

APPENDIX 2 OFFICER'S REPORT REVIEW OF HERITAGE MATTERS

Para	Statement	Comment
13.20	The officer assessment below draws on the findings of the ES.	No mention of the Conservation Officer's response. The Conservation Officer did not agree with the ES in all respects. There is no clarity about where the case Officer disagrees with the Conservation Officers, or why.
13.24	No. 34 White Hart Lane (Listed Grade II). The nearest proposed plots to the building are the I plots. The ES concludes that the proposal would have a minor beneficial impact as a result of the demolition of nos 24-30 White Hart Lane and public realm improvements within its setting. Officers concur that the proposal would have a minor beneficial impact on the setting of this building.	Note comments on Conservation Officer's response in the table above. This beneficial impact directly contradicts the Conservation Officer's response. It says nothing of the "overwhelming impact" identified by the Conservation Officer.
13.43	"743 – 759 High Road (Locally Listed). The ES notes that the former public house has been subject to alteration, is of limited interest and is proposed for demolition."	Only the corner pub at 759 is covered. There is no indication whatsoever that this assessment covers the wholesale demolition of a whole street block of 9 separate locally listed buildings.
13.45	No. 790 High Road (Dial House) (Grade II* listed) "officers consider that these proposed tall buildings would cause 'less than substantial harm' to its setting and significance."	Conservation Officer's response was silent about this building (as with many others noted in the Case Officer's report)
13.48	"Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm in the mid-lower range."	But we can see from the Conservation Officer's response that she considered the harm to be "the mid-range of 'less than substantial'" in the illustrative "most heritage-sympathetic configuration". There is a clear discrepancy. On what basis is this impact on many heritage assets revised to a lower level, and what is being assessed (illustrative/max parameters)?
13.49	"Summary. Having carefully considered the proposals, including the findings in the applicant's ES, the Conservation Officer considers that the proposed towers would cause	But this is misleading. There are extensive discrepancies between the Conservation Officer's response and the Case Officer's report. Some heritage assets are assessed by the Case Officer which the Conservation Officer did not assess at all. Some assessments differ. Not once does the Case Officer communicate the

Para	Statement	Comment
	<i>'less than substantial harm' to the setting and significance of the above designated and non-designated heritage assets considered together and that, having considered the specific impact of the proposed development on each relevant heritage asset, the prevailing level of harm would be at the mid- lower range of 'less than substantial'"</i>	"overwhelming impact" identified by the Conservation Officer, or the concerns regarding the maximum parameters. It is not at all clear whether the Case Officer assesses the maximum parameters or the illustrative scheme.