

HGY/2021/3481 : 103-107 North Hill

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee is of the view that many people might find it difficult to fully understand the submitted material. We also wish to bring to your urgent attention the following errors etc. with the application documents, in the order as presented on your website:

020 EP Full res no trees: trees shown on image. This is loaded twice so both need to be removed. Correct image without trees is required.

06 EP Full re no trees: trees shown on image. Correct image without trees is required.

GLA WLCA Spreadsheet 11 21.xlsx: cannot be opened

P2719 121 Proposed Site Sections: Section A-A is wrong (this comment applies to other drawings)

P2719 122 Proposed Site Sections - existing and proposed buildings indicated. Section B-B is one of only a couple of places on any of the drawings where it is explained that the "existing maximum ridge height" is the top of the existing lift tower. Section B-B does not show proposed ridge height at the correct height; it should be higher.

P2719 137 Set back distances: these should include:

- existing set back dimensions
- proposed building to boundary of rear garden to no 109 North Hill (Prospect Terrace)
- extent to which the proposed building extends beyond the rear wall of 3 View Road

No sections or elevations show the height of the proposal relative to no. 3 View Road (positive contributor). Given the importance of no 3 View Road all relevant drawings must include it.

P2719 141 Comparative massing: AA: Highcroft is not material but Yeatman Road properties should be shown. Trees should be removed from the illustrations to allow proper evaluation.

RPAs for trees in grounds of Wetherley Court not shown (also note inconsistent and incorrect spelling). These trees are significant.

Notional trees prevent proper evaluation of drawings, design and context and therefore should be removed.

All CGIs need to be verified and be based on photographs taken from exactly the same position for comparison. Drawings of the existing neighbouring properties need to be drawn properly.

160A: Illustrative CGI.1: Top of proposed building cut off and relationship with neighbouring buildings and street scene not shown (note this CG1 is loaded several times) . This comment applies to all CGIs.

111A: black & white elevation with dotted horizontal lines. "Existing ridge height" and "new proposed ridge height" should be shown to allow comparison with various drawings

112A: needs to properly illustrate context

113A: Elevations 'showing neighbouring context'. Notional trees obliterate image of neighbouring and proposed buildings. Trees should be removed from drawings to allow evaluation of context. 3 View Road, a positive contributor, must be included.

114A: Proposed elevations and existing building outline: AA must show 3 View Road. BB & CC: grey buildings behind are very misleading and confusing so should be removed. If they are to be retained then the address of each building should be shown. DD: Highcroft and other buildings on North Hill should at best be in light grey but questionable whether these being shown add to the understanding of the drawing or evaluation of the design or the context.

Generally, drawings with horizontal dotted lines need to make it clear that the topmost line annotated 'existing maximum ridge line' refers to the top of the existing lift shaft

1800mm high balustrades to balconies suggest a high level of care for dementia patients. What level of Part M of the Buildings Regulations applies to the application? Dimensioned furniture and bathroom layouts are required. (Note windows adjacent to balconies are door height apparently with no upper opening sections)

Generally the use of the building is unclear. The document entitled 'Whole Life Carbon Emissions' states at 5.16 that future residents will be responsible for upkeep.

Table 3 on p17 attributes only 2% to 'repair' but no allowance is made to achieve zero carbon which will have to be achieved about half way through the expected lifespan of the building. During consultations we asked how that upgrade would be achieved in a highly serviced building with the residents in place. We note at 8.4 in the document 'Circular Economy' that a carbon offset payment of £404,721 is proposed.