

HGY/2024/2214: 120 Archway Road: July 2025 revised proposals

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee continues to objects strongly to this application.

From Design & Access Statement: *“Surrounding properties typically comprise long terraces of 3 and 4 storey brick dwellings and ground floor commercial premises.”* This statement is not generally true in the immediate vicinity of this site.

From Heritage Statement:

Fig 7 shows the matching end of terrace to that at 118, shown in Fig 6. It is acknowledged that the terrace was truncated at its centre but to place a tall building next to 118 challenges the integrity and symmetry of the streetscape in this part of Archway Road.



View of Archway Road on entering Highgate Conservation Area

The recent Decision on HGY/2024/1583 for rooflights in the roof of 160 Archway Road was influenced by its location adjacent to St. Augustine's Church. However, no mention was made on the wider context of that property, being part of the distinctive terrace from 122 – 160 Archway Road as evident in the above photograph. The impact of this proposal has to be seen in the wider context – from and including St. Augustine's Church to 122 Archway Road. From the photograph it is also evident that the flank wall and distinctive roof of no. 118 must be seen from this viewpoint therefore any development on this site including projecting balconies must be set back and lower.

Notwithstanding our very fundamental objection to this application, the symmetrical approach to the design and roof design result in problems and our previous grave concerns about the quality and amenity of the proposal remain a considerable concern:

- The roof finish will require a gutter of some sort. A secret gutter would be needed to achieve the design as presented. A normal gutter would be inappropriate. A lateral section through the building is required.
- Although the sections show concrete bases to the projecting balconies on the front elevation they are not shown on the front elevation. It is important to understand from the drawings what exactly is proposed. We have previously pointed out the proximity of this site to listed buildings and structures. The Highgate Conservation Area is a heritage asset so it is evident such details are important in these contexts.
- The windows on the front elevation appear over-large compared with 118. It is probably the case that these are required to achieve sufficient daylight in the very deep plans, especially the kitchens which are, in effect, in a narrow corridor at the back of the triple-function living rooms. We objected to this arrangement in our previous objection but we note no changes in the plans have been made.
- The floor-to-floor heights have increased. This has exaggerated the difference in floor heights between 118 and the application site making for an uncomfortable juxtaposition between the two buildings.

Overall, we consider that this tall building reflects a significant lack of understanding of this terrace and its setting and significance and any proposals must preserve and enhance the heritage assets including the streetscape within the Highgate Conservation Area. We consider this proposal would definitely not do so.

Our comments on the layouts of the flats were all set out in our earlier objection, namely the proximity of habitable rooms to the back of pavement – between 1m and 1.2 metres – the door to the ground floor bedroom being only 1m from the back of pavement and with the refuse area only 300mm from that door and window is less than satisfactory in terms of amenity or health. The Applicants' proposals have not changed from their first proposals.

The proposals must show that the space standards requirements and for furniture and electrical goods set out in the National Space Standards and GLA policies are met.

In summary, Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects in the strongest possible terms to this application.