



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2022/4004		
Application Type:	Full planning permission		
Address:	69, Cromwell Avenue, Hornsey, London, N6 5HS		
Proposal:	Amalgamation of 4no. residential flats into 1no. dwellinghouse, demolition of existing ground floor rear extension, erection of new ground floor rear extension, construction of basement extension with external stairs and lightwells, addition of rear rooflights, installation of rear balcony, various other external alterations and increase in height of front wall (AMENDED PLANS).		
Case Officer:	Matthew Gunning		
Valid Date:	13/12/2022		
Applicant:	Mr Andreas Weiskam		
Agent:	Mr Zakaria Farrah		

Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The application property is a substantial two and three storey semi- detached property located on the eastern side of Cromwell Avenue. The property was converted into four flats in the 1980s.
- 1.2 Cromwell Avenue and adjacent streets are lined mainly by well-crafted and handsome Victorian style residential properties. These properties have a unity of design, with a high degree of articulation and features such as projecting bays, staggered roof lines and small brick-fronted dormer windows. The application site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area
- 1.3 The property has a forecourt parking area to the front and rear garden with large outbuilding as well as mature trees. No 67 Cromwell Avenue is semi-detached to the north, while the neighbouring property to the south, No 71, is separated by an access alleyway.

The Proposal

- 1.4 This is an application for the following works:
 - amalgamation of 4no. residential flats into 1no. dwellinghouse,

- demolition of existing ground floor rear extension and erection of new ground floor rear extension,
- construction of basement extension with external stairs and lightwells,
- installation of overhanging rear balcony,
- other external alterations, including increase in height of front wall.

1.5 Following revisions to the scheme the following works as initially applied for have been removed or adapted:

- proposed dormer at roof has been removed and rather rooflights will be added to this area of rear roof slope.
- window on the first-floor of rear elevation reverted to existing to mirror No.67
- front light well removed and front planter rearranged (Note: The planter is existing, contrary to Conservation Officer initial comments) meaning, front windows in lower ground have also been omitted.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

1.6 The planning history in relation to the site is as follows.

HGY/2008/1502- Erection of single storey rear extension on existing terrace – Refused 27/11/2008 – Allowed on appeal 2009.

OLD/1987/0342 - Construction of roof terrace to top flat.- Granted 13-03-87

OLD/1985/0273 - Erection of single storey rear extension to create more adequate kitchen. – Approved 17-06-85

OLD/1984/0284 - Conversion into four self contained flats. – Approved 06-07-84

OLD/1984/1005 - Conversion into 4 self-contained flats. – Refused 16-03-84

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

2.1 The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Transportation
- LBH Building Control
- The Highgate Society
- Highgate Neighbourhood Forum
- Highgate CAAC

2.2 The following responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

- 1) LBH Conservation: The following comments were made on the plans as initially submitted. (Comment: Note Plans were amended to address concerns, as discussed further on in this report).

- No objections to the proposed new single-storey rear extension or to the flank and rear lightwells, subject to materiality and detailing which may be managed through the relevant planning conditions.
- In-principle objection to the proposed front lightwell.
- Concerns regarding the design of the proposed rear extension, the proposed rear balcony, and the proposed dormer with balcony to roof level.
- Proposed rear extension by reason of its configuration and materiality, in particular the proposed extent of glazing, fails to respond to, or reinforce, the architectural composition of the surviving façade behind.
- The well-preserved roof form of the site shares an attractive symmetry with that of No. 67.
- Balconies and terraces are uncharacteristic within the immediate environs of the Site, and the proposed introduction of these features to the site is considered incongruous and insensitive, and results in an appearance of visual clutter and overdevelopment to a sensitive façade.

2) LBH Building control: Have reviewed the BiA for this application and can confirm that it meets your policy requirements.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site, a notice placed in the local press, and letters sent to neighbouring occupants. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

Objecting: 16
Supporting: 0

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

Highgate CAAC - Object on the following grounds (as summarised):

- Highgate CAAC
- Velux Cabrio balcony window is unacceptable as it would adversely affect the plane of the rear roof slope, important to character of houses.
- Cabrio balcony space/head height is so tight and would be impracticable for users.
- First floor French windows and balcony as well as the proposed Cabrio balcony would intrude on neighbours' privacy.
- Daylight/sunlight to the Nanny's room looks extremely dubious.
- Lightwells would illuminate the flank wall thus introducing artificial light into a dark situation which would detract from the character of the Conservation Area.
- Loss of dwellings needs to be assessed in relation to policy.

Cromwell Area Residents Association - - Object on the following grounds (as summarised):

- The proposed works would have a significant impact on the Highgate Conservation area and the integrity of the harmonious Victorian architecture.
- The proposed dormer increases overlook and affects the skyline of the terrace.

- The balconies greatly increase overlooking to the neighbours.
- The lightwell would be out of character and would set a dangerous precedent in the area.
- The ground works would be extensive and lack clarity on the impact on the adjacent properties and the local geology including the many aquifers in the area.
- The scale and design is out of kilter for the area.

5.3 The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

Basement works

- Complicated local soil, water/aquifer and sink hole issues, plus the fact that these houses are partially sitting on reclaimed land.
- Works will jeopardise the safety of the foundations to No 67.
- Unsuitability of a basement extension at this location.
- Disruption from the basement extension would be significant.
- BIA report suggests that the degree of damage will not exceed the Burland Scale level 2 category which would breach guidelines.
- Burland scale 1 needs to be officially adopted in the plans and in a Party Wall Agreement to prevent excessive damage to No 67.
- No Party Wall Agreement in connection with works carried out to date/ internal stripping out, causing cracking and movement.
- Possible damage to mains sewage pipe that runs across the back gardens of 67, 69 and 71.
- No basement has been constructed at 71 Cromwell Avenue.

Design & heritage

- Proposed large dormer window at the rear of the house would be very visible from Cromwell Place, unsightly and would not in any way be consistent with the other houses in the conservation area.
- Approval of scheme would lead to a precedent for lightwells on other parts of Cromwell Place.
- Lightwells and attached wall at the front of the house are not in keeping with Cromwell Avenue, causing harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Proposed higher wall at the front on Cromwell Avenue out of keeping.

Amenity

- First floor French windows and balcony as well as the proposed Cabrio balcony would lead to overlooking/ intrude on neighbours' privacy.
- Concerns about raised terrace in garden.
- Concern about height of rear extension.
- Rear balcony and dormer would significantly alter the view from 41–55 Linden Mansions.
- Balcony on the second floor would overlook gardens of Linden Mansions.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and heritage;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
4. Basement development.

Principle of development

Loss of flats

- 6.2 As noted above the house is currently comprised of four self-contained flats, arranged over lower ground, ground, first and second floors. The flats here are small consisting of 1-2 bedroom units.
- 6.3 Section 55(3)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (1990 Act) outlines that the use as two or more separate dwellinghouses of any building previously used as a single dwellinghouse involves a material change in the use of the building and of each part of it which is so used. The 1990 Act does not state whether the reverse change of use would be material – and so that is a question which must be considered on the facts in any given case.
- 6.4 A change of use is however considered material if there is some significant change in the character of the activities taking place as a matter of fact and degree. The proposed change from one to two residential units is typically not viewed to cause significant change in the appearance of a site or the nature or scale of activities taking place.
- 6.5 In the case here it is accepted that consent is required to re-vert the building back to one family unit, given there are more than two residential units currently within the property.
- 6.6 As such it is necessary to consider the extent to which such a change would have a ‘significant planning consequence’ as a matter of fact and degree. The submitted plans show that the existing flats relate to one- and two-bedroom units, with none of the units being family sized or meeting current London Plan floorspace standards.
- 6.7 The current layout to some of the accommodation is also of small rooms with restricted light and outlook, namely the ground floor. Equally a number of the units here are substandard given the absence of access to amenity space.
- 6.8 It is undisputed that the effects of the proposal would be the net loss of residential unit from the overall housing supply, however the loss is not viewed to be significant in planning consequences, i.e. given the layout, size and quality of accommodation.
- 6.9 It is accepted if such housing was to a higher standard, it could be protected; however the decision needs to be made on what is currently in-situ. Equally, in making a decision on this application it needs to be borne in mind that the site falls within a Family Housing Protection Zone as set out in the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) – policy DM16, specifically introduced to limit the number of conversions.
- 6.10 As such a reversion here back to a family house, serves to provide a family house and to protect/ reinforce the character of this area as that of family housing. Given the property here was originally constructed as a large single-family dwelling, the reinstatement of a single dwelling typology will help to reinforce the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 6.11 The removal of the current large rear extensions and introduction of a smaller extension will also serve to provide benefits to the rear of the site, in particular an increase in the size of the rear garden.
- 6.12 Given the above the principle of development is considered acceptable here.

Design & Heritage

- 6.13 DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.
- 6.14 London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.
- 6.15 DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.
- 6.16 Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) 2017 requires proposals to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Highgate's conservation areas. Policy DH4 requires rear extensions to be subordinate to and complement the original dwelling. Policy DH5 requires proposals for roof extensions, dormers and rooflights to respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail.

Rear extension

- 6.17 It is noted that concerns are raised by the Conservation Officer about the rear extension in terms of its configuration and materiality, in specific the extent of glazing.
- 6.18 In considering this extension, consideration needs to be given to the current configuration of rear extensions to the back of this property and the fact that there is no uniform pattern of development to the backs of these properties at ground floor level.

- 6.19 As noted in the planning history section above, the property here was extended by way of a second ground floor rear extension, as allowed on appeal in 2009. In the Planning Inspectors decision in allowing this appeal it was outlined that the extension:

“would not in my view appear excessive and would achieve an acceptable relationship with the main building”

“would be clearly subordinate to the original dwelling in both scale and size and the proposed extension would not represent a disproportionate addition to the building”.

- 6.20 The proposed rear/ wrap around extension would be largely glazed having a contemporary appearance, contrasting with the brickwork and fenestration of the upper floors. Such an approach is however an acceptable way to extend a property, even in conservation areas, with often modest sized rear extensions being possible to build without the need for planning permission, i.e. under ‘permitted development rights’, even in conservation areas.
- 6.21 The design and form of the extension being smaller in size, compared to the current extensions on site, would not appear visually jarring or dominant. Rather a smaller rear extension serves to improve the appearance to the back of this property, as well providing a slightly larger rear garden etc.

Alteration to the upper floor rear elevation and rear roof slope

- 6.22 As per the amended plans the rear dormer has been removed from the scheme and rather more roof lights are to be added to the rear roof slope. The removal of the rear dormer serves to respect the roof form and plane of the current roof and symmetry with No 67.
- 6.23 Two Velux Cabrio units are to be added to the area of roof slope where the dormer was initially proposed. These contain an upper and lower section of glazing. In the context of a large area of the original rear roof plane being unaffected and the back of this property not being highly visible, such features would not be harmful to the traditional character of this house.
- 6.24 There are other examples of rooflights to the backs of properties here, with equally it pointed out that the addition of rooflights to a single-family dwelling do not require planning permission.
- 6.25 In terms of the overhanging rear balcony, the siting of such a feature and associated opening is not viewed to adversely affect the character and appearance of this property, given it relates to the inner rear wall tucked in next to the outrigger.
- 6.26 The original opening here has already been changed and it is noted that there are examples of roof terraces to the backs of properties here, i.e. to the back of No 71 and balconies on the rear of Linden Mansions. As per the amended plans given the existing first floor window on the rear elevation of the outrigger is a sash window, this opening is not being changed so as to respect the existing mirroring arrangement of a window of the same size found at the back of No 67.
- 6.27 The principle of a front lightwell was not supported as it was considered to detract from the established character of this well-preserved part of the Highgate Conservation Area. New lightwells and an access staircase are however to be created at the rear and side, which are

viewed to be discrete features which will not materially affect the appearance of this property or that of the conservation area. The concern about light spillage from the opening is noted from the representation received, however there is no substantive evidence to argue these would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 6.28 It is also noted that a concern is raised about light level to a bedroom within the basement. Light to this room will be served by two lightwells to the side which the agent argues to be “adequately lit”. It is accepted light to this room will be constrained, however in the context of one property with multiple bedrooms and access to different rooms over different floors a high standard of accommodation is provided.
- 6.29 Overall, having given great weight to the conservation of the heritage asset (the conservation area), it is concluded that the proposed works and alterations as described above are acceptable in design and heritage terms and would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of this property and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area. Consequently, as demonstrable harm would not arise it is not necessary to consider the weight that would be attached to the public benefits of this proposal.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 6.30 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. Policy DH3 of the HNP also states that proposals should not harm the amenity of adjacent properties.
- 6.31 DPD Policy DM1 ‘Delivering High Quality Design’ states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development’s users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.
- 6.32 The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH3 of the HNP also states that proposals should not harm the amenity of adjacent properties.
- 6.33 The proposed side and rear extension and other associated alterations to the rear of the property would not materially impact neighbour amenity in terms of conditions of light and outlook and privacy, taking account of the current larger extension on site as well as the presence of vegetation along the respective boundary lines.
- 6.34 In terms of the projecting balcony, the balcony area is small in size and would not harm privacy conditions, namely taking account of the existing situation of mutual degrees of overlooking from upper floor windows and the manner in which the balcony area in question is tucked into the rear elevation with opportunities to overlook from this, restricted by the current rear outrigger.
- 6.35 As per the detail provided in the Design & Access Statement, namely a photo, it is shown that the line of vision from recessed balcony in the rear dormer (now removed from the scheme) would be restricted by the roof forms of rear outriggers. As such equally the opportunity for

overlooking from the two Velux Cabrio units would be very much restricted. These rooflights are also set sufficient distance away from the back of Linden Mansions, so as not to affect the amenity of residents within these flats. The two new windows on the side to be installed are to serve bathrooms and as such will not affect neighbouring amenity.

- 6.36 In the representations received it is noted that concerns are raised about the height of the area of raised terrace. The height of this is shown in drawing 326_GE_02 Rev P2. This raised patio is set in sufficiently from both neighbouring properties with boundary fences and the vegetation on the shared boundaries sufficient to restrict opportunities for overlooking.
- 6.37 In the representations received it is also noted that concerns are raised about noise and disturbance. While it is accepted that there will be some degree of inconvenience/disturbance associated with construction such impact can be mitigated and minimised with the submission of a construction management plan. It is important to highlight that also there would be no justification for refusing planning permission on this basis. Equally it is pointed out that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 provides safeguards in respect of construction site noise.
- 6.38 Taking the above into consideration, the proposal is acceptable with regards to amenity considerations.

Basement development

- 6.39 DPD policy DM18 ('Residential Basement Development and Light Wells') requires householder extensions for basement development to demonstrate that a proposal will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building and neighbouring buildings; does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties; avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area and not to adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment. Policy DM24 outlines the requirement of new development to manage and reduce surface water runoff.
- 6.40 The supporting text to policy DM18 outlines that in established residential areas basements are an increasingly popular way of gaining additional space in homes but that it is important that such development is carried out in a way that does not harm the amenity of neighbours, compromise the structural stability of adjoining properties, increase flood risk and that where appropriate, applicants will need to submit specific information to demonstrate that such issues have been addressed.
- 6.41 Policy DH7 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) requires impact assessments to be submitted with basement development where there is evidence that there may be problems with drainage or flooding and to show there are no adverse effect from such development on the structural stability of adjacent properties or associated potential damage. It specifically talks about there being no possibility of irreparable damage to the local water regime both in terms of ground water diversion and surface water flooding and that construction should not be allowed where there is evidence that damage to neighbouring properties would exceed Burland Scale 1.
- 6.42 London Plan 2021 policy relates more specifically to large-scale basement development but in paragraph 3.10.6 it outlines and recognises that small-scale basement excavations, where they are appropriately designed and constructed, can contribute to the efficient use of land, and provide extra living space. Paragraph 3.10.5 equally highlights the need to manage

sensitively through the planning application process potential impacts on the local environment and residential amenity.

- 6.43 The proposal is for the formation of a full-storey basement under the footprint of the existing property. The property has void space/ an existing coal-cellar, with this uniform to these properties on this street. It is noted that basements are not a prevalent feature to these houses, with it noted that consent was given for a basement at No 71, allowed on appeal, however such a project was never implemented.
- 6.44 The new basement floor will have a floor to ceiling height of 2.6m. In terms of the existing basement footings site analysis show that these are formed between approximately 1.5 and 3m below ground level. The depth of underpinning to the current footings will be in the region of 0.35 to 1.85m.
- 6.45 As set out above representations have been made by both residents and amenity groups concerning the basement works, specifically risks associated with works exceeding Burland Scale 1.
- 6.46 Whilst respecting that there can be genuine concerns about basement works and risks of damage to a property, the role of the LPA is to conclude whether adequate consideration has been given to the potential impacts of such works at the planning application stage. Other pieces of legislation, regulations, and codes of practice, play a part in controlling basement development in terms of ground movement etc, specifically following the detailed design stage and the appointment of a contractor and specialist engineer(s) to oversee such works and during construction. Equally in dealing with this application it also needs to be appreciated that impacts/ concerns in relation to the execution/ implementation of a development can be mitigated through the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.
- 6.47 A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) prepared by MHA Structural Design has been submitted as well a Site Investigation Report prepared by Spoil Consultants.

Impact on groundwater conditions

- 6.48 As set out in the BIA the site here is located along the boundary of the Claygate Member (clay, silt & sand) and Bagshot Formation (sand), with Claygate Member is classified as a secondary aquifer. The BIA outlines that the investigations show that the basement formation level will be within the Bagshot Formation, a competent bearing material, and groundwater was not observed in the boreholes (max depth 5m) or in subsequent monitoring visits. The BIA is informed by 6 trial pit investigations undertaken for the purposes of the BIA.
- 6.49 The soil investigations have not found groundwater in connection with the trial pits. Given the pattern of development here of houses with historic cellar spaces, voids and varying height footings and taking account of the findings of the BIA, impacts on groundwater conditions are viewed to be negligible.
- 6.50 In respect of the basement being installed here, the structure will be protected from water ingress, meeting the requirements of BS 8102:2009 - Code of practice for protection of below ground structures against water from the ground. It is also pointed out that the site here is not located in an area at risk of surface water flooding.

Ground movement/ structural stability

- 6.51 The building here is being retained in its entirety with onsite control of the construction process to be carried out to maintain the structural integrity of the building as well as the adjoining semi-detached property. The resulting basement floor would be separated in relation to No 71.
- 6.52 The BIA outlines how the basement will be constructed. Specifically, the new basement perimeter retaining walls are to be constructed using conventional hit-and-miss underpinning sequences in order to minimise disturbance to the existing adjacent structures. The basement floor slabs will also be constructed from insitu reinforced concrete.
- 6.53 The BIA sets out that the risk of damage with the works undertaken by an ASUC member is low and will not exceed, at worst, Category 2 (Slight -Burland et al). The BIA in specific references that the clay portion in the Bagshot Formation at basement formation level is low, as such limiting the risk of significant heave or differential settlement.
- 6.54 While noting the advice provided by Building Control in respect of the basement work and findings of the BIA, in the context of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017 it is noted that the risk of damage to neighbouring properties should be no higher than Burland Scale 1 'very slight'.
- 6.55 This matter was raised with the agent and outlined as being a specific requirement. The agent contends that the requirement of (very slight <1mm) can be met, by the adoption of rigorous construction controls, including the appointment of an experienced ASUC member (Specialist Underpinning Contractors) for the contractor and MHA to visit site weekly during the underpinning works along the Party Wall with No.67.
- 6.56 As reflected above there is ample scope through the imposition of a planning condition following the completion of detailed design in respect of such a project, to ensure that the Burland Scale 1 'very slight' test is met. As such a condition is being imposed to secure a method statement and associated survey works to demonstrate compliance, with such works to be overseen by a suitably qualified engineer. The imposition of such a condition as well as safeguards associated with other areas of legislation serve to identify and control the nature and magnitude of the effect on neighbouring properties, in particular No 67.
- 6.57 Overall, the information put forward as part of the BIA process and subject to additional information to be secured in terms of a method statement following detailed design, serve to ensure the structural stability of neighbouring buildings are safeguarded., consistent with the requirements of policy DM18 and policy DH7 of the HNP.

Conclusion

- 6.58 The proposed extensions and alterations, as amended, are considered acceptable in design terms, in terms of the appearance of the dwelling and in relation to the adjacent dwellings and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, leaving it preserved. The extensions and alterations would also not affect the amenities of adjoining neighbours. The basement floor/ extension is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions to secure compliance with the requirement of Burland Scale 1 and such works to be overseen by a suitably qualified engineer.

6.59 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. CIL APPLICABLE

7.1 The additional floorspace is less than 100 square metres and as such is not liable for CIL.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:	
1	The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect. Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.
2	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3	The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with details as outlined in the drawings and application form. In specific the materials to be used in the construction of the altered front boundary wall shall match those used in the existing wall unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
4	Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application no development shall take place until a final Method Statement for the construction of the basement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Method Statement shall demonstrate that the predicted Burland Scale at the time of the construction phase is no more than Burland Scale 1 in relation to neighbouring buildings/structures within the zone of influence. It shall include pre-commencement condition surveys of the adjoining building (No 67) and the proposed systems of excavation support including any underpinning. The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with this approved methodology and detail.

	The condition of nearby buildings shall be monitored throughout the construction process and works shall cease immediately if Burland Scale 1 damage is recorded. Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would have no undue impact on the structural integrity of adjoining and neighbouring buildings, in accordance with Policy DM18 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.
6	The development hereby approved shall not commence until such time as a suitably qualified chartered engineer with membership of the appropriate professional body has been appointed to inspect, approve and monitor the critical elements of both permanent and temporary basement construction works throughout their duration to ensure compliance with the design which has been checked and approved by a building control body. Details of the appointment and the appointee's responsibilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Any subsequent change or reappointment shall be confirmed forthwith and retained for the duration of the construction works. Reason: To safeguard the appearance and structural stability of neighbouring buildings and the character of the immediate area.
7	Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, detailing the programme of works and providing details in respect of the construction traffic movements, material and plant storage areas, details of necessary suspended car parking spaces, details of conveyor and gantry to transfer material over the footway. The approved details thereafter shall be implemented throughout the project period. Reasons: To ensure there are no adverse impacts on the free flow of traffic on local roads and to safeguard the amenities of the area consistent with Policies T4, T7 and D14 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP0 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and with Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

•	INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.
•	INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

