

HGY/2023/1135 Philip Court, 89 Hornsey Lane, N6 5LN

Installation of 1 no. new gas riser to the front (north east) elevation (retrospective).

Highgate CAAC objects to this application.

This is described as a retrospective application for works required by Cadent to keep the gas supply safe, but it is not clear that the work has already taken place. The application is phrased in terms of proposed work and indicative locations, so it would appear that the proposals could still be improved. We believe they should be.

The Design and Access Statement says that advice has been sought from Heritage England, but this is somewhat confusing. The suggestions include:

- Ensure holes for the riser are drilled between the brick joints rather than the bricks themselves;
- Paint the pipework black to match the existing utilities visible to the front elevation;
- Avoid any physical impact to existing architectural features, such as the Corinthian portico and first floor level balcony;

However, the NE entrance of Philip Court (on Hornsey Lane Gardens) does not have a Corinthian portico or first floor level balcony.

Also, Section 5, the Statement of Significance, suggests that the building is constructed from “brown” bricks, features visual clutter such as vents, gullies and satellites and is hidden behind trees.

In fact, Philip Court is built of pale grey/beige bricks with comparatively little clutter attached to the Hornsey Lane Gardens frontage: a short section of black downpipe below the level of the entrance way and a high level grey metal post on the corner supporting a TV aerial. Otherwise the frontage is fairly tidy and unaltered. The proposed site of the additional pipework would be very clearly visible from Hornsey Lane Gardens:



Figure 1 of the D&A gives an indicative path for black pipework up the centre of the building next to the front door, but these blue lines are very thin. The red lines indicating the position of the new pipes in drawing

“20230405_23004242_PLN_EL_1.1.pdf” are considerably more intrusive.

This cannot possibly be described as “*sensitively sited to avoid impacting on architectural features and to minimise its visual impact*” (D&A para 5.1.8).

Clearly it would be better if the pipes were relocated to a less prominent position, ran internally or were a coloured a similar colour to the brickwork.

There is a precedent for setting a condition to this effect in the decision notice for application [HGY/2021/0179](#) for Copper Beech, North Grove, N6:

“3. Notwithstanding the approved plans a coloured finish shall be applied to the external pipework with the elements of the pipework installed to the concrete banding having a dark grey/black coloured finish and the short sections installed to the buff-coloured brickwork having a coloured finish to match the brickwork, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local

planning authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.”

We would like to see a similar condition set here, although obviously the colours referred to would be different.

In that case the new pipework was on the side of the building in a less prominent position than proposed here and the installer sent a photo of the installation subsequently. The new pipes could barely be seen. The indicative route for the pipework proposed here will be far more visible from the street.

We would like these indicative proposals to be reconsidered with a view to placing the new gas pipes on a side away from the public realm or internally and a condition set as above.

Also no damage should be done to the characteristic low rubble walls around the perimeter when undertaking the underground works illustrated in document “20230405_23004242_PLN_SI_4.1.pdf”.

For the above reasons we object to this application.