

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application on the grounds set out below:

The Highgate Conservation Area Character and Management Plan (HCACA & MP) states in the section on Cromwell Avenue and streets off it at 6.4.131: "*The red brick walls are a prominent feature with recessed panels and stone copings and brick piers with stone caps which also contribute to the design cohesion ...*".

Until 2012 there was an open parking space for three cars at the rear of no. 59 Hornsey Lane and the other gardens were enclosed with very tatty fencing. Two neighbours paid for the new wall, seen in the Google Streetview image below. The then owners of no. 17 Cromwell Place built the section of wall to the left hand side of the gate in the centre of the photograph prior to 2009. The owner of no. 59 Hornsey Lane paid for and built the section to the right of his gate prior to 2012. The HCACA & MP is dated December 2013.

This wall makes a significant contribution to the street scene. Any changes to it should therefore have been fully presented in this planning application but no information on the changes to the appearance of the wall, the exact position of the proposed gate, whether piers to match existing would be introduced, etc. is provided. The position of the proposed gate appears to be between the pier aligned with the front retaining walls in Cromwell Place (on the left in the image below) and the pier aligned with the kerbstones at the edge of the pavement. Either the proposal involves a double gate between those two piers; or no piers at all to the new gate positioned somewhere within that panel of brickwork, crashing through the decorative panel in the centre of that part of the wall.

Clearly this planning application is deficient but neither of those solutions would be visually acceptable as they would cause harm to the Highgate Conservation Area with no public benefit, indeed it may well result in damage to public benefit.

We understand that refuse in Hornsey Lane is collected from the front of the properties. It would need to be established if refuse collection for the properties on Hornsey Lane could be collected from Cromwell Place. However there is no controlled area of pavement at the end of Cromwell Place for the bins from nos. 57 - 61 Hornsey Lane. It would appear that the four bins (excluding garden waste) from no. 61 Hornsey Lane would impede access to/from no.17 Cromwell Place.



Google Streetview June 2022

- The application states it is for work to the Basement flat. This is not an accurate description of what is proposed. A significant part of the work would be at ground floor level.
- The Location Plan does not show the position of the road surface and pavements on each side in Cromwell Place nor precisely the proposed position of the gate.
- Elevation drawings of the wall, as existing and proposed showing the piers, existing gates and position of the proposed new gate, design of the gate, etc. are required.
- It would appear that the proposed new gate may open into the front garden of no. 17 Cromwell Place which would of course be unacceptable.
- There do not appear to be precedents for rear extensions at ground floor level. Setting a precedent would be unacceptable because of the adverse impact on daylight to basement rooms in the rest of this homogenous terrace. No evaluation of the impact of this proposal on the neighbouring property has been provided.
- The bedroom in Studio 3 on the ground floor appears to be internal without daylight. A section through the main rear wall between the proposed bathroom and the bedroom is required.
- Overlooking from the proposed terrace at ground floor level may cause overlooking issues for neighbours.
- All potentially affected neighbours must be consulted on Conditions regarding a Construction Management Plan and access to the site generally. Demolition materials and construction materials must be stored on site and not on the road in Cromwell Place. Dust and noise must be controlled.
- The BIA for the application for no. 69 Crowell Avenue has revealed health hazards arising from excavation. The ground water situation may also be problematic. Specialist reports are required.
- The word 'Entrance' needs to be removed from the door to the front room at basement level and the area of the flat checked in consequence.
- The application states that no garden will be lost, implying that hard-standing IS NOT garden. This is not consistent with the extensive paving of the garden shown, which by implication IS garden. The applicant cannot have it both ways i.e. the area of paved patio to be built over is not garden, but the new paving in the garden would be garden. The part of the new extension on the patio is therefore subtracting from the existing area of garden, so the application form is incorrect on that point.