



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2022/4004
Date: 23/01/2023

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 69, Cromwell Avenue, Hornsey, London, N6 5HS.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: Amalgamation of 4no. residential flats into 1no. dwellinghouse, demolition of existing ground floor rear extension, erection of new ground floor rear extension, construction of basement extension with external stairs, addition of rear dormer window, installation of rear balconies, creation of lightwells, various other external alterations and increase in height of front wall.

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.

A pre-application for 'conversion of four self-contained flats to a family dwelling, demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension, increased size of the lower ground floor to existing main building and light wells to lower ground floor' was submitted in May 2022 (PRE/2022/0144). During this process the principle of demolition and construction of a new ground floor rear extension was established, as was the acceptability of the proposed flank and rear lightwells. However, the principle of a front lightwell was not supported as it was considered to detract from the established character of this well-preserved part of the Highgate Conservation Area.

There are no objections to the proposed new single-storey rear extension or to the flank and rear lightwells, subject to materiality and detailing which may be managed through the relevant planning conditions.



However, there remains an in-principle objection to the proposed front lightwell. Cromwell Avenue is within a well-preserved part of Highgate Conservation Area with most of the properties sharing a distinctive style with a small front garden and no front lightwells. The proposed front lightwell would detract from the established character of the conservation area, the local character and distinctiveness of the streetscape, and is not in keeping with the host dwelling, contrary to Paragraphs 197c and 206 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the mitigation measures, specifically the introduction of a secondary wall and the increase in height to the existing boundary wall, would undermine the spatial relationship between the house and its front garden and would therefore be contrary to the original and positive design, form, and appearance of the conservation area.

As such, the proposals would constitute a scheme which would lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF relevant. This harm may be mitigated through the omission of the front lightwell and secondary garden wall.

There are also concerns regarding the design of the proposed rear extension, the proposed rear balcony, and the proposed dormer with balcony to roof level.

The proposed rear extension by reason of its configuration and materiality, in particular the proposed extent of glazing, fails to respond to, or reinforce, the architectural composition of the surviving façade behind.

The well-preserved roof form of the Site shares an attractive symmetry with that of No. 67. The proposed dormer with balcony to the roof level would erode and obscure the symmetry and overall roofscape of the pair of houses, resulting in an adverse visual impact which would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF.

Balconies and terraces are uncharacteristic within the immediate environs of the Site, and the proposed introduction of these features to the Site is considered incongruous and insensitive, and results in an appearance of visual clutter and overdevelopment to a sensitive façade which would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF.

As such, the proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF. Furthermore, no clear and convincing justification for that harm has been provided, contrary to Paragraph 200 of the NPPF.

It is not possible to support the current iteration of proposals as they are in conflict with Paragraphs 197c, 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