

HGY/2024/0806: 41 Sheldon Avenue re. revisions submitted on 23 July 2024

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee welcome the changes made to this application in terms, for example, of the width and fenestration. However we have the following comments to make:

1. The railings introduced each side of the property on the line of the front elevation are extremely high. If the spikes were removed and they were painted green (covered by condition) they could be acceptable.
2. The proposed extension at the rear, given the change in levels, would have an unacceptable impact on neighbours and so would not meet the amenity requirements in policy DM1. In addition, if you look at dwg. P2204 you will see under 'Proposed Notes' at top right, the code (03) refers to an 'acoustic enclosure' with a reference to Section EE. This proposed enclosure is far from insubstantial and, because of the angle of the boundary with the adjacent property, it would seem to be in front of their rear windows. We are unable to find this enclosure on any of the other drawings. Both this acoustic enclosure and the Family Room would fail to meet the requirements of DM1.

The following comments from our first objections stand:

3. Independent audit of BIA would be prudent as there are aspects of the submitted BIA which may give rise to concern:

4.5.1 notes that there is a second aquifer

4.5.4 notes the rear garden appears to be in an area at a low to medium risk of flooding from surface water

4.5.3 notes there would be a slight increase of the hard surface area due to the enlargement of the building footprint and the proposed pool

5.1.1: 1b notes ground water was encountered at a depth of between 0.34m and 1.07m below ground floor level (?) of the rear garden. Which applies?

Q10: Excavation will be undertaken within the Claygate member which is a Secondary Aquifer A.

In response to the standard questionnaire:

Q4 and Q5: based on the surface water modelling on the gov.uk website, the surface water flood risk is mainly at the rear of the property.

Q6: Is the site in an area identified to have surface water flood risk – Yes. Refer to Flood Risk Assessment for further details

5.4: cumulative development: is response reasonable?

9.2 states the basement construction will only partially act as a barrier to ground water flow.

9.3: Construction below the groundwater level could theoretically deviate the ground water flows. However, the arrangement of the buildings is as such that no significant influence on the local hydrogeology is expected.

4. Where native trees are to be removed, mature native replacements should be required. Larger tree at front required to replace T 14.

Encroachment on RPAs unacceptable:

ASHP pit and swimming pool severely encroach on the RPA of the neighbour's fine tree; football and small seating areas could be managed to restrict root damage. The rear terrace also encroaches on an RPA. Loss of additional trees due to these encroachments would be unacceptable.

There appear to be only three single stem trees to replace the loss of 5 mature trees. New trees should be native species.