

HGY/2022/4004 - 69 Cromwell Avenue. Response to Objections to application

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee Objection

1 - Reference to HCAAC

This is an oversight however we assumed that you would consult as a matter of course anyway

2 – Loss of Residential

This was deemed to be acceptable at Per Application stage as it is returning the property to its original state.

3 – Rear Dormer/Balcony

Before commenting on the dormer/balcony we would welcome the Design/Conservation Officers comments on the design

4 - Balcony

Appended documents demonstrate that there will be no overlooking issues

5 - Lightwells

The issue of the front lightwell was raised by Planners at Pre App so we have tried to justify the design in our D+A document.

The side lightwells would not be seen by anyone so we view these as acceptable

6 – Front wall design

We agree with the comments and the appended drawings show that it will match the original design seen on neighbouring properties

7 – HN Plan DH7 1. III – Burland Scale 1 (commentary by MHA Structural Design)

MHA Structural Design's Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was undertaken with reference to Haringey's basement policies.

We do not know the weight of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) 2017, commissioned by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum, or if it actually carries any weight.

In planning terms, it is normal for the local authority (e.g. Camden, Islington, Westminster) to limit damage to Burland Scale 2 – slight. That is why MHA provided this limit in their BIA report.

For competently undertaken underpinning work MHA expect any cracking induced is more likely to be Burland Scale 1 – very slight, but MHA have referenced the common limit of Scale 2 in the application.

8 – Trial Holes and Boreholes (commentary by MHA Structural Design)

The ground investigations and the report were undertaken by a reputable company and was checked by one of their chartered geologists. The window sample boreholes were taken to a depth of 5.45m, which is significantly below the basement formation level of around 2.5m below the general external ground level. Trial pits were taken to depths near to the proposed foundation formation level. Water was not found in any of these investigations. An aquifer has not been breached here and reasonable and appropriate measures have been taken to investigate this.

Publicly available records, on the British Geological Survey's (BGS) website, show the soil progression to the north. These were included in Appendix C of MHA's BIA

It good practice to get a groundwater depth reading in the winter too and this will be undertaken by Soil Consultants shortly. A winter reading was not possible with the timing of the investigations and the planning submission, although it rarely becomes a stumbling block with planning application submissions. Most local authorities are satisfied if the investigation have been undertaken by a reputable firm and are below the depth of the proposed formation.

9 – Environmental Hazards (commentary by MHA Structural Design)

If soil with the elevated level of lead is encapsulated by hard finishes, then this will not present a risk to the end users.

If planting areas are to be provided, then the top level of soil (usually around 0.8m) should be safely removed and replaced with certified clear imported topsoil, together with a geofabric separator. This requirement is not unusual for urban projects.

10 - Timber boarded gate/fence

We have not considered this as part of the application

There are several other objections mostly covered in the HCAAC response above, below is a few examples

Andrew Baker – Basement /Rear extension/ Front walls

We already have a basement and are extending it slightly in terms of noise and disturbance these will be addressed by the Contractor and may be conditioned with a Construction Management Plan. Regarding the front wall design I refer to Item 6 on HCAAC response.

Jill Moore – Basement concern

We already have a basement and are extending it slightly and it will be away from existing sewer pipe

Katharine Ridler – Rear dormer + Balcony affecting her privacy to rear of site (Linden Mansions)/ Front Wall design

The appended drawings demonstrate that there is way in excess of 18m to this block and doesn't overlook.

In terms of design etc I refer to Item 3 on HCAAC response.

Regarding the front wall design I refer to Item 6 on HCAAC response.