andrewmarshall19@btinternet.com

To: Planning Support;
Subject: 22B Talbot Road, Highgate N6 4QR - Retention of Windows (HGY/2026/2831) - Representation Comment

I support the application (HGY/2026/2831) in full.

I am a former Joint Freeholder of 22 Talbot Road and Chartered Building Surveyor (retired). I have been directly involved with the external repair and maintenance of the subject property during the last 40 years. My support for the application is based on :-

1. Haringey's Pre Application Advice (PRE/2026/0175) to fit timber windows.

There have never been timber windows at the property ,so installing them would not maintain or reinstate any original features. The previous lawful windows removed were UPVC. The use of high quality aluminium framed windows is believed to be complimentary to the other existing metal windows at 22 Talbot Road , sympathetic to the architectural history of No 22and in accordance with relevant planning policies.

2. Front Dormer Window

The front white dormer aluminium window is of simple equal casement design and form , similar to that approved at No 30 (HGY/2013/0410), part of the group of similar post-WW2 damage rebuilds. The latter was considered not to be detrimental to the appearance and character of the Highgate Conservation Area and there is therefore every reason to believe that the applicant's front dormer window is similarly benign, when considering its effect upon the Highgate Conservation Area,

3. Rear Roof Level Dormer Bifold Doors and Clear Glass frameless Balustrade

The applicant's roof rear elevation bifold doors and glass balustrade are almost identical in design, colour and form to those approved at 55C Talbot Road (HGY/2012/1235) and (HGY/2012/1239). Contrary to Haringey's Pre-Application comment (PRE/2026/0175), fenestration at 55C was clearly identified in the filed planning application form and lodged drawings as being of grey aluminium construction. There was no ambiguity on that application for No 55C.

4. Are Rear elevation, roof level ,grey Aluminium doors detrimental to the appearance and character of the Highgate Conservation Area ?

The previous approvals by Haringey of very similar roof level grey aluminium fenestration at 55C Talbot Road (HGY/2012/1235) and also at a post- WW2 , 3 storey block of flats nearby 3-5 Church Road (HGY/2015/1667), is evidence that such rear fenestration has been deemed by Haringey not to cause harm or damage to the appearance and character of the Highgate Conservation Area. At 3-5 Church Road, the permitted grey aluminium roof level windows are in sharp contrast to the original remaining older white UPVC windows to the lower floors. The rear anthracite aluminium fenestration at no 55C Talbot Road also contrasts sharply with the traditional Edwardian heritage white timber windows of the larger host building. Haringey Officers' Reports have frequently previously justified granting such development on the basis that the rear fenestration is not in the public streetscape domain and is therefore unlikely to be detrimental to the Conservation Area. Please refer to the Appendices submitted by Martin Gaine MRTPI for specific Haringey Council Officers' reports. In addition , there are examples of Haringey Council permitted aluminium door installations to the rear of Nos 30,32 and 34 Talbot Road . The 3 latter addresses are of similar post -WW2 damage design to the applicant's building and I respectfully suggest that the subject application at No 22B should be reviewed in a similar consistent manner. There are similar 1st floor grey aluminium bifold doors in the adjoining property, No 20A. The rear elevations of nearby properties have varied architectural styles , window treatments and alterations and the application for No 22B should be considered in the wider elevational context.

5. The removal of cill brickwork to the rear Dormer Window to form the Bifold Door opening.

Haringey's Pre- Application Advice (PRE/2026/0175) recommends the removal of the rear Bifold doors and reinstatement of external wall brickwork up to previous cill level. Haringey's Pre-Application Advice was to install timber window. Permission to remove cill brickwork down to internal floor level for the installation of aluminium doors has been granted at the rear of 55C Talbot Road and rear of 1 Church Road (HGY/2016/3657). Haringey Officers' Reports found such enlargement to be reasonable and minor , given the overall scale of the buildings . For consistency , the application for No 22B should be similarly considered acceptable.

6. <u>The use of a modest contemporary clear glass balustrade to rear Bifold doors.</u>

The applicant's minimalist clear frameless glass balustrade is discrete, proportionate to the opening and designed so as not to compete with the existing first floor balcony metal balustrade and other adjoining property features. The Bifold doors at 22B do not have a useable or projecting balcony. Haringey's Pre-Application advice suggests that the use of contemporary glass balustrades is not acceptable and is un- typical of buildings similar to 22B. I believe this view to be inconsistent with planning consents previously granted by Haringey at nearby architecturally similar properties in similar rear elevation locations. I draw Haringey's attention to the permitted extensive use of similar clear frameless glazed balustrades at the rear of Nos 30,34 and 55C Talbot Road and also at nos 1 Church Road (HGY/ 2016/3637) and 3-5 Church Road (HGY/2015/1667) . Haringey need to consider these previous permitted developments and apply similar and consistent criteria to the subject application.

7. <u>Policy DM9 -The use of non-original contemporary materials that complement the subject Property</u>

The recently granted application for the alteration and rear extension of the nearby listed building 92 North Hill (HGY/2025/0065) involved the use of design, materials ,colours and construction not original to the heritage building. Haringey's Principal Conservation officer stated in the Officers' Report that "*Haringey Policy DM9 does not require alterations and extensions to existing buildings to match or imitate their original materiality and design, but to acknowledge it, and compliment it.*" . Similar principles were applied earlier to the permitted contemporary rear extension of No 30 Talbot Road (HGY/2013/0410) and the contrasting and contemporary roof extension at 3-5 Church Road (HGY/2012/1667). I believe the subject application for 22B Talbot Road should be considered with these principles in mind.

I respectfully suggest that subject application (HGY/2026/2831) should be granted in full.