

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects to application [2023/0072/P](#) for The Coach House, 12 Millfield Lane. London N6 6JD for the following reasons:

1. The drawings are inadequate and potentially misleading:

- There are no first floor plan drawings comparing the existing and proposed.
- The site plan shows the proposed terrace at first floor level but not the existing balcony/walkway up to and at first floor level.
- The proposed first floor walkway is shown on the ground floor plan but the existing first floor balcony is not.
- The existing and proposed first floor balconies/walkways are only shown side by side on roof plan [1044-004-EX PROP ROOF PLAN P1.pdf](#).
- The depth of the existing stairs and balcony cannot be seen on the side elevation drawing even though the top of the railings is higher than the wall between the courtyard and garden.
- A section through the existing and proposed stairway/aerial walkway to the east of the high/reduced height wall would be helpful.

The inconsistent combinations of existing and proposed in different drawings is potentially misleading and makes it far more difficult to make a proper comparison.

2. As we said in our objection to the previous planning application for this site:

*“The very high wall on the west side of the front garden appears to date from the time the coach house was built, some time in the 19th century. Could it be older? Does it contribute to the character of the conservation area? Should the applicants be allowed to reduce the height of this wall?”*

[1044-006-EX PROP SIDE ELE P1.pdf](#) shows the high side wall of the front courtyard replaced with a much lower wall, below the level of the existing walkway to the 1st floor front door. We consider that this wall, which we presume is an untouched original wall, should not be altered.

The new lower wall and aerial walkway will clearly be visible from Millfield Lane but there are no drawings or artists impressions of this or additional historical information which would aid in assessing whether any significant historical structures will be lost or damaged.

We believe this aspect of the proposals will damage the conservation area.

Photo taken on 6th August 2021:



Photo taken by HCAAC for application 2021/2828/P.

3. The description of the current stairway and balustrade as an “escape stair” is also potentially misleading as it appears to be the front door to a separate flat upstairs and was being used as a seating area until recently.

4. It is not clear from the DAS and drawings whether the coach house doors will be renovated and partially glazed or wholly replaced apart from the hinges. We consider that a change to the garage doors is unwarranted.

5. The purpose of the proposed extension is not clear. It appears to contain only a toilet and a storage room of some sort. Why is it separated from the house by a narrow corridor all along the back wall? Conditions should be set on its future use.

6. It is unacceptable to provide only drawings of “typical” windows and doors, which may not be typical of this particular house. The applicant should provide a schedule of windows and doors showing close-up photos of each window or door to be replaced and 1:2 details of the existing and proposed, along with details from the manufacturer, plus U values demonstrating that the replacements will meet sustainability standards.

It would be unacceptable for any existing timber sash windows to be replaced by the uncharacteristic casement windows illustrated in these drawings.

7. The deeper, entirely horizontal front balcony/terrace area extending over the lowered side wall would be a far more dominating visual element on the front of the house than the existing iron stairway, significantly altering the appearance of the house. It would also cast shade on the rooms below. A daylight/sunlight study of those rooms should be required.

If the intention is to build a much larger outdoor seating/dining/play area at first floor level, then there may be implications for neighbours’ amenity in terms of noise, privacy, overlooking and so-on.

8. No information is provided about the ancillary out-house structure proposed for demolition.

9. We remain concerned about a number of other issues we mentioned in our objection to 2021/2828/P, including:

*Insufficient historical background is provided. No date of construction is mentioned. No detail is given about which elements are original nor about features which might be worth retaining.*

*No photos are provided of any surviving original windows. Neither are any old photographs or illustrations provided of this house or the main house next door which show the original window pattern.*

*Is the interesting herringbone pattern driveway in the photo above original? Will it be retained or recycled? What will it be replaced with? Will any replacement meet SUDS requirements?*

For all of the above reasons Highgate CAAC believes these proposals will harm Highgate Conservation Area and should be refused.