

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objection to [HGY/2022/4188](#).

Highgate CAAC understands that this application is a response to an Enforcement Case after the applicants replaced the original shop front with modern glazing behind external shutters without planning permission. However, we find the application confusing and somewhat implausible.

The applicant previously attempted to gain retrospective planning permission for the removal and replacement of the original shop front under planning application HGY/2022/1335. That application was refused on the following grounds:

*SCHEDULE OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL FOR DECISION REFERENCE No.
HGY/2022/1335*

The application shown above has been refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed shopfront alterations by virtue of their design, arrangement and materiality would be detrimental to the original building design and would detract from the parade as a whole and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the existing pair of buildings. As such it would be harmful to the Highgate Conservation Area and contrary to Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP0, SP11, SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM8 and DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017.

Both the Highgate Society and HCAAC pointed out the historical significance of these buildings in our objections. Our objection to HGY/2022/1335:

“365 to 373 Archway Road are clearly shown on the 1869 map of the area. 373 may well be Georgian. If these buildings were in Highgate Village they would have been listed. Replacing original windows in such an old building with uPVC is not acceptable in a Conservation Area. Whether other nearby houses/shops have replaced original windows with uPVC or changed frontages, with or without permission, is irrelevant. This application should be considered on its own merits. The policies applicable to the Highgate Conservation Area should apply.

Highgate Neighbourhood Plan DH2 supporting text states: 'Original windows and doors are integral to Highgate's special character, and should be retained and repaired wherever possible. Replacements should match the originals in terms of materials, design and detail.'

This section of the Archway Road consists of properties of various dates going back to around 1830 and that character and quality should be maintained. Its importance and contribution to the Conservation Area is such that its careful preservation must be ensured. Careful repair of the pilasters, capitals and corbel brackets should be conditioned. The entablature should be exactly the same dimensions as the adjacent property with which this forms a pair.

Any security grilles, etc. must follow the requirements of Haringey's Development Management DPD Policy DM8: Shop fronts, signs and on-street dining.

The recessed entrance to the door to the flats above the shop should be maintained.”

We have not changed our views since we made the above observations.

The Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2013) observes in Chapter 6 that this part of Archway Road has not been well maintained. However, those unaltered shop fronts which remain should be protected.

The applicant is proposing to remove the glazed aluminium external door placed in front of the original door to the upstairs flats and to move the original front door forward to replace the new glazed door. There is no persuasive reason to do this. The shop/cafe would not be any larger than it is now. It is not necessary “for maintenance reasons”; similar shop fronts along Archway Road have been maintained for 150 years or more without such a change. The only certain result would be the destruction of the original recessed entrance of an 1800s building, causing further harm to the conservation area. This aspect of the application should be refused.

We are unclear exactly what the applicant intends to do with the remainder of the shop front as the drawings are hard to fathom.

Both the existing and proposed drawings appear to show the cafe signage as it was back in 2012, not as it looked subsequently, with at least two different cafe frontages between 2014 and 2016 and a blank frontage between (at least) August 2017 and April 2021, during which time the premises appeared not to be in use as a cafe. (See images below, taken from Streetview.)

Is the applicant intending to return the shop frontage to the way it looked more than 10 years ago? This seems unlikely.

What does the applicant intend to do? There is no D&A or other explanation of why the drawings do not accurately show the cafe as it was in the years prior to the replacement of the original frontage with aluminium and glass. For the same reason the “proposed” drawings are not convincing either.

The proposed drawings show a timber framed frontage which follows only a very broadly similar pattern to the original and which omits the details on the original corner pillar. The proportions of the upper windows to the main windows and door are wrong. We do not understand why the applicant would go to the trouble of installing timber frames but not replicate the original pattern.

This is contrary to Highgate Neighbourhood Plan DH2, mentioned above, and does not answer the enforcement case satisfactorily. The applicant should be obliged to install timber framed windows which exactly “match the originals in terms of materials, design and detail”.

As we said in our objection to the previous application:

“Careful repair of the pilasters, capitals and corbel brackets should be conditioned. The entablature should be exactly the same dimensions as the adjacent property with which this forms a pair.

Any security grilles, etc. must follow the requirements of Haringey's Development Management DPD Policy DM8: Shop fronts, signs and on-street dining."

Highgate CAAC objects very strongly indeed to this application. It is inadequate and confusing. The original door to the upstairs flats should be left where it is, not moved. The new frontage should exactly match the original which the applicant removed without permission. This application should be refused.

Images from Streetview over recent years:



