

HGY/2024/0958 - Flat C, 284 Archway Road, N6 5AU

Conversion of loft space to form master bedroom and ensuite with installation of front and rear roof lights.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application for a number of reasons.

1. No Heritage Statement is provided with this application. 284 Archway Road is part of Prestwood Mansions, which is on Haringey Council's Register of local listed buildings of merit (PDF, 71KB) - Nos. 278 to 310 (even), added to the list on 27 January 1997.

Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (HCA CA) describes Prestwood Mansions as *“a beautifully preserved terrace of the late Victorian era”*, and Nos 278-310 Archway Road are listed as positive contributors to Highgate Conservation Area:

6.4.31 Between nos. 258 and 276 there are two car repair centers, a printing company, and the rebuilt Cholmeley Evangelical Church. Following on from this, nos. 278 to 310 is a beautifully preserved red brick terrace of the late Victorian era which stands on the corner of Holmesdale Road. This terrace is called Prestwood Mansions and is named after the Prestwood Cottage seen in this site on the 1864 Ordnance Survey map (see chapter 2). The terrace is three storeys tall, with a canted bay on each floor, and was designed as flats. There are no shops on the ground floor except for the last three houses on the corner of Holmesdale Road. At nos. 276-304, all flat entrances have their original front doors and dados of glazed tiles. All have some or all of the stained glass to the front doors. Nos. 280, 282, 286, 288, 300 & 302 have original letter plates and nos. 278 & 296 have tiled paths with coal hole covers. Nos. 306 to 310 have original shops on the ground floor level. Satellite



Prestwood Mansions, Archway Road

6.8 Positive Contributors

6.8.1 Most of the existing buildings contribute to the rich and varied Highgate urban townscape. Fine architectural details, boundary walls, gate piers, cast iron railings and gates, all form part of the character of the area and should be retained and re-instated where lost. In particular they include:

- **Archway Road:** Nos. 253-263; Nos. 271-311; Jackson's Lane Community Centre; Nos. 278-304; Prestwood Mansions; Boogaloo Public House; Planting between Archway Road and Highgate Underground Station; Highgate Overground; Woodman Public House, No 412

As the Planning Inspector noted when turning down an appeal against enforcement in relation to an overly large rear dormer at No 292:

“7. The site forms the upper part of 290 Archway Road within the terrace of buildings at 278 to 310 Archway Road. These are noted within the Highgate Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2013 (CAMP) as a beautifully preserved terrace of the late Victorian era. The detailing to the rear of the terrace is more muted than the high quality street frontage, and is not specifically mentioned within the CAMP. Even so, there is a regular arrangement of three-storey outrigger projections with canted bays to their sides and contrasting brick bands, and save for the appeal site and 292 Archway Road adjacent, the roofslopes are little altered. Overall, this gives rise to a strong sense of uniformity to the terrace group and an attractive rhythm and architectural value. Together with the retained original features to the front elevation, the terrace therefore contributes positively to the street scenes and the significance of the CA, and I find that, irrespective of whether or not it is a locally listed building, the heritage interest of the terrace warrants its consideration as a non-designated heritage asset.”
(Appeal Decision APP/Y5420/W/20/3245091)

We note that the location of the building shown on the plan on page 3 of the Design and Access Statement is incorrect, placing 284 next to 278.

2. The Design and Access Statement shows a couple of nearby buildings have a Velux window on the front roof slope. However, many do not. We feel that four Velux windows on the front are excessive, and will detract from the positive contribution Prestwood Mansions makes to the Highgate Conservation Area.

3. The elevation and plan drawings of the proposed Velux windows shown in section 5 of the Design and Access Statement and in drawings “BN 357 P - 002 Rev - Proposed Plans and Elevations.jpg” are inconsistent.

The elevation drawings show four Velux windows on the front and three on the rear roof slope, but the plan drawing appears to show a further two rooflights between these, somewhere near the ridge line.

As these buildings do not have a flat section between the front and rear roof slopes these two windows should appear on either the front or rear elevation drawings, or both. No section drawings are provided which might aid understanding. Neither does the Design and Access Statement explain these two additional rooflights.

The status of these two extra rooflights needs to be resolved.

We would very much object to the shape of the roof being altered to accommodate two roof lights on the ridge line.

4. It is not clear that the rooflight shown on the front turret feature will fit into the space indicated. Again, the drawings are not sufficient to show how this would work.

5. The lack of any section drawings also means it is unclear whether the door to the store room will open fully if it is more than 1500mm tall, or whether there is sufficient headroom above the upper part of the staircase. The proposed dressing room and bathroom may not have sufficient headroom, particularly above the bath, and are the bedroom and bathroom doors too close to each other to be practical?

6. The Velux windows should be conservation rooflights, flush with the roof slope. Again, the lack of section drawings and detail about the windows makes it hard to tell which sort of Velux window is proposed.

7. Since No 284 is one of the houses listed in para 6.4.31 of the HCA CA (above) as retaining original glazed tiles around the front door, if permission is granted, protection measures need to be included in the CMP to ensure the safety of any surviving original features.

In summary, Highgate CAAC believes the information provided is inadequate and confusing, and the above matters need to be resolved before any permission can be considered. We believe the proposals would damage the Highgate Conservation Area. The application should be refused.