

HGY/2024/2032: 1A Chomeley Park

Removal of 4 x trees (previously approved for removal under CON/2021/0507) to allow erection of single storey front storage extension, erection of single storey extension to existing rear extension.

We note that this application is for extensions and alterations to this property which, in order to build what is sought, would require the removal of four trees.

In this objection we address the following:

1. Amount of plot which would be built on
2. Kitchen extension
3. Erecting a store on a courtyard area
4. Clarity required on proposed curtilage
5. Loss of trees
6. Impact on Highgate Conservation Area



Looking towards Archway Road



The site of the proposed store and the evergreen trees which would be felled. The crossover allows the applicant's Twizy vehicle to be parked on site.



As above



The house can barely be seen above the fence

Taking each of our objection points in turn we make the following comments and/or objections:

1. Amount of plot which would be built on

The ratio of the area of the house to the size of the plot may already be over-built in policy terms.

2. Kitchen extension

If planners consider the proposed size of the kitchen extension would not adversely impact the reduced size of the garden and retain enough garden to meet policy requirements, then we would find this small extension acceptable but the following point comes into consideration.

3. Erecting a store on a courtyard area

It is this extension which would result in the loss of the trees. We object on the grounds that loss of the trees would be unacceptable. See also 4, 5 & 6 below.

4. Clarity required on proposed curtilage

The proposed plan shows what may be a brick faced cavity wall with the outer face on the boundary with the back-of-pavement. However, the proposed elevation appears to show horizontal fencing panels to match the existing fence panels from the spacing of the horizontal lines on the drawing. There also appears to be a brick-on-edge coping on a tile creasing course so the intention is not clear. There then appears to be glazing sitting on the brick coping, above the general line of the curtilage fencing. Although a small part of the roofline of the existing house can be seen very slightly above the fence line, no part of this proposal should appear above the established height of the fence.

5. Loss of trees

We object to the loss of trees for two reasons:

1. These trees provide significant greenery at this point in the road especially in the winter months
2. There would appear to be nowhere to plant substantial replacement trees as would be required and in such a position as to contribute to the public realm

6. Impact of Highgate Conservation Area

We consider that because it is unclear what the curtilage proposals are, obviously clarity is required with revised drawings to be able to assess the impact on the Highgate Conservation Area. As the proposal stands, we consider the trees contribute to the green character of the Highgate Conservation Area. Any built form above the line of the existing fencing would undermine the simplicity of the curtilage treatment and must be refused.

For all the reasons set out above Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to this application.