

James Argles

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: HGY/2022/4212 & HGY/2022/4057 Oakleigh, 42, Hampstead Lane, London, N6 4LL

From: Elisabetta Tonazzi
Sent: 22 May 2023 18:05
To: Gareth Prosser
Subject: HGY/2022/4212 & HGY/2022/4057 Oakleigh, 42, Hampstead Lane, London, N6 4LL

Dear Gareth,
application HGY/2022/4212 proposes the following amendments to the original scheme approved by consent:

1. New solid door to front facade.
2. Windows to west facade repositioned and shape updated.
3. Kitchen window omission to east facade.
4. LGF door and window reconfiguration.
5. New door and new small gate for dog's shed to rear stairs.
6. Lift overrun.
7. Rear windows to GF Formal living to be arched.
8. Glazed overhead panel to front door omitted.
9. Increased basement excavation under West Side ramp.
10. Ground floor and First Floor quoins to be stone & central rear bay quoins omitted.
11. Roof lights to be repositions / omitted.
12. Stone fascia added to front and rear dormers.
13. Rear external staircase reconfiguration.
14. Reconfiguration of rear facade windows.
15. Orangery composition updated.
16. Roof hatch added for maintenance.
17. Chimneys update

Application HGY/2022/4057 proposes further amendments to the approved scheme as follows:

18. All sash windows to be casement
19. All glazing bars to windows omitted.
20. Rear Lower Ground Floor windows be sliding doors

Many of the proposed amendments are acceptable as omissions and simplifications of the approved design, in some cases are localised design changes that will be largely screened to the view by the mature boundary hedges that will enclose the property and in other cases more relevant and cumulative changes to the composition and fenestration of the Orangery and rear windows of central bay to ground and first floors of the rear elevation are clearly intended as refinements of the proposed classically inspired façade composition.

However, while many proposed amendments are justified and supported, the proposed lift overrun at point 6 of the proposed amendments' list and the revised, overly elaborated, Palladian window-inspired front dormer, confusingly described at point 12 as a stone fascia added to front dormer, would very undesirably unbalance the architectural composition of the new house, would erode, and dominate its traditional and elegantly symmetric roof form and would be visible as an anomaly in views of the new house along Hampstead lane. The lift overrun and the pastiche design of the front dormer would very negatively increase the perceived bulk of the house, would detract from the design quality of the proposed building and in its current configuration application HGY/2022/4212 cannot be supported.

The proposed casement windows throughout appear very utilitarian and stylistically incongruous with the proportions and defining features of such a classically inspired suburban villa. Windows are fundamental to define the proportions, rhythm, and aesthetics of an elevation, are key elements of the driving architectural language of a building and should consistently reflect its character and stylistic references.

The reconfiguration of the rear elevation to basement level through large, again very utilitarian sliding doors is strikingly incongruous with the composition, architectural language, forms, and architectural hierarchy of the rear elevation to ground and first floors above.

A totally disconnected design of the elevation at basement level would lead to an unacceptable pastiche design which would be contrary to the NPPF requirements to ensure that new development is an example of good architecture and is sympathetic to local character.

The proposed amendments as per application HGY/2022/4057 would severely detract from the design quality of the approved scheme within the heritage setting of the conservation area and are not supported in principle.

Both applications would negatively impact on the appearance and design quality of the approved house and on the character of the nationally important conservation area. Although this negative impact would lead to a low level of less than substantial harm, it should be considered that any level of harm to the conservation area is undesirable in principle and, as required by the NPPF at paragraph 199, 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 test outlined at paragraph 202 of The NPPF should apply.

Kind Regards,

Elisabetta Tonazzi ARB RIBA Conservation Architect
Principal Conservation Officer
Placemaking and Housing | Haringey Council
Alexandra House 10 Station Road, Wood Green, N22 7TR