

2019/4092/P: 45 Highgate West Hill

Dear Ms Raghunathan,

Thank you for contacting the Georgian Group regarding the above application.

45 Highgate West Hill is a Grade II* semi-detached house dating from 1729 and is set in the historic centre of the Highgate Village Conservation Area. The neighbouring 46 Highgate West Hill is also Grade II* and together were described by Pevsner as 'a formidable pair'. Highgate Village is a Conservation Area of extremely high historic significance – originally growing up around the Bishop of London's deer park, it saw considerable prosperity and growth during the C18 as a gentleman's escape from the pollution of the capital.

Comments:

We acknowledge that the applicant has taken pre-application advice from Historic England and Camden Council on board, and that the proposed extension makes some effort to respond to their comments. However, we believe the extension will cause harm to the significance of the main house, and its neighbour due to its scale and massing. This will also have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area. As shown in the visual impact photographs, the extension will be clearly visible across the New River Water Reservoir and is dominating. We note that the applicant has reduced the height of the building by a meter since the pre-application advice and has moved the extension back so that it is less imposing than originally conceived but we believe that further improvements to the scheme can be made that will further reduce the impact on the designated heritage asset. The 1970s extension, while of no historic value, is of a far more suitable scale and does not compete for dominance with the house itself. We recommend that the scale and massing of the current extension be followed for the proposed extension.

Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset should be considered, 'irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Leading on from this we do not believe that the application sufficiently justifies the harm clearly and convincingly, as per paragraph 194 (NPPF 2019), and there will be no demonstrable public benefit from the proposed extension (paragraph 196 NPPF 2019).

We request that the current application is WITHDRAWN or REFUSED in its current iteration. We will be happy to advise further and will consider any material changes to the application.

Yours sincerely,

Matilda Harden

Conservation Adviser