

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objection to application

**HGY/2022/4362 Flat A, 170 Archway Road, N6 5BB**

Loft conversion and alterations to facilitate the conversion of 3 bed flat to form 1 x 1 bed and a 1 x 2 bed self-contained units.

HCAAC objects to these proposals for a number of reasons:

1. Firstly, we find the drawings very hard to follow. Some are very faint and a number are wrongly labelled “Lower ground floor”.

Also we do not understand how the drawings relate to the *“beautifully designed structure” ... “that replaces the current extension with a well-designed glass window that wraps the back and a portion of the facade at ground level”* described in the Design and Access Statement when the two new flats proposed are on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors.

We cannot see any changes to the facade at ground level in the drawings, nor the *“new glass slit window design between rear extension and side extension”* described in the DAS.

These comments appear to come from a completely different application:

*“(19/0392/HOT) Replacement single storey side/rear extension; proposed window on ground floor side elevation; blocking up of basement windows.”*

The description in the DAS does not match the drawings. The proposals should be clarified and the correct documents provided.

2. This is a very important, locally listed terrace within Highgate Conservation Area. The large arched windows along the terrace are interesting and characteristic of this stretch of Archway Road, and form part of the setting of nearby listed structures such as Hornsey Lane Bridge and St Augustine's Church.

The window at the front of this building appears to be a largely or wholly unaltered example of the original windows and should therefore be protected. A great deal of care should be applied in assessing this application. The conservation officer should

take a careful look at any impact on the arched window, taking into account that it is one of a series. The entire terrace needs to be seen as a unit.

3. The creation of a new attic level in the top maisonette needs careful consideration given these factors. We need a larger scale section which shows precisely how the new attic floor relates to the very important window on the front elevation, and details about exactly how the relationship between the two will be achieved in practice.

Also the head height of the attic space should be indicated to assess whether enough of it is sufficiently high to make it practical.

4. The glazing of the large arched window overlooking Archway Road is shown slightly differently between the existing and proposed plans. What does this signify? The front window should not be altered in any significant way. Precise proposals and drawings are required.

5. Numerous other roofs along the terrace appear to have side facing roof windows, but were these installed prior to current policies being introduced and so do they form a precedent for this application?

6. Also, why is there a sun study when the proposals appear to involve little or no change to the overall shape of the building?

7. The two separate flats proposed are an improvement on the current HMO as the baths and WCs will no longer be communal, however the two bedrooms at the rear may be slightly under the legally required area (11.45m).

We do not think permission should be granted until a great deal more information and clarification is provided.