



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0337		
Application Type:	Full planning permission		
Address:	Elm Court, Cholmeley Park, Hornsey, London, N6 5EJ		
Proposal:	Construction of basement and mansard roof extension to create 4 additional flats (use class C3: 2 x 2 bed & 1X 1 bed & 1 x 3 bed) with associated amenity space, landscaping, lightwells, and cycle storage. Internal Reconfiguration of the existing building.		
Case Officer:	Adam Silverwood		
Valid Date:	11/02/2026		
Applicant:	see company name		
Agent:	SM Planning		

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development seeks planning permission for the construction of two lower ground floor basement flats beneath the existing property, together with alterations to the roof from a pitched form to a mansard roof, incorporating the creation of two additional flats within the roof space.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area, which is described in the Character Appraisal as being "formed by its high percentage of buildings of architectural merit, its topography, its green open spaces and distant views". Cholmeley Park is specifically referenced on page 69 of the appraisal as containing several listed buildings, including the neo-classical Grade II listed Furnival House and Kempton House (constructed during the 1970s and 1980s). This particular part of Highgate experienced substantial development during the turn of the twentieth century.

The site itself is situated on a moderately steep gradient, sloping northwards away from the Grade II listed Furnival House, which is located approximately 55 metres from the site. Elm Court is a four-storey brick building set back approximately 8.4 metres from the road frontage. The wider site also includes a garage to the rear, accessed via a driveway immediately to the south of Elm Court. The site backs onto the rear gardens of residential properties at Winchester Place and, in part, the rear gardens of properties at Cromwell Avenue.

The surrounding buildings vary in both design and scale, with larger flatted developments located towards the top of the hill closer to Elm Court, and smaller single residential dwellings situated closer to the junction of Cholmeley Park and Causton Road. To the north of the site is a three-storey brick building featuring bay windows, a partial basement, and stepped access to the ground floor. To the south is a four-storey block of flats, notable for its ramped walkway constructed from painted blue metalwork, which forms its most prominent street-facing feature.

There is limited consistency within the wider area in terms of roof design and the scale of dwellings. Some properties benefit from landscaped frontages with modest parking provision, while others comprise larger dwellings with gated frontages. The surrounding area also has a substantial degree of tree cover and, owing to its conservation area designation, contains a significant number of arboricultural assets.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2020/0575 - Construction of a new garden wall, side gates and resurfaced driveway following demolition of the existing front garden wall and new front porch and door. Approve with Conditions - 24/04/2020

HGY/2011/2317 - Replacement of existing metal (steel) UPVC windows / doors with double glazed windows / doors – Approve with Conditions: 06/02/2012

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Internal Consultees

LBH Transport - Officers advised that the application would be acceptable in transport terms subject to a number of matters being secured. Officers requested further details of the location, design, weatherproofing, security, and layout of the proposed cycle parking to demonstrate compliance with London Cycle Design Standards.

Given the site's PTAL rating of 4, officers supported the proposed car-free development and advised that this should be secured through a Section 106 agreement preventing future occupiers from obtaining residential parking permits, except for Blue Badge holders. Clarification was also requested regarding how the car-free arrangement would be managed and enforced.

Officers further requested the submission of a Construction Management Plan detailing construction logistics, construction vehicle management, delivery arrangements, mitigation of impacts on the highway network and neighbouring residents, and measures to minimise noise, dust, and disruption during the construction process.

Additional requirements included a pre-commencement highway dilapidation survey, servicing and delivery arrangements, and agreement with the Council's Highways Team to repair any damage to the highway or footways arising from the development works

LBH Conservation - Officers noted that Elm Court is located within the Highgate Conservation Area and that, while the building is a relatively plain 1950s infill development, it currently makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Officers advised that the proposed basement extension, including the lightwells and rear patio, is generally well integrated into the site and could be made acceptable subject to conditions securing appropriate materials and landscaping.

However, concerns were raised regarding the proposed upward extension. Conservation Officers considered that the existing roof form does not lend itself well to a mansard addition and advised that the proposed additional storey would appear bulky and prominent within the street scene, particularly due to the site's position on a bend in the road and rising land levels. Concerns were also raised that the proposals would alter the proportions and appearance of the existing building.

Further comments were made regarding the limited detail submitted for the proposed bin and cycle stores, particularly in relation to their potential impact on trees and the surrounding verdant character of the area. Officers considered that these details could potentially be addressed through planning conditions.

Overall, Conservation Officers advised that the proposed upward extension would not sufficiently preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore did not support the scheme in its current form.

LBH Carbon Management - As summarised the Officer advised that the proposed development would achieve a 62% reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions. However, officers raised concerns that the scheme does not currently comply with Policy SI2 of the London Plan and Policy SP4 of the Local Plan, as it fails to achieve the required 20% reduction through on-site renewable energy generation, specifically through the installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels.

Officers confirmed that the submitted Energy Statement demonstrates that solar PV panels are feasible on the site and therefore requested further details and confirmation of their installation. Subject to conditions securing the provision of solar PV panels and compliance with the energy hierarchy, officers considered the proposal acceptable.

The development was also identified as not fully meeting the Council's zero-carbon requirements, resulting in a residual carbon shortfall of 1.6 tCO₂ per year. As such, a carbon offset contribution of £4,560 would be required, to be secured through a Unilateral Undertaking.

LBH Waste Management – Officers advised that the proposal represents a small extension to the existing residential building and confirmed that the additional recycling bin provision proposed as part of the development is acceptable. Officers further confirmed that waste and recycling collections for the additional units can be incorporated within the existing waste collection arrangements serving the site and, on this basis, raised no objection to the proposal.

LBH Arboricultural Officer - Officers have advised that, subject to compliance with the submitted Arboricultural Report, which can be secured by condition, the proposed basement development is acceptable. Officers further note that the limited root encroachment into T11 (Lime) at approximately 1% and T39 at approximately 0.5% is considered minor.

LBH SUD's and Flooding - Officers reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (Ref: 1334-C-RP-0002, Issue P03, dated 22 December 2025) and Drainage Strategy Report (Ref: 1334-C-RP-0001, Issue P02, dated 22 December 2025), both prepared by Cube Consulting Engineers.

Officers advised that they raise no objection to the proposed development. Subject to the development being constructed, managed, and maintained in accordance with the submitted reports, it is considered that the impacts relating to surface water drainage have been appropriately addressed.

5. LOCAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Local Residents

The application was subject to public consultation through the distribution of notification letters to neighbouring properties on 11/02/2026 and 31/03/2026, the publication of a notice in a local newspaper, and the display of a site notice outside the application site on 14/02/2026. Confirmation of the site notice display was received on 14/02/2026. From the public consultation, 24 objections were received and 2 statements of support.

Summary of Objections Raised

- Overlooking and loss of privacy from new upper-floor windows, balconies and roof terraces.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed basement-level patios and windows.
- Increased noise and disturbance arising from additional occupants, balconies, terraces and outdoor amenity areas.
- Noise, dust, air pollution and general disruption during the construction phase.
- Concerns regarding noise and vibration from proposed Exhaust Air Heat Pumps and associated plant.
- Potential impacts on groundwater, watercourses, drainage patterns and the water table arising from basement excavation.
- Concerns regarding subsidence, structural impacts and effects on neighbouring foundations associated with basement construction.
- Requests for a hydrogeological assessment and further investigation of drainage impacts.
- Increased pressure on on-street parking and concerns regarding parking displacement despite the proposed car-free nature of the development.
- Increased traffic, servicing and vehicle movements, including concerns regarding congestion on nearby roads.
- Overdevelopment of the site and excessive intensification of residential occupation.
- Increase in the number of occupants and associated reduction in residential amenity for existing residents.
- Loss of communal amenity space and concerns that parts of the shared garden would become effectively private areas for the proposed flats.
- Loss of green space and erosion of the spacious character of the site.
- Harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.
- Impact on trees within the Conservation Area.
- Impact on biodiversity and wildlife, including bats and owls.
- Concerns regarding the effect of construction works on neighbouring residents' wellbeing and enjoyment of their homes and gardens.

- Lack of step-free access and concerns regarding accessibility for disabled residents and people with reduced mobility.
- Concerns that emergency and vehicle access for existing residents could be disrupted during construction.
- Alleged lack of public consultation and concerns that neighbouring residents were not properly notified of the application.
- Requests for an extension of the consultation period.
- Concerns that the development would set a precedent for future development within the grounds.
- Concerns regarding the future redevelopment of the garages and rear garden areas for additional residential units.
- Requests that any permission include restrictions preventing or limiting further development of the site.
- Concerns regarding the effect of further development on neighbouring properties in Winchester Place and Cromwell Avenue.
- Concerns regarding the long-term protection of the site's car-free status.
- Concerns regarding spoil removal and construction traffic associated with basement excavation.

Summary of Supporting Comments

- Proposal represents high-quality architecture and design.
- Revised roof form would improve the appearance of the existing building.
- Development is appropriate within the context of the street and surrounding area.
- Proposal would make efficient use of a large residential site.
- Development would contribute towards housing delivery.
- Scheme would provide additional high-quality living accommodation.
- Design is considered proportionate and sympathetic to the host building.
- Proposal would reduce the overall ridge height of the building and sit more comfortably within the landscape.
- Materials and architectural detailing are considered attractive and well considered

Local Community Groups

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- Basement development: Concerns that the sloping site could increase groundwater movement, waterlogging, and flooding to neighbouring properties lower down the hill; further boreholes and site investigations requested.

- Amenity space: Proposed roof-level balconies are considered undersized and not compliant with GLA minimum private amenity space standards for the proposed flats.
- Balcony design: Semi-recessed balconies reduce usable amenity space and some balconies are accessed from bedrooms rather than living spaces, contrary to GLA guidance.
- Mansard roof design: Proposed mansard windows are considered out of keeping with traditional mansard design and harmful to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.
- Trees: Concerns raised regarding previous tree removals on the site and whether replacement planting has been carried out and maintained.
- Tree protection: All retained trees, including limes adjacent to the driveway, should be protected during demolition, excavation, and construction works.
- Public consultation: Concerns that neighbouring residents were not properly notified of the application and were not given sufficient time to comment.
- Neighbouring amenity: Concerns regarding overlooking, noise, light pollution, and loss of privacy from proposed windows, terraces, and lower ground floor development. The proposal is considered contrary to Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD due to perceived impacts on neighbouring amenity.

The Highgate Society

- Roofscape and mansard extension: The proposed mansard roof extension is considered harmful to the established roofscape character of the area. Objectors consider that the existing pitched roof form contributes positively to the surrounding townscape through its balanced and visually lightweight appearance, whereas the proposed mansard would appear bulkier, top-heavy, and visually dominant, eroding the building's relationship with the surrounding Highgate Conservation Area.
- Overdevelopment and intensification: Concerns are raised that the proposal represents an over-intensification of the site through the combined introduction of four additional flats, basement excavation, roof extension, and substantial internal reconfiguration. The extent of excavation and alteration is considered disproportionate to the relatively limited housing gain.
- Loss of landscaping and green character: The proposed lightwells are considered likely to reduce garden space and soft landscaping, fragmenting the verdant character of the site and harming the established green setting that contributes to the wider character of Highgate.
- Basement development and ground conditions: Concerns are raised regarding the suitability of basement development in Highgate due to the area's historically complex geology, including variable subsoils, springs, sand lenses, groundwater movement, and unstable strata. Objectors consider

basement development in this location cannot be treated as routine and requires significantly more robust technical justification.

- Adequacy of Basement Impact Assessment (BIA): The submitted basement, drainage, and structural reports are considered preliminary and insufficiently robust to demonstrate policy compliance. Concerns are raised that the BIA relies heavily on a single nearby 1986 borehole record and uses “below ground level” measurements rather than Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) levels, which objectors consider limits the accuracy of the analysis.
- Local geology and groundwater: Objectors dispute the reports’ conclusion that competent London Clay exists close to the surface, arguing that the site instead contains variable made ground, sand, clay, and gravel layers with significant groundwater movement. Reference is made to historic borehole data recording groundwater approximately 3.26m below ground level.
- Groundwater interception and structural risk: Concerns are raised that the proposed basement excavation depth and foundations could intercept groundwater flows. Objectors dispute statements within the BIA suggesting groundwater would simply flow around the basement structure, citing concerns that diverted groundwater could destabilise adjacent soils and foundations, potentially causing structural damage to neighbouring properties.
- Slope stability and structural calculations: Concerns are raised that the reports conclude impacts would remain within Burland Scale 1 damage levels without providing detailed calculations or analysis appropriate to the steeply sloping nature of the site and surrounding land.
- Existing building stability: Objectors note that no detailed structural assessment of the existing building has been provided to demonstrate that the structure can safely accommodate both the basement excavation below and the additional mansard storey above.
- Construction monitoring and resident safety: Concerns are raised that insufficient detail has been provided regarding structural monitoring, mitigation measures, and construction management, particularly given that existing residents are expected to remain in occupation during the works.
- Drainage infrastructure: Concerns are raised that the site’s private drainage network has not been fully investigated despite conclusions being drawn within the flood risk assessment regarding groundwater and drainage impacts.
- Further technical investigations requested: Requests are made for additional structural, topographical, hydrogeological, geotechnical, and drainage investigations, including site-specific boreholes, seasonal groundwater monitoring, detailed impact assessments, and slope-specific structural calculations.

- Design life of structure: Concerns are raised that the assumed 50-year structural design life before significant maintenance is inadequate for a permanent residential building comprising 12 flats.
- Independent review: A further independent Campbell Reith audit of the revised basement and structural reports is requested prior to determination.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Design & heritage
3. Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity
4. Standard and Quality of Accommodation
5. Inclusive Access
6. Basement Excavation
7. Transport and Parking
8. Waste and Recycling
9. Energy and Sustainability
10. Trees and Biodiversity
11. Fire Safety

Principle of Development

Supply of Housing / Small Sites

Government policy, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024), places significant weight on boosting housing delivery and making effective use of previously developed urban land. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF confirms that Local Planning Authorities should significantly boost the supply of homes, whilst paragraph 73 recognises that small and medium-sized sites can make an important contribution towards meeting local housing needs, often delivering development relatively quickly. Paragraph 129 further supports the efficient use of land, including through the optimisation of sites in sustainable urban locations, whilst balancing such growth against the need to maintain the character and appearance of an area.

The London Plan (2021) similarly places substantial emphasis on the contribution that small sites can make towards meeting London's housing needs. Policy H2 (Small Sites) establishes a presumption in favour of small housing developments on under-utilised sites, particularly where sites are located within areas of good public transport accessibility and within walking distance of public transport nodes. The application site benefits from a PTAL rating of 4 and is located within approximately

800 metres of Highgate Underground Station, representing a sustainable location for additional residential development.

London Plan Policies GG2, D3 and H1 further support the optimisation of brownfield and under-utilised sites through a design-led approach which secures additional housing whilst responding appropriately to local character and context. The proposal seeks to intensify the residential use of an existing residential building through the sensitive extension and adaptation of the property, rather than through the loss of open land or redevelopment of a vacant site.

Policy SC1 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) seeks to facilitate the delivery of additional housing within Highgate and confirms that significant weight should be afforded to developments which contribute towards a broader mix of housing sizes and types within the area. In particular, the policy supports the provision of smaller residential units and developments which make efficient use of land whilst contributing towards balanced and sustainable communities.

The proposal would deliver four additional self-contained residential units within an existing flatted building through a combination of basement and roof extensions.

The development would increase the efficient use of an established residential site whilst maintaining its existing residential function. The proposal would also contribute towards local and strategic housing supply objectives through the provision of additional housing within a sustainable location with good access to public transport, services and facilities.

Whilst the proposal results in an intensification of the site, Officers are satisfied that, subject to the detailed considerations relating to design, heritage, residential quality and neighbour amenity assessed elsewhere within this report, the principle of providing additional residential accommodation at this location is acceptable. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the objectives of the NPPF (2024), the London Plan (2021), the Haringey Local Plan and the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan in relation to housing delivery and the optimisation of small urban sites.

Further development on site

A number of representations raised concerns regarding potential future redevelopment of the garages and rear garden areas. Officers note that no such development forms part of the current application and any future proposal for additional residential development within the site would require its own planning application and would be assessed on its own merits against the development plan and other material considerations prevailing at that time. The possibility of future development is therefore not a matter that can be considered here.

Design & heritage

Policy Context

Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) states that all new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Development proposals are required to relate positively to neighbouring structures, contribute positively to place making, respond appropriately to local context, and demonstrate high quality architecture, detailing, and materials.

London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality design and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D3 (Optimising Site Capacity Through the Design-Led Approach) states that development proposals should enhance the local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance, proportion and massing, with due regard to street hierarchy, building typologies and established urban grain.

Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management DPD Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character. Policy DM1 requires that development proposals relate positively to neighbouring buildings through careful consideration of scale, form, massing, building heights, materials and architectural detailing.

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings conserve their significance. Similarly, Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment. Policy DM9 requires extensions and alterations, including roof extensions, to be of a high quality, site-specific and sensitive design that respects the form, proportions, architectural character and detailing of the host building and surrounding heritage context.

Policies within the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan are also material considerations in the assessment of this application. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that development proposals preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets and respond sensitively to the established character of the area.

The application site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area. The significance of the Conservation Area, as identified within the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2013), derives from the historic pattern of development, the large number of buildings of architectural merit, the

topography of the area, and the relationship of the built environment to open spaces and verdant landscaping.

In reaching this conclusion, special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Character of the Host Building and Street Scene

The host building itself is a mid-20th century infill block and is not identified within the Conservation Area Appraisal as a positive contributor to the significance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the building remains part of the wider significance of the Conservation Area, its neutral contribution affords some flexibility for sensitive contemporary adaptation. The building is of a relatively utilitarian architectural appearance compared to many surrounding Victorian and Edwardian properties.

The character of Cholmeley Park and the wider area is notably varied in terms of architectural style, building scale and roof form. The street contains a mixture of detached villas, later flatted developments, institutional buildings and altered properties with differing roof profiles and architectural treatments. This varied character is further influenced by the steeply sloping topography of the area, generous building set-backs, extensive mature landscaping and tree cover, all of which filter and soften views within the street scene. Buildings are therefore experienced in layered and partial views rather than as continuous uniform terraces.

Within this varied townscape context, mansard roof forms are not uncommon on larger buildings within the immediate and surrounding area. The flatted development opposite the site, Parklands, incorporates a mansard roof, whilst additional examples are evident within the nearby Channing School Estate and through the more contemporary mansard roof extension at Furnival House. The surrounding roofscape is therefore neither uniform nor historically fixed to the extent that the introduction of a further mansard roof form would appear wholly incongruous within the context of the Conservation Area.

Evolution of the Design

Concerns were raised at pre-application stage and through consultation responses regarding the scale, prominence and proportions of the proposed roof extension. These concerns have been considered through the evolution of the submitted design.

In response, the scale and proportions of the openings within the principal front elevation have been revised and reduced from earlier iterations of the scheme. This amendment specifically sought to address concerns that the previously proposed taller patio doors, together with the limited depth above the openings, would exaggerate the apparent vertical proportions and visual height of the roof extension.

The revised fenestration arrangement now presents more modestly proportioned openings with greater visual solidity around and above the windows, resulting in a more balanced and subordinate roof form.

Similarly, the extent of the recessed cut-outs and terraces within the rear roof slope has been substantially reduced. These amendments have lessened the visual prominence of the roof extension and achieved a more coherent and refined design composition when viewed from surrounding properties and longer public views. The submitted visualisations also demonstrate that the tall chimneys to either side of the principal front elevation would be retained. The continued presence of these prominent vertical elements assists in visually framing the roof extension and preserving the established rhythm and proportions of the existing building within the street scene.

Assessment of Visual and Heritage Impact

Whilst the concerns raised by the Council's Conservation Officers are acknowledged, it is considered that the revised mansard extension responds appropriately to both the host building and the varied character of the surrounding area.

The proposed roof form would sit below the highest point of the existing roof structure and would reduce the existing ridge height when compared against the current roof arrangement. Whilst the roof profile would change, the development would not materially increase the apparent height or overall scale of the building when experienced from the public realm.

Whilst the roof extension would be visible within certain public views along Cholmeley Park, visibility in itself does not necessarily equate to heritage harm, particularly within a varied and evolving townscape context. Given the varied roofscape of the area, the altered and neutral contribution of the host building, the sloping topography, mature street trees and the layered manner in which buildings are viewed along Cholmeley Park, Officers do not consider that the proposed roof extension would result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed basement extensions and associated lightwells are comparatively discreet in visual terms and are largely contained beneath the footprint of the

existing building. Subject to conditions securing final materials, landscaping and detailing, the basement works are considered capable of integrating appropriately into the site without resulting in material harm to the character or appearance of the area.

Impact on the Setting of Listed Buildings

The proposal has also been assessed in relation to nearby listed buildings, including the Grade II listed Furnival House and Elisabeth House. Taking account of the siting, scale and appearance of the proposed development, together with the established separation distances, mature landscaping and varied built context, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the setting or significance of these listed buildings.

The proposed roof extension would be experienced within the wider layered townscape of Cholmeley Park and would not interrupt or compete with the architectural prominence or appreciation of nearby listed buildings. The proposal therefore preserves the setting of nearby designated heritage assets in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Planning Balance and Conditions

Officers acknowledge that some limited change to the appearance of the building would result from the development. However, when assessed in the context of the wider townscape and the revised design approach, any identified heritage harm would, at most, fall within the very low end of the “less than substantial harm” category under the NPPF.

In this instance, substantial weight is also afforded to the public benefits arising from the proposal, including the provision of four additional self-contained residential units within a sustainable urban location, contributing towards local and strategic housing supply objectives and the efficient use of a small urban site.

Furthermore, conditions are recommended requiring the submission and approval of detailed architectural drawings and material specifications, including large-scale details of windows, doors, balustrades, roof edges, slate finishes and associated external detailing. These conditions will ensure that the final execution and materiality of the roof extension achieves a high quality architectural finish appropriate to its Conservation Area setting.

Taking all of the above into account, the development is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area and preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in design and heritage terms in accordance with the policies outlined above.

Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that development proposals should not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers and should provide appropriate levels of daylight, sunlight, privacy and outlook whilst minimising overshadowing impacts. Similarly, DPD Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) requires development proposals to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for both future occupiers and neighbouring residents, having regard to overlooking, loss of outlook, daylight, sunlight, noise and general disturbance.

Objections have been received from neighbouring occupiers raising concerns regarding overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance associated with the construction process, and the general intensification of residential activity arising from the additional units. These matters have been carefully considered in the assessment of the application.

Privacy and overlooking

Concerns have been raised regarding overlooking from the proposed roof terraces, dormer openings and rear-facing glazing. During the evolution of the scheme, the extent of glazing and recessed openings at roof level has been substantially reduced from earlier iterations in order to lessen perceptions of overlooking and visual prominence. The revised design now incorporates more limited and carefully proportioned openings within the mansard roof form.

The relationship between the proposed roof extension and neighbouring properties must also be viewed within the context of the surrounding urban environment, whereby there is already an established degree of mutual overlooking between neighbouring residential buildings and gardens. Furthermore, the site benefits from substantial separation distances to neighbouring properties to the rear, generally in the order of approximately 30–40 metres, together with mature tree cover and layered landscaping which significantly filters views between properties.

Whilst the introduction of additional windows and terraces would inevitably create some additional intervisibility, Officers do not consider that the proposal would result in a materially harmful or unacceptable loss of privacy when assessed within the context of the existing urban environment and the established relationship between surrounding buildings.

Impact on outlook, daylight & sunlight

The proposed roof extension would sit below the highest point of the existing roof structure and would not materially increase the apparent scale or bulk of the building as experienced from surrounding properties. As such, the proposal is not considered likely to give rise to any significant additional overshadowing, loss of outlook or overbearing impact to adjoining occupiers.

Given the positioning of surrounding buildings, the retained separation distances and the revised roof form, the proposal is not considered to result in any unacceptable impact on daylight or sunlight received by neighbouring residential properties.

Loss of amenity space

A number of objections raised concerns regarding the reduction in communal amenity space available to existing residents and the perception that the proposed patios would effectively privatise parts of the existing garden. Officers note that whilst small areas adjacent to the proposed lower ground floor units would become private amenity space, the site would retain substantial communal landscaped grounds for use by all residents. The quantum of communal amenity space remaining is considered sufficient for the scale of development proposed and the limited loss of communal area would not justify refusal of the application.

Noise and residential activity

Concerns have also been raised regarding increased activity associated with the additional residential units. Whilst the proposal would intensify the residential use of the site to a degree, the development would remain wholly residential in character and is not considered likely to generate noise and activity levels beyond those reasonably expected within an urban flatted development.

The site already operates as a residential building with communal amenity areas and associated comings and goings from residents. The addition of four units would not, in Officers' view, result in such an increase in activity as to materially harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Comments were received from the nearest adjoining occupier expressing concern that the proposed basement patios on the northern elevation would create an echo chamber effect, resulting in noise reverberating between the properties. It was also suggested that the patios would become areas for congregation, giving rise to unacceptable noise and disturbance that would be detrimental to neighbouring living conditions. Officers undertook a site inspection to assess these concerns.

The patio areas would be located approximately 4.5 to 5.5 metres from the neighbouring property. Whilst there is a boundary wall between the two sites, Officers do not consider that the introduction of patio areas in this location would generate a significant increase in activity beyond that reasonably associated with residential occupation. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence before the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the patios would give rise to noise levels materially different from those typically experienced between neighbouring residential properties.

Concerns were also raised regarding the potential noise and vibration impacts arising from any Exhaust Air Heat Pumps serving the development. Such equipment forms part of the building's domestic heating and ventilation system and is comparable in function to conventional residential heating infrastructure. As a result, it would generally be expected to operate at low noise levels consistent with those ordinarily associated with residential occupation. Nevertheless, in the interests of safeguarding neighbouring amenity, a condition is recommended requiring details of the equipment specification, location, predicted noise emissions and any necessary mitigation measures to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation. Subject to compliance with this condition, it is not considered that the equipment would give rise to unacceptable noise or vibration impacts.

Concerns were raised that the addition of four flats would result in over-intensification of the building and reduce the quality of accommodation enjoyed by existing residents. Whilst the number of units would increase from eight to twelve, officers are satisfied that the building would continue to operate satisfactorily as a residential development. The retained communal garden space, circulation areas and servicing arrangements are considered adequate to accommodate the increase in occupation and no unacceptable living conditions for existing residents would arise.

A number of representations also describe the proposal as overdevelopment, however it is noted the site comprises a substantial detached flatted development set within generous grounds in a sustainable location with good public transport accessibility. Having regard to the scale of the host building, the retained garden areas, the quality of accommodation proposed and the absence of unacceptable impacts on character, heritage assets, neighbouring amenity, drainage, trees or transport, officers do not consider the proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.

Construction Impacts and Basement Works

A number of objections relate to disruption during the construction process, particularly in relation to basement excavation works, noise, dust and disturbance to existing residents and neighbouring occupiers. It is acknowledged that the construction phase would result in a temporary degree of disruption and inconvenience, particularly given the extent of works proposed to the existing building. However, temporary construction impacts are not uncommon in an urban environment and subject to appropriate mitigation and management, would not warrant refusal of planning permission in this instance.

The basement proposals are accompanied by a Structural Assessment and Basement Impact Assessment which confirm that the building is founded on deep mass concrete footings that are to be retained and integrated into the proposed structure. The submitted information further confirms that the works would largely comprise the removal of material beneath the building rather than extensive open excavation works. The basement construction methodology is therefore considered relatively low impact in engineering terms.

A Construction Management Plan condition is recommended requiring details relating to construction logistics, hours of work, noise mitigation, dust suppression, vehicle movements and measures to protect neighbouring amenity during the construction process. Compliance with the submitted Basement Impact Assessment and associated structural reports would also be secured by condition.

Taking all of the above into account, whilst it is acknowledged that there would be some temporary impact on neighbouring residents during the construction period and a degree of additional intervisibility associated with the completed development, Officers do not consider that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight, noise or disturbance. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

Standard and Quality of Accommodation

Policy D6 (Housing Quality and Standards) of the London Plan 2021 requires that housing development 'should be high quality and provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differing between tenures'. It further states within paragraph (c) that housing developments 'should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings', and that 'design of development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context whilst avoiding

overheating, minimising overshadowing, and maximising the useability of outside amenity space’.

The internal GIA for the dwellings is detailed in the table below.

Floor No.	Flat No.	Bed Spaces	G.I.A (sqm)	Requirement	Complies
Lower Ground	A	1B– 2P	54.7	50	Y
	B	3B – 2P	125	74	Y
Ground	1	2B-4P	79.2	79	Y
	2	2B-4P	78.6	79	Y
First	3	1B-2P	79.2	50	Y
	4	2B-4P	78.6	70	Y
Second	5	2B-4P	79.2	70	Y
	6	2B-4P	78.6	70	Y
Third	7	2B-4P	79.2	70	Y
	8	1B-2P	78.6	70	Y
Mansard	9	2B-4P	77.5	70	Y
	10	2B-4P	80.6	70	Y

Floor Area Standards

The proposed flats at lower ground floor level and within the mansard roof have been assessed against the requirements of London Plan Policy D6 and the Nationally Described Space Standards and are considered to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation. All proposed units exceed the relevant minimum gross internal floor area standards and provide appropriately sized bedrooms, storage and circulation space. The proposals would also increase the range of accommodation available within the existing building through the introduction of a family-sized unit alongside additional one and two-bedroom flats.

The submitted Design and Access Statement confirms that all flats have been designed to be dual aspect where possible, maximising natural light, ventilation and outlook. The upper floor flats within the mansard roof are arranged symmetrically and include generously sized living spaces, recessed terraces and good levels of outlook over surrounding landscaping and the wider roofscape. The basement accommodation has also been carefully designed to take advantage of the site’s sloping topography, allowing the lower ground floor units to function effectively as garden-level accommodation rather than traditional enclosed basement flats.

Daylight and Sunlight

The proposed basement and mansard flats are considered to provide appropriate levels of natural light and outlook consistent with the requirements of London Plan Policy D6 and the Mayor's Housing SPG.

The proposed lower ground floor Flat B would receive natural light and outlook primarily from the northern and eastern elevations through generously sized windows and patio doors adjacent to the private rear patio. Flat A would similarly benefit from openings to the eastern and southern elevations alongside access to a private patio area. Due to the sloping nature of the site, the basement accommodation benefits from substantial exposure above ground level, reducing the perception of enclosure typically associated with basement development.

Whilst Flat A includes a bathroom and kitchen without direct external windows, these rooms are ancillary accommodation rather than primary habitable spaces. Full details of mechanical ventilation and extraction systems will be secured by condition to ensure appropriate ventilation and internal environmental quality for future occupiers.

The proposed mansard flats would benefit from windows to both front and rear roof slopes together with recessed terraces, ensuring acceptable levels of daylight, outlook and natural ventilation. The revised roof design has also reduced the extent of recessed roof cut-outs and glazing, whilst still maintaining sufficient light penetration into the new units.

Overall, Officers are satisfied that the proposed flats would provide sufficient levels of natural light, outlook and ventilation appropriate to their urban context.

Amenity Space

Policy D6 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that residential development provides sufficient and functional private outdoor amenity space for future occupiers.

The proposed lower ground floor Flat B would benefit from approximately 13.5sqm of private patio garden space positioned adjacent to the principal living accommodation and with direct access to the communal gardens beyond. Flat A would also benefit from a smaller private patio area which provides usable outdoor amenity space and assists in delivering light and outlook to the accommodation.

The two upper floor mansard flats would each benefit from recessed roof terraces providing private external amenity space with outlook over the surrounding tree canopy and wider townscape. The terraces are integrated into the roof form and are considered acceptable in both functional and visual terms.

In addition to the private amenity areas provided for the new units, future occupiers would continue to have access to the substantial communal landscaped grounds surrounding Elm Court. Given the generous communal amenity environment already associated with the site, together with the proposed private terraces and patios, Officers are satisfied that the development provides an acceptable level of amenity space for future occupiers consistent with the objectives of London Plan Policy D6.

Inclusive Access

London Plan Policy D5 requires all new development to achieve the highest standard of accessible and inclusive design, seeking to ensure new development can be used easily and with dignity by all. London Plan Policy D7 requires that 10% of new housing is wheelchair accessible and that the remaining 90% is easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.

Paragraph 3.7.6 of the 2021 London Plan recognises that the application of M4(2), which requires lift access (a step free approach into the dwelling) may not be achievable in some circumstances, i.e., development associated with small sites (Policy H2) and as such advocates some flexibility. Para. 2.3.11 of the Mayor's Housing SPG, notes that in some circumstances where step-free access is clearly undeliverable, M4(1) standards can be applied.

Level access to the main building is achieved from Cholmeley Park Road, and a lift serving both the basement and mansard flats would provide step-free access throughout the development. This is considered acceptable and would also improve accessibility for the existing flats within the building. A condition has been attached requiring compliance with M4(2) standards to be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Basement Development

Policy Context

DPD Policy DM18 (Residential Basement Development and Light Wells) requires basement development to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely affect the structural stability of the application site or neighbouring properties, increase flood risk, adversely impact neighbouring amenity, or harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area or local environment. Policy DM24 additionally requires development proposals to appropriately manage and reduce surface water runoff.

Policy DH7 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan similarly requires basement development proposals to demonstrate that there would be no unacceptable impacts relating to drainage, flooding, groundwater movement, structural stability or damage to neighbouring buildings.

The supporting text to Policy DM18 recognises that basement development can contribute towards the efficient use of land in sustainable urban areas, provided that proposals are appropriately designed and constructed and supported by sufficient technical information. Similarly, the London Plan recognises that well-designed basement development can contribute towards the optimisation of urban sites whilst requiring careful management of impacts relating to construction, hydrology and neighbouring amenity.

Proposed basement development

The proposal includes the formation of two additional residential units at lower ground floor level beneath the existing building footprint together with associated lightwells, retaining walls and external amenity areas. The development has been designed to respond to the sloping topography of the site, allowing the proposed accommodation to function as garden-level accommodation with direct access to external spaces rather than as fully subterranean basement units.

The submitted Design and Access Statement explains that the sloping topography of the site allows the lower ground floor accommodation to operate more akin to a garden level than a traditional enclosed basement environment. The design utilises the natural fall in levels across the site to provide direct access to external amenity areas, natural daylight and outward views to the proposed flats.

The proposed basement would largely be formed beneath the footprint of the existing building with relatively modest external alterations limited to new lightwells, retaining structures and associated landscaping works. Importantly, officers note that the engineering circumstances of this proposal differ materially from those commonly associated with substantial basement excavations beneath existing residential buildings.

The existing building is elevated above surrounding ground levels, sitting approximately eight steps above the principal ground level, with the north-eastern corner of the building more substantially exposed owing to the site's sloping topography. As a consequence, the building already incorporates a significant undercroft or floor void beneath the existing ground floor. The submitted Structural Report and Basement Impact Assessment explain that the proposed works largely involve excavating existing backfilled material within this area to create a usable lower ground floor rather than constructing an entirely new storey beneath an

existing building. The submitted report specifically confirms that "the proposed underside of the new slab is set above the underside of the existing mass concrete foundations so no underpinning of the existing walls will be required" and that the works involve "excavating the backfilled floor void below ground floor to create a useable lower ground floor level".

Officers therefore consider that the proposal represents a relatively modest and contained form of basement intervention when compared against more extensive subterranean developments that require the formation of entirely new below-ground floors and associated underpinning works beneath existing structures.

Structural Stability

The application is supported by a Structural Report, Basement Impact Assessment and subsequent technical clarification note prepared by Cube Consulting Engineers. The submitted information confirms that the existing building is founded on substantial mass concrete foundations extending to approximately 2.8m below ground level which are proposed to be retained and integrated within the new structure.

In response to concerns regarding the condition of the existing building, the applicant's structural engineers confirm that the building has been inspected and found to be structurally robust with no evidence of structural movement requiring crack monitoring. The only identified structural concern relates to elements of the existing loft structure where some purlins and props appear overstressed and have been temporarily propped in the past. These works are proposed to be addressed as part of the roof conversion proposals and are not considered indicative of wider structural instability affecting the building.

The submitted structural information concludes that the proposed basement is technically feasible and can be delivered using reinforced concrete retaining walls, localised steelwork, ground-bearing slabs and a phased construction methodology. A key consideration in this case is that the proposal does not require underpinning of the existing building. Rather, the existing mass concrete foundations are retained and the basement slab is specifically designed to remain above foundation level. This significantly differentiates the proposal from many basement developments where extensive underpinning and deep excavation beneath existing structural walls are necessary.

The construction sequence proposes a controlled trench-in excavation methodology with temporary shoring, support measures and structural monitoring incorporated throughout the works. Whilst detailed temporary works designs would be progressed

following grant of permission, officers are satisfied that an appropriate engineering strategy has been demonstrated in principle.

It is recognised that construction may be undertaken whilst parts of the building remain occupied. The submitted information indicates that structural monitoring, temporary support arrangements and phased construction techniques would be employed to maintain structural stability during the works. Detailed measures relating to occupation, resident protection, site safety and construction management would be secured through a Construction Management Plan condition.

Given the nature of the works and concerns raised by residents and the Highgate Society, Officers consider it appropriate to secure additional safeguards through planning condition. Accordingly, a condition is recommended requiring the appointment of a suitably qualified Chartered Structural Engineer prior to commencement of any below-ground works. The engineer would be required to oversee all critical structural elements including excavation, foundation and groundworks operations and ensure that appropriate structural and ground movement monitoring is implemented throughout construction with the objective of ensuring impacts do not exceed Burland Category 1 damage criteria. This provides an additional level of assurance that the structural integrity of both the host building and neighbouring properties will be safeguarded during construction.

Whilst basement construction would inevitably result in a degree of temporary disruption, including noise, vibration and construction activity, such impacts are temporary in nature and are not considered sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission. A Construction Management Plan condition is recommended requiring detailed controls over construction hours, dust suppression, vehicle movements, noise mitigation, structural monitoring and site management practices in the interests of protecting neighbouring amenity.

Geology and ground conditions

A number of representations have raised concerns regarding local geological conditions within Highgate, including references to sand and gravel lenses, spring-fed conditions and perched groundwater.

The Basement Impact Assessment identifies the site as being underlain predominantly by London Clay together with localised Made Ground and superficial deposits. The submitted reports identify geological conditions characteristic of this part of Highgate and indicate that competent London Clay is expected to be encountered at relatively shallow depth.

In response to the concerns raised, the applicant's engineers clarify that no underpinning is proposed and that the retaining walls have been designed on a precautionary basis to accommodate anticipated ground and groundwater pressures. The applicant further advises that full site-specific borehole investigations and trial pits will be undertaken prior to construction works to confirm groundwater conditions, local geology and detailed design parameters for the retaining structures. The findings will inform the final detailed design of the basement and associated retaining walls.

Whilst some detailed geotechnical investigation remains to be undertaken, officers are satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted at the planning stage to demonstrate that the proposal is capable of being delivered without unacceptable risk to structural stability, subject to the recommended planning conditions and further technical assessment undertaken at detailed design stage.

Flood Risk

The submitted Basement Impact Assessment and Flood Risk Assessment confirm that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered to be at low risk from tidal, fluvial, reservoir and surface water flooding.

Representations have raised concerns regarding groundwater levels, perched groundwater and the possibility of natural spring conditions associated with the Highgate hillside. The submitted assessments indicate that groundwater may potentially be encountered at approximately 3m below ground level. The applicant's engineers acknowledge that parts of Highgate are known for natural springs and advise that groundwater ingress remains a potential construction risk that would be addressed through the contractor's construction methodology and risk management procedures should it be encountered.

Officers nevertheless consider it important to recognise the specific circumstances of this site. As outlined above, the proposal largely comprises excavation of backfilled material within an existing void beneath a building that is already elevated above surrounding ground levels. The proposal does not involve extensive new excavation extending well below the existing foundations, nor does it require underpinning works. The existing foundations are retained and the proposed basement slab is designed to remain above the underside of those foundations.

The building also occupies a relatively generous site with substantial open land surrounding the structure and significant separation from site boundaries. Unlike some basement developments that create extensive impermeable subterranean structures across much of a site, the proposed development remains substantially

confined within the footprint and structural envelope already established by the existing building.

Officers further note that traditional mass concrete foundations are not generally intended to operate as impermeable groundwater barriers and groundwater movement would continue to have available pathways around the building through surrounding land. Given the retention of the existing foundation arrangement, the absence of underpinning, and the relatively limited nature of the excavation proposed, officers are satisfied that the development is unlikely to materially impede groundwater movement, create significant groundwater damming effects, or give rise to unacceptable hydrogeological impacts affecting neighbouring properties.

The submitted Basement Impact Assessment similarly concludes that the development is unlikely to adversely affect local hydrogeology or groundwater movement. Whilst localised groundwater may potentially be encountered during construction, there is no substantive evidence before officers to indicate that the proposal would result in unacceptable groundwater diversion, erosion, scouring or impacts to neighbouring land, foundations or infrastructure. Any groundwater encountered during excavation would be managed through the contractor's detailed construction methodology and associated risk assessments.

The Council's Flood and SuDS Officers reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and raised no objection to the proposal subject to compliance with the approved drainage strategy.

Structural Movement and Monitoring

The Basement Impact Assessment concludes that impacts to surrounding structures can be maintained within Burland Category 1 damage criteria. Whilst representations questioned the basis of this conclusion and the proposed monitoring regime, the applicant's engineers confirm that movement monitoring equipment would be installed before commencement of works and retained during construction and for a period following completion, currently anticipated to be between six and twelve months. A detailed monitoring specification, including monitoring frequency, trigger levels and response measures, would be developed following completion of the proposed site investigations and would form part of the contractor's construction documentation.

Officers acknowledge that detailed monitoring arrangements are not yet finalised. However, the proposed planning condition requiring the appointment of an independent Chartered Structural Engineer, together with requirements for ongoing structural monitoring and achievement of Burland Category 1 performance criteria,

provides an appropriate mechanism to ensure that structural risks are carefully managed throughout the construction process.

Drainage Infrastructure

Representations also questioned the existing drainage arrangements and the extent to which current drainage infrastructure has been verified.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment confirms that the site currently drains to an existing below-ground drainage network and proposes connection of the new foul and surface water drainage systems into that network. The applicant acknowledges that the precise arrangement and condition of the existing drainage infrastructure has not yet been fully verified and confirms that a CCTV drainage survey will be undertaken before construction to establish the exact location, alignment and condition of the existing drainage system. Any defects identified would be appropriately remediated.

The proposed drainage infrastructure would connect locally to the existing drainage network around the building. Officers are satisfied that the submitted information demonstrates a viable drainage solution in principle and that detailed implementation matters can be secured through planning condition.

Trees and landscaping

The submitted Basement Impact Assessment confirms that the proposal would not require the removal of existing trees and would retain the majority of the site's landscaped character. The proposed lightwells and associated landscaping have been designed to integrate with the site's sloping topography and landscaped setting. Landscape reinstatement and planting are proposed following completion of works. The proposed lightwells and external interventions are relatively limited in extent and would be softened through landscaping secured by condition.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the basement element of the scheme is relatively discreet in visual terms and would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

Design Life

Representations also sought clarification regarding references within the structural report to a 50-year design life.

The applicant's structural engineers confirm that this reference relates to the standard minimum structural design life for a Category 4 building under BS EN 1990

and not to the overall lifespan of the building. The engineers advise that the building itself is expected to remain serviceable for well in excess of 100 years subject to normal maintenance, including activities such as repointing, replacement of roof coverings, maintenance of flashings and replacement of windows and doors as necessary.

Conclusion

Officers acknowledge the concerns raised by local residents and the Highgate Society regarding structural stability, geology, groundwater conditions, drainage infrastructure, structural monitoring and construction methodology.

Having considered the submitted Structural Report, Basement Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and the applicant's subsequent technical clarification note, officers are satisfied that the proposal has demonstrated an acceptable approach to structural stability, groundwater management, flood risk and construction methodology. Particular weight is attributed to the physical characteristics of the site, including the existing elevated building form, the presence of an existing undercroft beneath the ground floor, the retention of the existing foundations, the absence of underpinning works, and the fact that the proposal largely comprises the excavation of previously backfilled material rather than the creation of an entirely new basement beneath the structure.

Subject to conditions securing compliance that the basement works are overseen by a qualified Chartered Structural Engineer to oversee all below-ground works and implement an appropriate structural monitoring regime, officers are satisfied that the proposed basement development would not result in unacceptable impacts relating to structural stability, groundwater movement, drainage, flood risk or neighbouring amenity.

Accordingly, the basement development is considered to comply with Policies DM1, DM18 and DM24 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy DH7 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan.

Transport and Parking

Policy DM32 (Parking) of the Development Management DPD (2017) requires development proposals to accord with the parking standards of the London Plan and supports low-car and car-free development in locations with good access to public transport. Policies T5 and T6 of the London Plan promote sustainable travel choices, appropriate cycle parking provision and restraint in car parking provision. Policy TR4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan similarly supports car-free development in highly accessible locations.

The site benefits from a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 4 and is located within reasonable walking distance of Highgate and Archway Underground Stations, together with a number of bus services. The site is therefore considered to be well served by public transport and local facilities.

The proposal would increase the number of residential units from eight to twelve but would not result in any increase in on-site car parking provision. Given the site's accessibility and the policy support for car-free and low-car development in such locations, Officers consider this approach acceptable, with this to be secured as per a condition imposed. The works would not materially alter existing vehicular access arrangements and is not expected to result in severe residual impacts on the local highway network.

The submitted plans indicate provision of cycle parking to serve the development. Whilst the principle of cycle parking is supported, officers consider that further details are required regarding the design, capacity, dimensions, siting and appearance of the cycle store. Accordingly, a condition is recommended requiring full details of the cycle storage facilities to be submitted and approved prior to first occupation.

Objections have been received regarding parking pressures, traffic disruption and access arrangements during construction. Whilst construction activity may give rise to temporary impacts, these are inherently short-term in nature and do not, in this instance, constitute grounds to refuse a development. Furthermore, such impacts can be appropriately controlled through a Construction Management Plan, which would secure measures relating to deliveries, contractor parking, traffic management, pedestrian safety and the maintenance of safe access for existing residents throughout the construction period.

Subject to this condition, officers are satisfied that the development would promote sustainable travel choices and accord with the transport objectives of the Development Management DPD, Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and London Plan.

Waste and Recycling

8.120 DM DPD Policy DM4 requires proposals to sustainably manage waste arising during design, construction and occupation. Developments should provide on-site facilities for general waste, recyclables and organic material, with adequate internal and external storage and safe, accessible arrangements for occupiers and collection operatives. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH8 further requires that waste and recycling facilities in new buildings are well-designed and discreetly integrated into the overall scheme.

The submitted plans identify a location for refuse and recycling storage within the site with detailed information regarding the design, capacity, dimensions and appearance of the proposed facilities has not been provided at this stage.

Subject to compliance with this condition, officers are satisfied that adequate provision can be made for the storage and collection of refuse and recyclables and that the proposal accords with relevant local and London-wide waste management policies.

Energy and Sustainability

The London Plan, Local Plan Policy SP4 and DPD Policy DM21 require development to minimise energy demand, reduce carbon emissions and follow the energy hierarchy.

The application is supported by an Energy and Sustainability Statement prepared by Environmental Economics (December 2025), which proposes a fabric-first approach incorporating improved building performance, Exhaust Air Heat Pumps and Waste Water Heat Recovery systems. The submitted strategy demonstrates a 62% reduction in regulated carbon emissions compared with the Part L 2021 baseline.

The Council's Carbon Management Officers reviewed the proposal and advised that further assessment is required to demonstrate full compliance with the energy hierarchy and to consider opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation, including photovoltaic panels. As such, a condition is recommended requiring an updated Energy Assessment prior to above-ground construction, including consideration of PV installation, overheating mitigation and any additional low-carbon measures.

Any approved renewable energy and low-carbon technologies must be installed prior to first occupation and retained thereafter. A separate condition is being imposed requiring details of any Exhaust Air Heat Pumps, including their specification, location and noise mitigation measures, to ensure the amenities of existing and future occupiers are protected.

Subject to these conditions, officers are satisfied that the development would achieve a significant reduction in carbon emissions and comply with the relevant energy and sustainability policies.

Trees and Biodiversity

Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD requires development proposals to appropriately integrate landscaping and planting whilst safeguarding existing trees and biodiversity assets. Policies DM18 and DM19 seek to ensure that development, including basement development, does not result in unacceptable harm to trees, ecological assets or the wider natural environment. Policy G6 of the London Plan requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity and seek opportunities for biodiversity gains.

The application is supported by a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by GHA Trees (Ref: GHA/DS/160227:25). The assessment concludes that the proposed development would not require the removal or pruning of any trees either within the site or on neighbouring land and that the arboricultural character of the site would be retained. The report further concludes that, subject to appropriate tree protection measures being implemented during construction, the proposal would not result in harm to retained trees.

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment identifies only limited encroachment into the Root Protection Areas of trees T11 and T38 associated with the proposed lightwells and lower-ground-floor patios. These incursions are assessed as minor and acceptable and are not expected to adversely affect the health or longevity of the retained trees.

The Council's Arboricultural Officers have reviewed the submitted information and raise no objection subject to compliance with the recommendations and tree protection measures contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment. Accordingly, Condition 7 requires the development to be carried out in full accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement, including the installation of tree protection fencing prior to commencement of works and ongoing safeguards for retained trees throughout the construction period.

In respect of biodiversity, Officers note that Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) became a mandatory planning requirement for most developments in England from February 2024. However, the proposal falls within the statutory de minimis exemption as it does not involve the loss of any priority habitat and does not exceed the relevant habitat impact thresholds set out under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. As such, the development is not required to deliver the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.

Notwithstanding the exemption from mandatory BNG requirements, the submitted Design and Access Statement identifies additional planting and landscape enhancements across the site, including replacement shrub planting and improved

landscaped areas. To secure these benefits, Condition 4 requires details of the additional planting shown on the approved Proposed Habitat Gain and Loss Plan (Drawing 22P) to be submitted and approved, with replacement planting required where planting fails within five years.

It is also noted that concerns were raised regarding potential impacts upon wildlife, including bats and owls reported within neighbouring gardens. The proposed development is largely contained within the footprint of the existing building and would not result in the loss of trees or habitats identified as having significant ecological value. Furthermore, no evidence has been submitted demonstrating the presence of protected species within the building or areas affected by the development. Subject to the landscaping measures proposed, officers are satisfied that the development would not result in unacceptable impacts on biodiversity or protected species.

Fire Safety

London Plan Policy D12 seeks to ensure that development achieves high standards of fire safety. In this instance, the proposed development is not a "relevant building" for the purposes of the Planning Gateway One process, as it does not exceed 18 metres in height or comprise seven or more storeys. Accordingly, there is no requirement for the submission of a Fire Statement as part of this planning application.

The existing building benefits from access at both the front and rear and is served by a single internal staircase, which would be retained as part of the development. [

Given the scale and nature of the proposal, officers are satisfied that there is no requirement to undertake a detailed fire safety assessment as part of the planning process. It is, however, recognised that fire safety remains an important consideration and detailed matters relating to means of escape, compartmentation, smoke ventilation, firefighting access and overall compliance with Part B of the Building Regulations will be fully assessed through the Building Control process. On this basis, officers raise no objection in respect of fire safety.

Conclusion

The proposed development would provide four additional residential units within a sustainable location, making more efficient use of an existing residential site and contributing towards local and strategic housing delivery objectives.

Whilst the proposal would alter the appearance of the building through the introduction of a mansard roof extension and associated basement works, officers are satisfied that the scheme has been carefully designed to respond to the

characteristics of both the host building and the surrounding townscape. The host building is not identified as a positive contributor to the Highgate Conservation Area and the revised design, together with the varied roofscape, sloping topography and mature landscaping that characterise Cholmeley Park, ensure that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby heritage assets. Any heritage harm arising from the proposal would be at the very lowest end of the less-than-substantial harm spectrum and would be outweighed by the public benefits associated with the delivery of four additional homes.

Officers are also satisfied that the proposal would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers and would not result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity. Particular regard has been given to concerns relating to the basement development. Having considered the submitted structural, drainage and flood risk information, officers are satisfied that the proposed works can be undertaken without unacceptable impacts on structural stability, groundwater conditions, flood risk, drainage infrastructure or neighbouring properties, subject to the recommended conditions, including structural monitoring and Chartered Structural Engineer oversight.

Subject to the recommended conditions and legal agreement to secure the units as car free, the proposal is considered to accord with the policies outlined in above and planning permission is recommended for approval. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.

7. CIL Applicable

The application proposes 373.2 sqm of internal GIA, charged at £443.52 (Haringey CIL) and £72.73 (Mayoral CIL) would equate to a CIL charge of £165,521.7 + £27,142.83 = £192,662.53.

8. Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that this application be **APPROVED** in accordance with 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 below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission. Elm Court - AIA - Rev A - Nov 2025 revD_P12_SIDE[NORTH]ELEVATION revD_P13_SIDE[NORTH]ELEVATION revD_P14_SIDE[SOUTH]ELEVATION revD_P10_FRONT ELEVATION revD_P11_REAR ELEVATION revD_EX01_SITE PLAN_SC P_15 PROPOSED GARDEN FLOOR PLAN P_16 PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN P_17 PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN P_18 PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN P_19 PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR PLAN revD_P21_ROOF PLAN revD_P01_SITE PLAN_SC revD_P20_TOP FLOOR PLAN Existing and Proposed Foundation Sections Ref:P.22 Arboricultural Impact Assessment – Rev: A Structural Report & Basement Impact Assessment Ref: 1334-S-RP-0001 (P03) Drainage Strategy Ref:1334-C-RP-0001 (P02) Energy Report V2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 No development shall take place until full details of the external design and materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, comprising:

A. Detailed Design

Large-scale drawings at 1:5, 1:10 or 1:20 (as appropriate) of:

- i. Window and door frames, including reveals, sill profiles and junctions with external walls;
- ii. All proposed lower ground floor window and door openings, including heads, cills, reveals and their relationship with the adjoining patio areas;
- iii. Dormer construction, including cheeks, cladding, flashings and junctions with the main roof;
- iv. Any protective railings or balustrades, including fixing methods;
- v. The replacement chimney, including coping and termination details;
- vi. The junction between the steeper and lower roof pitches of the mansard;
- vii. Eaves, soffit and fascia details; and
- viii. Rooflights and their integration within the roof plane.

B. Materials

A schedule of external materials, including indicative product types, colours and finishes, with samples provided on request. This shall include details of the proposed hard surfacing materials to the lower ground floor patio areas.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a high-quality external appearance and to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

- 4 Prior to first occupation of the residential flats hereby approved, details of the additional planting shown on the approved Proposed Habitat Gain and Loss Plan (Drawing 22 P) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved planting shall be carried out during the first planting season following first occupation and shall thereafter be maintained. Any trees, shrubs or plants which die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years from the date of planting shall be replaced in the next available planting season with specimens of a similar size and species.

	Reason: To secure the delivery of landscaping and biodiversity enhancements in the interests of visual amenity, biodiversity and the character of the area, in accordance with Policies G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP13 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017).
5	Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved site layout plan indicating the location of the proposed cycle storage and refuse/recycling storage, full details of the design, dimensions, capacity, siting and external materials/finish of the storage structures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. The cycle parking and refuse/recycling storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development. Reason: To ensure the provision of high-quality, functional and visually appropriate cycle and refuse storage facilities, to promote sustainable transport choices, and to safeguard the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Development Management DPD (2017), Policies SP7 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policies SI7 and T5 of the London Plan (2021).
6	The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Energy and Sustainability Statement prepared by Environmental Economics (dated December 2025), delivering a minimum 62% reduction in carbon emissions over Part L 2021 through high-fabric efficiencies and a low-carbon heating system. (a) Energy Details – Prior to Above-Ground Construction Prior to above-ground construction, an updated Energy Assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include: i. confirmation of how the development will meet the zero-carbon policy requirement in line with the Energy Hierarchy ii. confirmation of the fabric efficiencies required to achieve at least a 10% Be Lean reduction; iii. details of measures to improve Energy Use Intensity and Space Heating Demand, demonstrating progress towards GLA benchmarks; iv. an assessment of the feasibility of incorporating PV array, having regard to the available roof area, heritage, design and technical constraints. Where such technologies are demonstrated to be feasible, full details shall be provided, including layout, orientation, specification, peak output and installation details;

- v. confirmation of any measures incorporated within the detailed design to minimise the risk of overheating.
- vi. specification of any additional low-carbon equipment to be installed.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and retained for the lifetime of the development. Where a photovoltaic (PV) array is approved pursuant to part (a)(iv) of this condition, it shall be installed with appropriate monitoring equipment prior to completion and maintained at least annually thereafter.

(b) Installation – Prior to First Occupation

Any on-site renewable energy generation and low-carbon equipment approved pursuant to part (a) of this condition shall be fully installed, commissioned and brought into use prior to first occupation of the relevant block and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces its impact on climate change by minimising on-site carbon emissions in accordance with the Energy Hierarchy, London Plan (2021) Policy SI2 and Haringey Local Plan (2017) Policies SP4 and DM22.

- 7 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations, tree protection measures and Arboricultural Method Statement contained within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by GHA Trees (Ref: GHA/DS/160227:25, dated 18 November 2025). All tree protection fencing shall be erected prior to the commencement of development and retained for the duration of the construction period. No storage of materials, site compounds, vehicle parking, excavation, level changes, service runs or other construction activities shall take place within the protected root protection areas except where expressly permitted by the approved Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure the protection of retained trees and their root protection areas during construction, in the interests of visual amenity, biodiversity and the character of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021), and BS5837:2012.

- 8 No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan including details of:

- a) A programme of works (including measures for traffic management).

- b) Vehicle routing and if any reversing manoeuvres on public highway land is required, provision for the management of their movement by a qualified and certificated banksman.
- c) Parking of vehicles, and details of any parking bay suspension required.
- d) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development.
- e) Details of any construction compound including the siting of any temporary site office, toilets, skips or any other structure.
- f) The erection and maintenance of scaffolding where appropriate, and measures to minimise impact on pedestrian movements.
- g) Details in respect of how existing owners or occupiers' ingress and egress will be managed throughout the development.
- h) Details in respect of how any adverse impact of noise, dust, vibration and traffic on adjoining and owners or occupiers and occupiers of the existing building will be mitigated.
- i) A photographic dilapidation survey of the highway, footway, crossover, kerbs, verges and other highway infrastructure adjacent to the site and along the construction access route from Cholmeley Park, together with details of how any damage arising from construction activities will be remedied.

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented and retained during the demolition and construction 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.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 9 | <p>Prior to first occupation of the residential flats hereby approved, details of the specification and location of any Exhaust Air Heat Pumps shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall demonstrate that the equipment has low operational noise and vibration levels and incorporates appropriate acoustic and anti-vibration measures to ensure that the amenities of occupiers of existing and proposed residential units are not adversely affected. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.</p> |
|---|--|

Reason: To protect residential amenity in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM23 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

- | | |
|----|--|
| 10 | <p>Prior to the commencement of any below-ground works, including excavation, underpinning and basement construction, details of the appointment of a suitably</p> |
|----|--|

	qualified Chartered Structural Engineer shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The appointed engineer shall be retained for the duration of the below-ground works and shall oversee the critical structural elements of the development, including groundworks, excavation, underpinning and foundation works. The engineer shall ensure that appropriate measures are implemented to monitor ground and structural movement throughout the construction process, with the objective of ensuring impacts do not exceed Burland Category 1. Reason: To safeguard the structural stability of the existing building and neighbouring properties during the construction of the basement and associated structural works, in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM18 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).
11	The Owner shall enter into a legal agreement with the Council to secure that the occupiers of the additional residential units created by the development shall not be eligible to obtain residents' parking permits or visitor parking permits within the local Controlled Parking Zone, save for persons who are entitled to such permits by virtue of a statutory disability exemption or any successor legislation. Reason: To promote sustainable travel patterns, minimise reliance on the private car, and ensure the development does not generate additional on-street parking demand, in accordance with London Plan Policies T6 and T6.1, Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD (2017).
12	The development hereby approved shall be carried out to achieve a maximum internal water consumption rate of 110 litres per person per day in accordance with the optional requirement of Building Regulation Part G2 (Water Efficiency). Reason: The site is located within an area of serious water stress. This condition is imposed in the interests of sustainable development, to mitigate the effects of climate change, and to ensure the prudent use of natural resources in accordance with national and local planning policy.
13	The four residential units hereby approved shall be designed and constructed to meet the requirements of Building Regulation M4(2) (Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible and adaptable homes to meet the changing needs of residents and to accord with Policy D7 of the London Plan

	(2021), Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017) and the Council's objectives for inclusive design.
14	In the event that satellite or television reception equipment is proposed to serve the development, details of a communal satellite dish, television antenna and associated reception equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to its installation. No individual satellite dishes, television antennae or other reception equipment shall thereafter be installed on the building without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure a coordinated and visually unobtrusive solution for television and satellite reception equipment and to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and the Highgate Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017).

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.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 3472) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE: Fire Safety

The submission/approval of this planning application does not replace the need for building regulation approval in relation to fire safety, nor does it convey or imply any approval under those regulations, with such a matter needing careful consideration in the context of these 2 new units and the existing units/residents within this building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

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: Community Infrastructure Levy

The applicant is advised that the proposed development will be liable for the Mayor of London and Haringey CIL. Based on information provided, this area is approximately 273.5sqm. The Mayoral charge will be £19,891.66 ($273.5 \text{ sqm} \times £72.73$) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £121,302.72 ($273.5 \times £443.52$). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

INFORMATIVE: Other restrictions

The grant of a permission does not relieve the applicant/developer of the necessity of complying with any local Acts, Regulations, Building By-laws, private legislation, and general statutory provisions in force in the area or modify or affect any personal or restrictive covenants, easements etc., applying to or affecting either the land to which the permission relates or any other land or the rights or any person(s) or authority(s) entitled to benefit thereof or holding an interest in the property.