

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>1 &amp; 2) 20/11/2014</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>1 &amp; 2) 30/10/2014</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Gideon Whittingham				1) 2014/6083/P 2) 2014/6232/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
41 Highgate West Hill London N6 6LS				Refer to Decision Notices			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
1) Erection of 2 service yard stores to west of tennis court on boundary with 5 Highfields Grove 2) Erection of 2 service yard stores to west of tennis court on boundary with 5 Highfields Grove							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		1) Grant Planning Permission 2) Grant Listed Building Consent					
<b>Application Type:</b>		1) Householder Application 2) Listed Building Consent					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notices					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>66</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A site notice was displayed from 10/09/2014 and a public notice was published in the Ham &amp; High from 09/10/2014.</p> <p>An occupier of South Grove commented:</p> <p><i>Is this really necessary? The area has been blighted by this building project for several years with heavy construction vehicles parking on the surrounding residential roads, excessive noise from the site and towering temporary buildings causing an eyesore.</i></p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> The details above are discussed in the Design and Transport sections of the below report</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		<p><b>English Heritage</b> advised that the applications be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance</p> <p>The Highgate CAAC were formally consulted. No response has been received to date.</p>					

## 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. The building has an 'L' shaped form. Several garden structures, including the pergola, garden steps, retaining walls, gateway, fountain, pond and four sculptures surrounding the pond in the Italianate garden are all Grade II listed. The tennis pavilion c 1913 (Listed Grade II), was designed by Sir Harold Peto.

The Highgate Village Conservation Area Statement specifically notes Witanhurst as being a building at risk as no viable use can be found for it. The building was placed on the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register in 2000, and remains as such to date.

The site is surrounded to the North, East and South by the residential boundaries of the Grove and Highfield Grove.

## Relevant History

**2009/2597/P & 2009/2595/L** - Non-determination APPEAL ALLOWED (23/06/2010) - Repair and reconstruction of boundary wall with associated tree removal and replanting on southern boundary facing Highgate West Hill (Option 3 of submitted structural report).

**2009/3192/P & 2009/3195/L** - LB & PP refused APPEAL ALLOWED (23/06/2010) – 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).

**2009/3171/P** - PP refused APPEAL ALLOWED (23/06/2010) - Demolition of the service wing and associated remodelling of front façade, forecourt reinstatement and landscaping. Construction of a 'Orangery' building to provide ancillary residential accommodation as part of Witanhurst House with associated link to main property, terrace, garden retaining walls and landscaping of eastern garden. In addition proposal for permanent vehicular access from Highgate West Hill.

**2011/5721/P** - Construction of a replacement tennis court, new tennis pavilion, glasshouse, tool shed, garage and service area within the grounds (northern west part) of existing house. (Class C3). This application was withdrawn to amend the design of the scheme, specifically moving the tennis pavilion away from the site boundary and the consolidation of the pergola design, in addition to submitting an acceptable Construction Management Plan, to form part of a subsequent application.

**2012/2068/P** – PP Granted (29/05/2012) Construction of a replacement tennis court, new tennis pavilion, glasshouse, tool shed, garage and service area within the grounds (northern west part) of existing house (Class C3).

**2012/5497/P** – PP Granted (21/03/2013) Amendment to planning permission 2012/2068/P dated 29/05/2012 for the erection of a replacement tennis court, new tennis pavilion, glasshouse, tool store and garage/tool store within the grounds (northern west part) of existing house (Class C3), namely amendment to the size and position of the garage/tool store and tool store.

## Relevant policies

### National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
London Plan (2011)

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

**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)  
**DP21** (Development connecting to the highway network)  
**DP22** (Promoting sustainable design and construction)  
**DP23**(Water)  
**DP24** (Securing high quality design)  
**DP25** (Conserving Camden's heritage)  
**DP26** (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)  
**DP28** (Noise and vibration)

### **Highgate conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2007)**

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2013:**

CPG 1- Design, CPG 6- Amenity

## **Assessment**

### **1. Background**

1.1 On 29/05/2012, permission was granted (2012/2068/P) for, amongst other works, the erection of 4 buildings to the north west of the grounds, namely a tennis pavilion, glasshouse, tool shed and garage.

1.2 A total of 3 buildings (Garage/Store, Glass House and Tool Shed) were set directly on the boundary with 5 Highfields Grove, whilst the Tennis Pavilion was inset adjacent to the tennis courts.

1.3 On 21/03/2013, the above permission was amended (2012/5497/P) to relocate and resize the Garage and Tool Store. As a result, 1 building (Glass House) would be set directly on the boundary with 5 Highfields Grove, whilst the Garage/Store, Tool Shed and Tennis Pavilion would be inset adjacent to the tennis court.

### **2. Proposal**

2.1 The applications propose:

- The erection of 2 additional buildings, a carport [4.9m in height (ridge) x 3.8m in width and length] and a tool shed [4.2m in height x 8.5m in width and 3.8m in length] set directly on the boundary with No.5 Highfields Grove. The structures are timber framed with slate hipped roofs.

2.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design
- Adjacent residential amenity
- Trees
- Transport

### **3. Design**

3.1 This application proposes 2 additional buildings of a similar size, scale, location and position to those approved as part of permission granted in 2012 (2012/2068/P). The proposal would therefore result in 6 buildings in total, set west of the tennis courts between the boundary with No.5 Highfields Grove.

#### *Impact on setting and interest of listed building*

3.2 Although relatively close to the boundaries edge of Highfields Grove, it is considered the proposal site, by virtue of its topography, a mixture of high boundary walls, mature vegetation and trees, is relatively concealed from surrounding viewpoints in a secluded part of the host's garden. The proposal would therefore preserve the setting of the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building.

#### *Impact on host building and conservation area*

3.3 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed structures and their cumulative impact (to total 6) are relatively large in size, particularly when compared to the surrounding residential buildings along Highfields Grove and the Grove, nevertheless when viewed in context of the size of the host building and its substantial grounds, it is considered the outbuildings would represent subordinate structures, ancillary to the use of the private open space as a garden.

3.4 In terms of design, the proposed outbuildings would use timber for framing and slate for the roofs. It is considered, by virtue of their size, scale and materials, the proposed structures would represent functional outbuildings for garden activities, thereby preserving the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area.

#### **4. Adjacent residential amenity**

4.1 In addition to the natural screen of mature trees and vegetation which forms the boundary between these buildings, it is considered no undue harm would be caused in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk, sense of enclosure or overlooking, to the adjacent occupants and particularly those of No.5 Highfields Grove.

4.2 As a result of the surrounding topography, the adjacent No.5 Highfields Grove is 3m above the general lying area of the development site. The proposal would not therefore encroach or be of detriment to the outlook, privacy or access of natural sunlight/daylight to the occupants of No.5 Highfields Grove.

4.3 With regard to noise and disturbance, it is considered the level of activity (including plant/machinery) associated with the reasonable use of outbuildings of this size for domestic purposes would not result in noise levels or disturbance that would be harmful to the neighbouring residential amenities.

#### **5. Trees**

5.1 With regard to the impact of the proposal upon the surrounding trees, this has been fully considered and it is concluded that there will be limited impact on trees. No trees shall be removed as part of this application, including those directly adjacent to the proposed tool shed and a condition shall secure all trees are protected from the associated works (as per 2012/2068/P).

#### **6. Transport**

6.1 In the context of works taking place on site, the nature and size of this particular scheme and those works already held by an existing Section 106 agreement for a Construction Management Plan (CMP), a CMP will not be required in this instance.

#### **Recommendation:**

**1) Grant Planning Permission**

**2) Grant Listed Building Consent**