

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application on the following grounds:

- elevational treatment and safety
- daylight/sunlight
- boundary treatment/landscape
- Conservation Area
- neighbours

We and the Highgate Society were given a presentation of the scheme by Simone de Gale on 22 July 2023.

We set out below our record of that meeting:

- S de Gale Architects had had two pre-apps with Mark Chan and Richard Truscott. She was steered away from modern to more contextual approach. We all said pastiche design with modern elements mixed in as presented was poor and we would prefer good modern architecture.
- Some discussion about a pale brick. On one side of the site, the houses are red brick; the other side the semi-d' Villa' is London stock.
- HS/HCAAC presumed Truscott seemed to be suggesting a form of building to give the impression of a pair of Villas. S de G said RT had insisted side entrance doors should be used rather than a central entrance so as to follow the existing 'Villa'.
- Simone stated daylight to neighbours and flats were acceptable. Concern about bedrooms in the middle of the plans. Also the overhangs to the rear rooms at full basement level.
- Overlooking over rear neighbours: at least one neighbour was worried about overlooking from rear balconies. We said overlooking needed to be addressed.
- Flats may meet GLA space requirement and room sizes but planning of flats very awkward. Insufficient furniture. Haringey had asked for a greater mix of flats which leads to awkward layouts
- Refuse chute at rear is distant from collection point at front. Apparently refuse is collected from front and rear.
- Main stair presents a wide area of plain brickwork to the street elevation.
- We suggested that she should consider a less deep plan to reduce overlooking.
- Street frontage - large utilitarian vehicular gate and some other undetermined treatment unsatisfactory

We set out below our comments on this application in detail:

Elevational treatment : we are pleased to note that there has been a move away from pastiche. We have the following detailed comments:

1. Front elevation: we welcome the modern design approach but with some reservations in relation to regulations : although the floor levels are not shown it can fairly be assumed that guarding to the ground and first floor full height windows would be required; or fixed glazing panels up to 1100mm above FFLs. This comment may also apply to the second and third floors. Note that the railings shown at ground level on dwg. no. 21-405-301 are to the light wells and not to the windows.
2. Side wings: We consider the side wings should be subordinate to the main villa form by being further set back from the main façade and that the roofs of the side wings should be lower than shown. We note that the flat section to the hipped roofs to the side wings are lower, which we welcome, but there seem to be discrepancies regarding the amount by which the side wing crowns are lower. The larger dimension should in our view be adopted.

which would not be realistic in practice. Eaves would have generous projecting eaves as does the villa next door. As drawn all RWPs would need to be internal with secret gutters at roof level. We note that the building as proposed takes up the full width of the site so clarity on the position of the gutters is crucial. It is not clear how regular clearing of gutters would be achieved. Access would have to be via neighbours' land and through their houses. The relationship between the front dormer cheeks and roofs with the hips to the main roof seems unrealistic.

4. Front doors to lower units: we note these front doors are set in side wings which are slightly set back from the main façade. We consider this set back should be greater to give prominence to the main façade. The doors and brick arches are rather mundane and might be better set in recessed porches to give shelter. We note that there are no draught lobbies and these front doors lead straight into the living areas.
5. Central section of front façade: We can see no reason why the main front door (to the flats above) should be off centre and generally not be more conspicuously the main flat entrance door with some protection from the weather. We also cannot see why daylight should not be provided in the common staircase in this wide blank central section of brickwork.
6. Side elevations: the parapet/eaves relationship is unclear.
7. Daylight/sunlight: It is evident from the side elevations why the ground floor and basement rooms are so dark. "FIG 2 – 3D Model by Simone De Gale Architects" (on page 12) in the Planning, Design and Access Statement illustrates this point.

The type of paint to be used is provided however note should be taken of the following Appeal Decision on 222 Archway Road, Hornsey, London N6 5AX re HGY/2021/1508 Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3279974

*8. However, in modelling the ADF, the DS Report has adjusted the BRE's default values for interior surface reflectance and reflectance beneath reference plane. Although general reference is made to the internal finish of the proposal for the LKD, a substantive and specific justification for the adjustments has not been set out. Furthermore, given the indicated very marginal exceedance of the BRE's guidance values for ADF, I am not persuaded that the conclusions of the DS Report are realistic given potential changes to the internal finish and the reasonable effects of occupation.*

It would appear the impact on neighbouring properties is in some cases unacceptable.

8. Landscaping, front garden and boundary treatment, parking, cycle and refuse storage: The Planning Statement states:

*"4.7 Landscaping: The front boundary will be lined with hedgerows, which complement the proposal and the surrounding area."*

*"5.42 The proposed landscaping scheme will soften the overall appearance of the development and allow the proposal to assimilate with its surroundings."*

The ground floor proposed plan shows gates to the pedestrian pathways to the front doors, two car parking spaces on the right as seen from the street open to the street; and possibly a wall to screen the Palladians. We would wish to see full details. There is a semi-mature tree in the front garden.

*"4.9 Access & Parking: The site is currently served by a single crossover and 2 no. on-site parking spaces are proposed to the front forecourt."*

Are the cars going to back out into Great North Road very close to the busy junction at the Wellington Roundabout and where there is a bus lane?

*"5.49 Cycle Provision: The plans clearly mark out cycle provision which is in accordance with the LP and the Borough-wide aims for sustainable transport links. 5.50 Cycle storage will be placed in the basement and will be accessible through the front entrance. This is suitable in meeting the requirements to provide storage."*

upper floors there does not appear to be any provision for the maisonettes.

*"5.51 Refuse Provision: The refuse area is clearly marked out on the proposed floor plans and provides adequate provision for each floor, in line with the requirements of the London Plan."*

There appear to be three Palladins in the front garden but these are very remote from the refuse chute at the rear which appears to serve the first and second floors only. Who will empty the refuse chute and how will they reach the Palladins? It is not clear how the Palladins would be emptied. As drawn, they are wider than the pedestrian entrance gates.

9. Conservation Area:

*"5.25 Policy DM1 (DPD) states that new developments should positively reflect the scale, form, and massing of surrounding buildings. Further Planning, Design & Access Statement 19 August 2023 9 to this, proposals should be sensitive to density and the existing rhythm of plots and building lines."*

Nos 10 and 8; and nos 6 and 4 are handsome semi-detached villas; and no. 2 is a handsome detached house, all built in the 19th century. This group of houses are outside Highgate Conservation Area but immediately adjacent to no. 2 there is a terrace of slightly smaller houses which are in the Conservation Area. We wish to see proposed elevations in the context of Great North Road and Sussex Gardens. The application site is sufficiently close to the Conservation Area that an assessment of any harm is needed. Once those drawings are submitted we will be able to evaluate any harm to the Conservation Area. We note that nos 10 and 8 have an extremely handsome front garden wall.

10. Neighbours: the impact on neighbours would appear not to meet Haringey's policy requirements.

11. Fire: open plan arrangements may require special fire fighting measures. We have not checked the escape distances.

For all the reasons set out above Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee considers this application must be refused.