

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory objects in the strongest terms to this application and requires fuller and more accurate information in order to assess it.

The houses on the north side of Hornsey Lane Gardens are the most substantial and elaborate of the 'Miltons' development, built in the late 1890s. No 47 forms part of the last terrace on the north side of Hornsey Lane Gardens (Nos. 43-51). These houses are of particular note for their first-floor full-height tripartite windows. These are divided by pilasters and deeply moulded mullions and transoms, and comprise a tall semi-circular arch with radial glazing bars flanked by side-hung casements with 6-pane lights above, opening onto a balconette above the ground-floor bay window. To the right is a single 6-over-1 pane sash window. The terrace as a whole is remarkably well preserved.

We assume that all timber structural elements – mullions, transoms etc. would be retained, but this should be made explicit. With regard to the large tripartite window however it could be inferred that only the left-hand casement is proposed for replacement, but this is unclear and the manufacturer's drawing suggests that all three elements are to be replaced. A new double-glazed sash is proposed for the single window.

Existing sections at 1:10 are provided by ARJ but there are no corresponding proposed sections at the same scale. This is vital in order to appreciate how the deeper double-glazed units would relate to the existing timber surrounds.

These are our comments in detail:

- The Planning Statement submitted on 19 October 2023 states:
"6.1.2. The Conservation Area Appraisal states that original windows should be retained and re-instated where lost. Street views of Hornsey Lane Gardens show that original windows of this type are common along this street, and these proposals seek to preserve the window style on this property whilst increasing the property's overall energy efficiency. The Conservation Area Appraisal states that UPVC windows are 'particularly unsuitable within conservation areas', but that 'high quality metal frame windows may be acceptable based on design details'. It is suggested that whilst timber is proposed instead of metal in this instance, this should still be considered acceptable as it consists of the **replacement of window frames** with the same material, built to the same design." HCAAC needs to know exactly how much, if any, of the original woodwork would be retained.
- we presume none of the documents submitted on 19 October other than the location plan are relevant
- Turning to the document submitted by B. Murphy & Co dated 14 December 2020 (not a typo on our part), taking each page in turn:

Page 1:

S/f...window/door frame..... glass specification 4/8/4mm (16mm)

"The decorative mouldings are for illustrative purposes and will need to be taken off for an accurate reading."

It would be very difficult to remove the mouldings without causing irreversible damage. We are not clear whether the decorative frames to the Venetian window would be kept but we presume not from the above.

Turning to the drawing at the bottom of the page:

- the upper sash is shown behind the top sash
- the dimensions are unrealistically located on the drawing
- the bottom rail to the bottom sash is too large
- there are no horns
- no details of the existing glazing bars are provided
- no details of the existing frames are provided

We are far from convinced that the replacements would preserve the appearance of the existing, setting an unfortunate precedent in and causing harm to the Highgate Conservation Area.

Page 2:

The information on this drawing lacks credibility:

- we need to see drawings as existing in plan, elevation and section for the centre part of the window and a side window/door including the arch and keystone
- the proposed drawing is diagrammatic and out of proportion. An accurate drawing is required
- no profiles are provided
- the dimensions are unrealistically located on the drawing
- the glazing bars are shown as 22mm (see actual proposed glazing bar is shown as 27mm)
- the sections at the jamb/mullion etc at the bottom of the page appear to bear no relation to the photo
- we think it unlikely the horizontal glazing bar to the left hand door is higher than those to the central and right hand panels

Page 3:

Proposed timber sections of Box frame (sash window) and Door frame (presumably the outer lights of the Venetian window).

- there are no sections showing the 'as existing' details to enable comparison
- we cannot tell if the Ovolo mould is on the inside or the outside
- there is no information about the existing horns to make a comparison with what is proposed

Dwg no. PL301:

This is a very diagrammatic drawing of the existing Venetian Window which shows only the width and height of the opening as existing and the size of the glazing bars at 27mm. The width of the outer panels and the proportions of the glazing to the toplights clearly indicate this drawing is wrong.

Dwg no. PL302:

It is difficult to tell from the various information provided whether the proportions of this window are accurate in comparison with the proposed drawing and photo on page 1 of B. Murphy & Co.'s proposals

- Which is correct?

The quality of the information provided can be seen to be very inadequate.

The existing windows appear to be in sound condition and capable of upgrading, therefore secondary glazing should be considered a more suitable option for such an important feature in this terrace. As it stands this application must, in no uncertain terms, be refused. There is the risk of substantial harm to the Highgate Conservation Area with little or no public benefit especially when a suitable alternative is available.

Kind regards,

Gail Waldman
Chair, Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee