

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee 9 February 2024

[HGY/2023/3142](#) 62 North Hill, London, N6 4RH

Demolition of existing ground floor rear & side extension and the construction of new ground floor rear & side extension with a glazed walkway to a new outbuilding at the rear of the garden.

Highgate CAAC objects to this application. There are a number of potentially problematic issues which need to be resolved, as outlined below.

Light pollution, overlooking and privacy

The illustrations on p 12 and 14 of the Design and Access Statement show that the garden ensuite will have large glass doors/windows facing No 64's garden from very close range. No elevation drawings from the NW are included which show this. "749 P 121_Proposed Elevations.pdf" seems to be looking through the proposed structure from the SE side (No 60). An elevation which clearly shows the side facing No 64 is required.

Since the wall between Nos 62 and 64 is lower than these windows, there may be light pollution problems for No 64, and No 64 may be able to look into the new bathroom.

The design includes a fully glazed elevation to the bedroom, facing the back of the house. There would be a privacy issue for the occupant as it would be overlooked by the upper storey windows of both neighbouring properties.

There would also be light pollution for Nos 64 and 60 North Hill from these windows, and perhaps also for No 64 from the long glazed walkway.

The glazed link and extension would be taller than the party garden fence/brick wall with No 64. The impact on the neighbours' small garden needs to be very carefully assessed, preferably with a site visit.

Section 4.1 of the DAS “Neighbours Amenity” appears not to make much sense from the perspective of No 64.

Heritage concerns

This pair of semi detached houses are important and relatively rare survivals of the type of modest cottages built for occupation by worker and artisans, and connected to the agricultural history of Highgate.

This proposal has apparently been supported by Conservation and Planning Officers on the basis that the removal of the existing extension would reveal the original rear wall of the cottage. However the walls which are currently interior and plastered would most likely need to be rendered because the surface of the bricks would be damaged, and a wall which becomes external would have to satisfy Part B of the Bldg Regs. Hence the appearance would not be fully revealed though the form of it would be.

We are also concerned about the proposal to remodel the boundary/wall between the gardens of Nos 62 and 64. Its historic value is not evaluated in the Heritage Assessment but should be. Looking at the 1869 map, it could well be original. Original features should be retained.

Sustainability

The glazed link together with the glazing to the bedroom and ensuite suggest there would be heat loss/gain. Haringey's sustainability officer should be asked to check it.

The new garden extension will require foul and rainwater disposal. If the existing inverts were too high and pumping was required, this would also have sustainability implications.

Loss of greenspace

Officers have apparently said that enough of the garden would be left and it would be a better shape, which would be a benefit which outweighs other issues. The remaining garden area should comply with policy requirements.

The gardens in Talbot Road at this point are long and there are glimpses of trees from North Hill. These back gardens could be said to contribute as ecological stepping stones, so any loss of greenery is to be regretted.

Usage of extension

If this were an application for a home office we would expect a condition that it would not be a habitable room. This proposal would have a bedroom, study/dressing room and a bathroom. Conditions should be set preventing its use as a short or long term rental property.

Means of escape

Means of escape is currently non-compliant from the two first floor bedrooms via the kitchen. If those bedrooms were occupied by children with their parents remote at the end of the garden there would seem to be an issue, although Bldg Regs allows a rear garden to be a place of safety if the length of the garden is at least as long as the height of the building. Although the children could in theory reach that place of safety it is relatively unusual for children to be sleeping in bedrooms that are remote from their parents. Even during the day with the parents' study at the end of the garden there would seem to be an unacceptable risk. The children's rooms are shown as double bedrooms so it is potentially a 6 person house.

Maintenance

The wall behind the new extension will need regular maintenance. It is not clear how this would be achieved.