CAAC and Neighbourhood Forum we then met on site with the project architect, whose response to our concerns was that we were "unrepresentative and unelected", while offering his assurance that there was still some way to go with the scheme and "nothing was set in stone".

Indeed, given the deplorable decisions the Haringey Quality Review Panel have been making recently, we have invited them to a walkabout of the area to learn of our concerns. We await any response.

In July 2022 Camden confirmed an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights on their side of the High Street, allowing change of use from commercial to a dwelling without the need for planning permission. This was introduced because it would have harmful social, economic and amenity impacts and restrict the Council's ability to properly plan. This was very welcome, but in his infinite wisdom the Secretary of State has reduced the size of the area covered, although Camden point out that the majority of the area covered in the original Direction is covered. Plans showing the new area are at <https://www.camden.gov.uk/article-4-directions-land-use-classes>

Unfortunately, we have been unable to persuade Haringey to introduce a similar Direction for their side of the High Street, so Highgate is in the absurd position of having Article 4 protection for half a village.

Those of you who know **Hampstead Heath** and its long-serving staff will be as shocked as those of us on the Consultative Committee to learn of the sudden death of their Senior Ranger, Declan Gallagher, on Sunday 30 April, following a sporting accident. Declan was a respected and dedicated member of the Heath team and a great supporter of the community groups on the Committee, and will be very much missed. A book of condolence was placed at Golders Hill Park.

Among the many aspects of Heath management, the City planned an event over the Coronation bank holiday at Golders Hill Park which was well attended. Camden have refused the application for a license for wedding receptions at the Pergola, the City putting in an application suggesting the limit on numbers was below 5000, rather than the intended limit of 120; they will reapply. The City are also concerned about the impact of the proposed 36-storey tower block at Archway on the amenities of, and views to and from, the Heath and are consulting their planning specialist. There are proposals for greening the rather dull area north of the Lido. Across the Heath, the owner of the North Fairground site is still trying to establish residential use; the City have objected to what would have a very damaging impact on the Vale of Health area.

A consultant has been appointed to look at the future of the Heath's cafes and the impending expiration of their leases; the importance of consulting the public, eg by questionnaires to customers on what they wanted, is recognised. The bids are likely to be in two phases: first Highgate Wood, the Lido and Queens Park, then Parliament Hill Yard (where there is scope for a small visitor centre and toilets within the existing building footprint). It is proposed to offer longer leases, enabling cafe operators to plan longer-term and make improvements.

Licences for professional dog walkers are now in operation. And, on the subject of dogs, recent discussion about the damaging effects of neonicotinoids used to kill fleas on dogs, and the resultant pollution of the ponds when dogs swim in them, has promoted the City to undertake testing of the ponds' water, the first such study in the UK.

English Heritage is creating a new Master Plan for the **Kenwood Estate**, and is about to release an ambitious Nature Strategy. The old Summer concerts, with their substantial impact on landscape and possibly wildlife, have been stopped, and new events like Christmas at Kenwood introduced. The current garden team at Kenwood comprises four staff and 20 volunteers who help with garden maintenance with Heath Hands once a week, focusing on natural habitats, but this is still too small a team to manage a 112 acre Estate. In the Flower Garden, large rhododendron hedges are being gradually reduced to stay vigorous.

The issue of Forest Schools remains a concern. Despite their value for children, they cause considerable damage to woodland habitats, compacting soil and eliminating ground vegetation, and Kenwood has limited the size of the one on Mount Tyndal and rotates the site to reduce impact. The ancient oaks boundary oaks near Mount Tyndall and The Elms have been supported by halo pruning and reducing competing birches, and it is proposed that new oaks be planted in gaps in this ancient hedgerow. The Sphagnum Bog is now well-managed; while one of London's few remaining bog habitats, it is in fact only about 70 years old, its sphagnum probably coming from discarded potting materials. The broader aim is to restore features of the Repton landscape while protecting and improving natural habitats and biodiversity. Maintenance of fencing is important for protecting the ancient Ken Wood itself; many of its oaks are more than 300 years old and it is essential to prevent compaction around their roots and to prevent holly and rhododendron from crowding out the habitat.

An important Court of Appeal decision in February on a development in Hertfordshire ruled that local planning authorities may take account of such factors as scale, visual appearance and impact on neighbours' amenity when considering prior approval applications for upward extensions to properties. Upholding a refusal by Barnet and a subsequent High Court ruling, three judges rejected a developer's argument that decisions made under the more informal prior approval process should not be treated less strictly than those for granting planning permission and that local planning policies must still apply.

Finally, news that 22% of **visitors to the Society's website** come from China (compared with 9.3% from the USA, 2% from Ireland and just 54% from the rest of the UK) is mystifying, as we doubt either Highgate's financial muscle or its nuclear arsenal pose sufficient threat to interest a trader in the Wuhan meat market, let alone the centre of power in Beijing. Perhaps we should ask the Foreign Office? historyworld.net has 2.4% of visits from China, Waterlowpark.org.uk has 4.9%, and others are around the 2.5% mark. Might some keywords on our website divert their spy services' computers? Or are most UK (and other) websites monitored 24/7 by the Chinese? We need to know. Equally curious is that, over an 8-day period on March-April, the Archway Bridge Suicide Measures section was the second-most visited part of our website.