

Geri Gohin
Planning Case Officer
Development Management
Regeneration and Planning
L B Camden
5 Pancras Square
N1C 4AG

80 HIGHGATE ROAD, NW5 - 2025/0821/P

Alterations to windows and doors to the front and side (retrospective to 2023/0437/P consent)

The DPCAAC **objects** strongly to retention of unauthorized works:

Documents inconsistencies:

Proposed plan: drwg BBA 971.P.01

incorrectly shows front existing entrance arrangement retained
- not as built.

Proposed sections: drwg BBA 971.P.02

Section 3 incorrectly shows elevational fenestration arrangement
alongside footpath.

Design and Access Statement BBA 971 – Revision 28.02.25:

‘Ground Floor Fenestration Improvement’

3. Materials: ‘front entrance door... to replace existing like for like’

This is not so, neither in existing setback location nor configuration.
Photographs show as built.

Note: Early this year when scaffolding and shroud had been removed and applicant given notice of deviation from consent (2023/0437/P) the premises were still an internal building site/shell. With a first retrospective application in Feb withdrawn, the current March registered retrospective application pending, applicant chose continued fit-out to completion.

Site and Historic Context: Contrary to the applicant’s DAS, this part of the DPCA Sub-area 1 is predominantly residential. Its historic 18C early linear development’s importance accorded an early (Highgate Village extension) CA status in 1985. It is lined with predominantly (many listed) residential buildings. The historic No 80 building marked as Coach House with stabling on the King’s Panorama of mid 19C and indicated on all area historic maps. No 80 retains its notable small scale with sloping roofline, providing a distinct attractive character. Adjacent Nos 76-78 a larger scale 20C development. This eastern Highgate Road side, CA protected, is architecturally distinctly different in character from the west side with its large light industrial buildings and other commercial use classes.

Design: We object to the uniformity of design style that is being introduced to the ground floors of the ‘block’ a stretch from No 74 to No 80.

It is relevant to note that the applicant owns No 74, Nos 76-78, No 80 (also No 82) the entire street frontage between Lady Somerset Road and the ancient footpath along The Vine PH connecting Highgate Road to College Lane. Nos 74 and Nos 76-78 also winding down as carpet storage and showroom and are thus likely to have new occupants. Over the years all these premises were internally interconnected, low key, with a trade much locally admired, but with each frontage retaining their individual character at ground floor level. The host buildings of these shopfronts are all of a distinct different architectural historic period and character.

While the DPCAAC had no objection to the granting of consent for No 80 (2023/0437/P) as the changes did not alter the building's individuality, this retrospective/as built variant however reflects the design style of the proposed shopfront changes recently granted consent at No 74 (2024/3555/P) at the southern end of this 'block' frontage, to which the CAAC did originally object.

The initial No 74 application (2023/4960/P) was withdrawn after our objection to the introduction of an enlarged display window at the building's corner return. This design detail was removed in the subsequent 2024 approved application. However, a similar principle enlarged window design arrangement has now appeared at No 80 at the 'block's' northern end without consent. A property in same ownership.

The introduction of this large glazed side display window along the footpath introduces an alien aspect in its immediate surroundings and in the setting of the long view south onto this historic corner building. Notably after dark. The now elongated front side-of-entrance windows do not proportionally relate to the scale of the building.

Lighting/Light spillage: Our CA is noted for its quality of darkness at night as per Appraisal. Introducing added commercial shopfront glazing is contrary to this principle of its character.

Extensive internal showroom lighting after dark further adds to external light spillage, is visually intrusive after dark in this low-key area. We note external lighting has been mounted to the footpath elevation, while some window panes are left obscured.

Use Class: We note Elizabeth Beaumont's officer's report for No 80 (2008/3249/P) from retail storage to residential at first floor level, which was granted. While not part of this application, we query this as the upper floor use on this current application drwg BBA 971.P.02 designates office and retail use. Adjacent properties all have residential use at upper floor(s), and the 1973 temporary consent for shop use of No 90 Highgate Road, opposite northern corner, was due to revert to residential according to the then Development Plan.

Advertisement consent: There is no existing consent for an internally illuminated sign for this property.

Conclusion: Disallow changes and restore fenestration to side and front windows as shown on applicant's As Existing drwg BBA 971.P.04, and as per consent of 2023/0437/P, by removal of unauthorized works.

DPCAAC
31 March 2025