

CHAIR, HIGHGATE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

24/7/2023

Object

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application for the following reasons:

1. Velux Cabrio balcony window is unacceptable as it would adversely affect the plane of the rear roof slope between the eaves and the ridge; and the heritage significance of the two dormers which are the Cromwell Avenue original pattern on the front elevations. This rear elevation can be seen from Cromwell Place. See dwgs 326_GS_05, 326_GE_02 and 326_GE_01. It would be an unacceptable alien element in the roof slope. **It is on the plane of the slope and there are higher existing rooflights on 69 and adjacent neighbours and most of properties along Cromwell and surrounding streets (refer attached)**
2. The section shows the space/head height is so tight as to be impracticable and the Cabrio balcony window impossible to open without crawling on the floor. We note that Velux's image for this product is set in a much steeper roof slope. **The velux ideal slope is 35 degrees ours is 33 deg so not significantly different... you can walk into comfortably i.e. 2000mm...refer attached section/plan**
3. The room that the Cabrio balcony window would serve has no definition so whether it meets space standards for that room is unknown. **Definition I guess would be sunspace or similar and is actually a large seating space (refer attached)**
4. The first floor French windows and balcony as well as the proposed Cabrio balcony would intrude on neighbours' privacy. **This is not the case...we have demonstrated this on previous dormer proposal...also there is an existing terrace @ 1st floor level on No.71**
5. 326_GA_-01: the amount of daylight/sunlight to the Nanny's room looks extremely dubious. **It is one room with 2 lightwells so we believe it will be adequately lit**
6. The two side lightwells remain so our original objection stands. These lightwells, if allowed, would illuminate the flank wall thus introducing artificial light into a dark situation which would detract from the character of the Conservation Area. **You cannot see the side flank wall due to very high solid gates to No.69 and No.71 therefore no impact from internal lighting**
7. Loss of dwellings needs to be assessed in relation to policy. 8. Points 1 and 6 would cause harm to the Highgate Conservation Area which would not be balanced by any public benefit. For all the above reasons this application must be refused. **This was covered way back by Planners themselves under policy**

DAVID TOWNSEND

Comment left on 24/7/2023

Stance Object

My objections to the application to build a basement/develop no 69 Cromwell Avenue HGY/2022/4004. I live in no 67 Cromwell Avenue in the semi-detached house next door to no 69 and so will be most likely be the most impacted by the proposed work. I recognise that the amended plans have taken into account some of the objections raised by myself and others in late January (thank you) but we still have some concerns particularly about the impact of the basement. I refer to the issues raised in my letter of 26 January. Namely

1) Basement

a) Burland scale 2 noted in BIA report Despite the 'Response to Objections' report on 2/2/23 addressing this issue and noting the objection to the work being in excess of Burland scale 1, I do not see that the amended application has adopted Level 1 as the maximum allowable damage to No 67. We would like to see this officially adopted in the plans and in a Party Wall Agreement to prevent excessive damage to no 67. We are very worried about the implications of this work for our house.

b) The objections relating to the complicated local soil, water/aquifer and sink hole issues, plus the fact that these houses are partially sitting on reclaimed land with a large drop have not really been adequately addressed (please see my letter of 26 Jan). Plus we have now found out that no 71 has already suffered from subsidence with substantial consequences in terms of remedial work and insurance costs underlining why we are very worried about the implications for us in no 67.

c) Our concerns re the shallow foundations and previous movement in our house therefore still stand.

We believe we have covered their concerns with comments from our Structural Engineer and that their speculation about the ground vs our BIA report is covered by our professional Engineering Consultancy and their BIA.

2) Privacy

a) Juliette balcony on 2nd floor We are grateful that the proposed French style balcony window has been removed and restored to the original window as it would overlook our garden

b) Top floor dormer window We are also pleased this has been amended to a 'velux balcony'. This is an improvement but we are still somewhat concerned it will mean we are overlooked, and the new style is still not really consistent with the surrounding area.

There are many,many veluxs on roofscapes to the rear of properties all along Cromwell Avenue and surrounding streets (refer attached)and we also did demonstrate no overlooking from that location with the original dormer proposal.

c) Raised terrace in garden It is still not clear to us what the height of this terrace will be as that is not detailed sufficiently in the plans for us to know if it will allow overlooking into our garden.

This terrace is around the same level as the existing paved surface (see attached photo) therefore no overlooking into No.67

d) The proposed new extension The old extension that is being partially replaced was originally refused planning permission but was for some reason (never explained) allowed on appeal while we lived abroad. It's dimensions were extremely high and an eyesore from our side. It looks like the replacement extension will be the same height and we would request some clarity here. Does it need to be as high?

We are reducing the impact by demolishing the old extension and pulling back the building line significantly ...the height matches existing

3) Due Process – We need a Party Wall Agreement As mentioned in my previous letter the work in no 69 started in early 2022 and went on all year stripping out pretty well all the internal parts in order to prepare to convert the house from 4 residencies to 1. We have suffered cracking and movement as a result. We were not given a Party Wall Agreement as the owner plans to retrospectively apply for planning permission for this work. This is unreasonable and we are not currently protected. We would like to be allowed to proceed with a PWS and get them to survey our house so we are adequately protected from this work and to be given enough time for our PWS to do his job thoroughly, especially given our concerns re subsidence etc.

The works carried out to date have been stripping out and no major works have been carried out or existing structural elements removed or altered therefore it is hard to believe that any new cracking has occurred. The applicant is happy for his team to inspect this.

In terms of Party Wall the applicant has appointed a PWS some time ago who carried out his initial notices and consultation under the code.