

Dear Cameron

Thank you for your constructive communication and willingness to engage with us proactively to progress this application favourably. We agree that there is scope for minor amendments to the design, and we are absolutely committed to achieving a well-functioning and attractive proposal that is sensitive to the conservation of the house and its wider conservation area setting. To address the Conservation Officer's letter:

We accept the stated historical urban narrative and general description, and agree that 41 Leaside Avenue makes a positive contribution to the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. As such any proposals should seek to conserve and enhance its historic character and significance.

We note that while there is no objection in principle to the proposed extensions – indeed they are very positive with regard to the ground floor extension – the Conservation Officer has expressed concern over the detailed articulation of some elements:

Replacement windows & doors.

All original windows in the existing building are single-glazed, and as the photographs below illustrate, many are in a poor state of repair. As such, they are draughty, of very poor energy efficiency, and in need of improvement to their functionality and appearance.



Above – Photographs of state of repair of existing windows in front (top) and rear (bottom).

Whilst our clients are ecologically minded and wish to greatly improve the thermal efficiency of the building, they are also determined to preserve and enhance the building and conservation area's historic appearance and significance through a conservation-focused approach to intervention.

The replacement of windows and doors with high-performance units to match the existing in appearance is part of a comprehensive strategy to upgrade the building fabric and services. Such an approach is explicitly supported by local policy, including Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017, and the Sustainable Design & Construction SPD 2013.

As the typical details supplied in the amended drawings show, this can be done in a historically sensitive way, with high-performance timber-framed double-glazed units greatly improving the building's thermal performance, whilst being detailed in such a way as to '*accurately replicate*' the form, proportion, and detail (including glazing bars) of the originals, as required by the Conservation Officer. We assert that this constitutes the justification for their sensitive replacement, and while the attached drawings show a typical detail for a traditional-style timber-framed double-glazed sash window, they are reflective of the level of care, quality, and detail that we are committed to delivering in principle.

A comprehensive set of production drawings of a similar level of detail to the typical ones supplied will be procured for each replacement window ahead of manufacture. As suggested by the Conservation Officer, we are happy to share these with the Council in order to discharge a condition attached to the granted permission.

We also note as comparison that in the absence of an Article 4 Direction restricting it, the proposed replacement of external windows falls under the owner's Permitted Development (Class A) rights, with Condition A.3(a) stipulating that '*the material used in any exterior work...shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse*'. Whilst, by definition, the term 'similar' is quite broad in scope of interpretation, our commitment to replicating the existing materials and details faithfully in new high-performance double-glazed units arguably exceeds the requirement to satisfy the proposal's classification as Permitted Development.

As evidenced above, we assert that the replacement of existing poor-quality single-glazed windows and doors with high-performance double-glazed timber-framed units to match the existing in appearance will help secure the building's optimal viable use in a historically sensitive way. The strategy is therefore justified from the perspective of both local policy and conservation.

Enclosure of secondary front porch.

We agree with the Conservation Officer that the nearby precedent at 39 Leaside Avenue justifies the enclosure of the porch, as a locally established pattern of development. As mentioned above and in our original Design, Access and Heritage Statement, we re-assert our commitment to a high-quality design that is of an appearance that is historically appropriate to the original house and conservation area.

Rear dormer roof extension.

As suggested by the Conservation Officer, the height of the dormer has been reduced to bring it below the main full ridge tile, and ensure that the dormer is not visible from the street. Please see revised drawings. As noted by the Conservation Officer, this is similar to the adjacent neighbour at 43 Leaside Avenue, as well as the approved design at 1 Leaside Avenue (HGY/2017/2388), and will therefore hopefully satisfy any concerns regarding this element of the proposal.



Above - Rear Elevation of 43 Leaside Avenue



Above - Rear elevation of 1 Leaside Avenue (HGY/2017/2388)

Roof tiles.

We agree to the Conservation Officer's stipulation that the renewed roof covering use natural clay tiles. This has always been our preferred material strategy, as outlined in chapter 5.2 of the Design, Access & Heritage Statement already provided.

Kind regards,

Henri Bredenkamp