

Dear Josh,

I uploaded some comments on 2021/4103/P to the Camden planning webpage on behalf of HCAAC last Friday (see below). However, it appears that the comments have not yet been uploaded on to the relevant application page. Is there a problem?

Thanks very much,

Therese Gray



Subject: Comments on 2021/4103/P have been received by the council.

While Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee appreciates the decision to extend the existing house rather than build an entirely new one, sadly we object to this application on various grounds:

1. A number of CGIs are included in the documents which illustrate what the proposed house might look like if it were hidden behind the informal array of trees and shrubs on site at present. According to other documents provided most of these will no longer be there so that these CGIs are highly misleading.

For instance the tree report claims only two trees are worth saving: a bay and an oak along the frontage to Millfield Lane, and the applicant proposes to crown lift and prune one of these so it will look quite different from the way it does now.

Elsewhere a planting "concept" document suggests planting a number of far more formal looking tall thin Italian style poplars around the gate, replacing part of the parking area with lawn and so-on. None of this is reflected in the CGI illustrations.

It is not clear what the status of this "concept" document is. Are these definite proposals or merely ideas? Will any planting turn out to be completely different from the "concept" ideas included in this application?

We would like to see a far more certain plan for what the applicant intends by way of tree works and planting.

One thing is certain: the development will not look anything like the CGIs included in the DAS and other application documentation.

We would like the CGIs to be redone so that they reflect what the development will look like after most of the trees and other plants have been removed and the "planting concept" has been implemented in reality. We strongly suspect the new house will be a great deal more visible from the public realm than suggested.

- 2. Trees removed (e.g. on the boundary with 4 Millfield Lane) should be replaced elsewhere on site so the plans comply with local and national sustainability requirements.
- 3. It also seems very likely that whereas the Millfield Lane boundary of the property currently has an informal, leafy appearance consistent with neighbouring properties and the Heath itself, the proposals strongly hint at a much more minimalist, formal garden out of keeping with the character of this part of the conservation area. This could damage the conservation area.
- 4. The proposed side extension is built right up to the boundary with 4 Millfield Lane (or "walkway" as it is described in some of the drawings), almost all the way to the road frontage, whereas the existing house is set well back behind both boundaries with trees and greenery between it and No 4. Hence the elevation facing 4 Millfield Lane will be far less open and leafy than at present, consisting mainly of a large area of burnt larch cladding and other fencing, much closer and higher than at present. This seems likely to be quite oppressive and even perhaps to have implications for light/daylight.

Similarly the extensions on the northern side of the house will bring the building much closer to the neighbouring house in Millfield Place. The illustrations of the proposed house from this direction suggest there will be very little planting along the boundary which, again, may make for an oppressive aspect close to the southern boundary of the neighbouring garden. The contrast between the architectural styles of the two houses may be very stark. It will be important to take neighbours' views and amenity into account when assessing these proposals.

Comments made by Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee of Flat 1, Northfield Hall, 59 North Road, London, N6 4BJ

Phone

**EMail** 

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection