

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	17/03/2011
(Members Briefing)		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	24/02/2011
Officer			Application Number	
Jennifer Walsh			2011/0298/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
41 Highgate West Hill London N6 6LS			Please refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal				
Variation of condition 4 (development in accordance with approved plans) as an minor material amendment to planning permission granted on 16/11/2010 (ref: 2010/4544/P) for construction of garden pond and associated garden steps with associated replacement tree planting within the lower garden grounds of Witanhurst House.				
Recommendation:	Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:	Variation or Removal of Condition(s)			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice
Informatives:	

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		

Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Heath Winds, Merton Lane comments on the application as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They welcome the list of trees to be planted on the site; - In relation to the pond, this is a more acceptable scheme than that which was first proposed; - They draw the attention to the contents of the hydrological report which makes it clear that any deeper excavations than proposed would have posed a real danger to water flows off this site; <p>Haycock Associates on behalf of the Highfields Grove Properties outlines 'ongoing concerns' as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They acknowledge that there has been a reduction in the total storage volume of the pond and the maximum depth will sit within the impermeable layer of clay at the site, reducing the risk of retaining wall failure and subsequent flooding for adjacent properties. However, there is still some cause for concern (as outlined in letter dated 20th December in relation to the previous planning application) as details on drainage calculations and soakaway tests are not provided. <i>(Officers response: Please refer to paragraph 5.2)</i> - They feel that this would have been an opportune moment to provide such details, in order to put some of the concerns of the Highfield Grove Property residents at ease.
---	--

CAAC/Local groups comments:	Heath Winds provided comments on behalf of the Highgate CAAC.
------------------------------------	---

Site Description

The application site comprises a substantial neo-Georgian detached single family dwelling house. The property was built between 1913 and 1920 by George Hubbard for Sir Arthur Crosfield and is a Grade II* Listed Building. It is located on Highgate West Hill and is located within the Highgate Conservation Area.

Relevant History

2009/3192/P: Construction of a basement in front forecourt area for ancillary residential use as part of Witanhurst House including associated planting, forecourt reinstatement and landscaping plus permanent vehicular access from Highgate West Hill (Class C3). **REFUSED 16/12/2009 – APPEAL ALLOWED 23/06/2010**

2010/3824/P: Submission of details of sustainable urban drainage system, design/layout of all building foundations and renewable energy measures pursuant to conditions 7, 13 and 14 of planning permission (Ref: 2009/3192/P) allowed on appeal on 23/06/2010 (Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2119330) for construction of a basement in front forecourt area for ancillary residential use as part of Witanhurst House including associated planting, forecourt reinstatement and landscaping plus permanent vehicular access from Highgate West Hill (Class C3). **GRANTED 14/09/2010**

2010/4555/P and 2010/4556/P: Installation of rear (north-west) and side (south-west) terrace and steps and associated works to existing Grade II* Listed residential dwelling house (Class C3) and the Grade II Listed Peto Staircase. **GRANTED 18/10/2010**

2010/ 5057/T : WITHIN THE GROUNDS: 6 x Yew – Fell, 2 x Holm Oak – Fell, 5 x English Oak – Fell, 3 x Silver Birch – Fell, 1 x Holly – Fell, 6 x Sycamore – Fell, 2 x Oak – Fell, 1 x Wild Cherry – Fell, 1 x Goat Willow - Fell. **NO OBJECTION TO TREE WORKS IN A CA 26/10/2010**

2010/4544/P: Construction of garden pond and associated garden steps as well as structural tree re-planting within the lower garden grounds of Witanhurst House (class C3). **GRANTED 16/11/2011**

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)
- DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
- DP23 (Water)
- DP24 (Securing high quality design)
- DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Minor material amendments are proposed to the previously approved scheme which sought to install large pond within the lower lawn of Witanhurst House. The revisions include alterations to the pond design as well as amendments to the tree planting which was previously included within the application.

1.2 The depth of the pond has been reduced from 2.5m to a depth of 1.5m. The size of the pond has also changed with the pond now being proposed at a size of 38m in length x 15m in width. A revised tree planting schedule is also seeking permission. The Revised planting schedule contains a greater content of indigenous species.

1.3 The hydrological issues were discussed at length in relation to the previous application. Therefore, as the principle of the pond has been previously considered acceptable in principle and as the pond is to be made 1m shallower, it shall not be discussed within the determination of this application.

2.0 Design

2.1 The proposed pond is to be located within the lower lawn, in front of the Grade II listed Tennis Pavilion. This currently consists of a large expanse of lawn in front of, and surrounding the Grade II listed tennis pavilion. Whilst the revised pond is to be longer in length to that which was previously approved, it is considered to create a unique design, one which is suited to the age of the host property as well as the Tennis Pavilion. As with the previous design, the installation of a pond will create a focal point of the space. A small pond with a fountain is also proposed within the revised scheme. It is considered that the revised scheme will complete the area and would not harm the architectural integrity of the host property nor the wider area. The design is simplistic yet sophisticated and sympathetic and complements the age of the host property. Together with the previously approved proposals in relation to the additional steps, the revised proposals are considered acceptable in design terms in this instance.

3.0 Trees

3.1 A schedule of the proposed trees to be planted and their subsequent locations has been submitted in support of the application. The Council's Tree Officer has examined the proposals and considers that the details of the woodland belt around the northern boundary are considered to be satisfactory. The planting mix is considered to be predominately native and as such is considered to provide a significant contribution to the biodiversity value of the site. Therefore the proposals are considered consistent with planning policy and no objection is raised.

4.0 Hydrology

4.1 As previously stated, the proposed pond is to be 1m shallower than the pond which was granted consent in 2010. Therefore as the ground conditions were found to be impermeable stoney clay to a depth of 2m, it is considered that as the proposal is to reach a depth of 1.5m the revised proposal would not have an adverse effect on the hydrology of the local area in line with Camden's Planning Policies and is considered acceptable in this location.

5.0 Amenity

5.1 As the proposed works are located to the lower lawn, approximately 40m from the closest residential property, it is considered that the proposed minor material amendments to the great pond would not impact on the amenities of the adjoining residents in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

5.2 Concerns have been raised regarding the pipe capacities and the soak-away tests. The Sustainable Urban Drainage System was submitted for the whole scheme in support of the application which was determined at appeal and subsequently details have been discharged by the Council. At such a time, it was considered that the information submitted was satisfactory for planning purposes at such a time. Thames Water were previously consulted and provided no objection to the documentation. As with the previous application an additional condition is recommended to be added to the permission to ensure that the total surface water flows entering the combined sewer is limited to a maximum of 15 litres per second during storm conditions, to minimise the impact on the existing sewer and to be in line with Thames Waters previous comments.

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613