

HGY/2024/0622 & HGY/2024/0546 : Apt 1 Furnival House

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

- the application does not respect the fact that this property is listed Grade II
- the proportions of the elements do not reflect the character of the building
- the construction of the proposed door requires clarification

1. Application does not respect the fact that this property is listed Grade II
The extracts below are taken from Historic England's listing for Furnival House. It was listed before the conversion to apartments was carried out. Those works received listed buildings' consent and retained the aspects of the building noted in the listing:

CHOLMELEY PARK HIGHGATE Furnival House Grade II
Hostel for domestic staff of the Prudential Assurance Company, latterly student accommodation. 1916-1919 by Joseph Henry Pitt (b. 1871), with later-C20 modifications internally. Edwardian Baroque style. Red brick with rubbed red brick dressings; timber sash windows; stone quoins, entrance block, cornice, banding and balustraded parapet. 'U' plan above ground floor.

Special architectural interest as a handsome institutional building in the Edwardian Baroque style built with quality materials and craftsmanship, making rich use of the patron's motto and crest through architectural detail; * While the interior has been much institutionalized, the special interest can be clearly identified in some areas, particular the elaborately plastered entrance hall and the remains of the dining hall; * The quality brick and stone entrance boundary wall and composite stone balustrades in the grounds reflect its awareness of its location of quality.

HCAAC considers this application fails to reflect this character for reasons set out in more detail below.

2. Proportions of the elements do not reflect the character of the building
 - 2.1 The very deep transom to the proposed double french doors seems to seek to make the combined parts of the upper parts of the doors appear as though it is a sash window. The view from a sitting position would be awkward.
 - 2.2 The resulting window panes fail to reflect the proportions of the existing windows.
 - 2.3 This failure to achieve the same proportions of the panes in the rest of the building is exacerbated by the width of the door stiles at the perimeter of the opening and the unrealistic size of the meeting stiles.
3. Construction of the proposed door requires clarification
The Design & Access Statement at 3.1 states:
"The design proposal includes a double-leaf, white painted softwood door with glazed panels to carefully match the existing windows."
However the meeting stiles of the two doors are incredibly and unrealistically narrow in softwood. On the face of it, it would appear it could only be achieved in steel. A detail showing how this could be achieved is essential. However the visual appearance is uncomfortable.

Taking all these points together HCAAC considers the design unacceptable and must be refused.