



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2022/4188
Date: 13/01/2023

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 373 Archway Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4EJ.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: Replacement of existing shop front.

The proposed development site (the Site) is located in Sub Area 3 (Archway) of the Highgate Conservation Area.

In statutory terms, the significance of the heritage asset is recognised by its designation as a conservation area, reflecting its 'special interest'. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

The parade of shops which runs from Southwood Lane to Bishops Road, as described by the Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP), is less uniform, and fewer shops have survived in a good condition. Nevertheless, the pre-existing shopfront of the Site (as evidenced by Google Streetview images dating from April 2021), which forms one of a pair of existing buildings, comprised several traditional details including brick pilasters, timber fascia, stall riser, clerestory/transom lights, ornamental timber transoms and mullions, and recessed doorway with tiled entrance. As such, the Site, notwithstanding its condition, was considered a positive contributor to the street scene and wider conservation area.

In September 2022, a retrospective application for the 'retention of existing shop front' (HGY/2022/1335) was refused consent for the following reason:

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.

Limited information has been provided regarding the contribution the proposed development site makes to the significance of the conservation area, contrary to Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 194 states that:

*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. **The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.** As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

The following publications and advice notes from Historic England are useful guidance:

- Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets – (Second Edition)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 12: Statements of Heritage Significance

The proposals are also unclear. The existing elevations show the scheme which has been implemented without consent; this is not the baseline from which the impact of the proposals can be assessed.

Notwithstanding the above, there are concerns regarding the proposals. Whilst the proposals seek to reinstate historic features such as the stall riser, transom lights, and timber fascia, the proposals continue to result in the loss of historic fabric and features including, ornamental timber mullions and recessed doorway. Furthermore, the proposed height of the fascia appears disproportionate to the existing shopfront.

Taken together the proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. The proposals, therefore, would constitute a scheme which would lead to less than substantial harm to the identified heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF relevant. Furthermore, no clear and convincing justification for that harm has been provided contrary to Paragraph 200 of the NPPF.

In conclusion, it is not possible to support the proposals as they are in conflict with Paragraphs 194, 199, 200, 202, and 206 of the NPPF and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Pace BA (Hons) MSc IHBC
Historic Environment Team
Place Services

Note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter