
To: Planning Department, Haringey Council [FAO: Robbie McNaugher]
From: Nairita Chakraborty, BA MSc (Hons) IHBC, RTPi
Heritage & Townscape Consultant
Founder, Revive & Tailor
Date: 18th September 2023
Title: **Heritage Impact Assessment on behalf of London Borough of Haringey for proposed redevelopment at: The Grove Lawn Tennis Club, Cascade Avenue, N10 3PS [Ref: HGY/2023/0733]**

Introduction

1. This Note is prepared on behalf of the Council in order to assist them in assessing heritage related impacts of the proposed development at The Grove Lawn Tennis Club, Cascade Avenue, N10 3PS, hereafter referred to as ("the Site").
2. The proposed development is for:

Redevelopment of site including conversion of existing pavilion into 1.no residential dwelling and erection of 8.no residential dwellings, associated landscaping and cycle storage.
3. The proposal has been subject to pre-application advice (PRE/2021/0100) with the Council dated 25th May 2021. In their advice, the Council sated:

".....the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of Rookfield Conservation Area, which would not be outweighed by any public benefit that may be gained from the provision of 9 additional houses."
4. The Site is located Rookfield Estate Conservation Area. *The Conservation Area was designated in.... An Article 4 direction for*

a. History of the Site

-
5. The Estate was envisioned by William Jeffries Collins and later developed by his sons Herbert Collins and William Collins.
 6. William Jefferies Collins (1856-1939) became a speculative builder in the late nineteenth century tradition. He made his fortune buying up land adjacent to recently opened railway lines, on which he built houses to meet the needs of the growing and flourishing middle classes moving out to the suburbs of North London.
 7. The Collins family lived at 'Fortismere', a large house at Fortis Green, North London. In 1899 William bought a piece of land to the south of Muswell Hill, including the cottage 'Lalla Rookh', one time home of the poet Thomas Moore, and Rookfield House, the former home of A. W. Gamage, the department store proprietor. About 1900, Rookfield became the Collins family home and Fortismere was demolished.

8. W. J. Collins produced a site layout for the development of the Rookfield Estate and in about 1901 started building on the boundaries in Muswell Hill and Etheldene Avenue. The houses were built with narrow frontages in long straight terraces to make maximum use of the site. Their design, with small pane casement windows and simple hooded front doors, was influenced by the then fashionable 'Queen Anne movement' and hint at what was to become the 'Collins Style'. W. J. Collins soon turned his attention to other parts of his estates and left Rookfield for his sons Herbert and William to develop.
9. Herbert established Herbert & Co. in 1906 and developed the west side of Rookfield Avenue, having obtained City and Guilds certificates in carpentry and brickwork in 1903. He was a student of architectural history under Banister Fletcher and obtained University of London certificates of merit for courses held between 1914 and 1919 at the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Central School of Arts and Crafts. He also studied part-time at the Architectural Association School of Architecture, and records show that he passed his third year certificate in 1919. By this time he had already built many houses on his father's estate and was trading under the name of 'Herbert & Company'.
10. He consciously showed a departure from his father's work, with the houses having wider frontages, built in shorter terraces along a curving road with carefully preserved trees. The houses incorporated fashionable architectural features of the time - roughcast walls, corner windows, small paned casements, large gables, and 'battered' brickwalls to the front porches. His work showed influences from Parker and Unwin, Voysey, Baillie Scott and Lutyens who were involved with Hampstead Garden Suburb being built at the same time less than two miles away.
11. The whole of the west side of Rookfield Avenue was completed by 1911. In W J Collins moved to Southampton and the house Rookfield was demolished to make way for further building. Herbert's brother William founded the Rookfield Garden Village Co. Ltd. in 1912 and was responsible for most of the remaining development of the site. William's houses are carefully detailed and designed in styles derived from late seventeenth and early eighteenth century traditional buildings. Cranmore Way and Rookfield Close are characteristic of his work, with a communal green and trees retained from the grounds of 'Rookfield'.
12. From 1909 to 1922 Herbert and his first wife lived at No. 31 Rookfield Avenue. While qualifying in architecture, Herbert came into contact with the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association. For about eighteen months he was involved with the initial development of Welwyn Garden City and was appointed to the board of directors. The work inspired Herbert with the idea of setting up his own garden city. In 1921 he approached Ebenezer Howard, founder of the Garden City Movement. He later developed garden city residential estates in Southampton, Uplands Estate being the first, developed in 1922.

b. Character Appraisal

13. Inspired by the Hampstead and Welwyn garden cities, the Rookfield Estate shows direct influences of Free English Domestic style and the Arts and Crafts movement. The distinctive topography of this area with varying levels and ground conditions of its hillside location dictated the irregular layout of the estate, with its curving road alignments, slopes and views. This was complimented by addition of trees and grass verges along the streets.
14. The roof line cascades slowly based on the topography creating interest along the street. Spacing between the plots is tight, but the gentle slope and curving alignment of the street

allows the suburban character . The plots are set back from the street, often with informal steps through the front garden to the front door.



15. Despite efforts from Herbert Collins urging for the adoption of the streets, these were not heeded by the Council. As a result, almost all the streets within the estate remain unadopted and under the private ownership of the residents. Under their supervision, the landscaping and verges have been well preserved adding to the suburban character of the area.

16. The tennis courts were developed at the edge of the estate. Tennis courts in suburban residential were particularly fashionable during the inter-war years. The Central Square within Hampstead Garden Suburb has 4 tennis courts. Where these were not planned, large rear gardens were amalgamated to form courts and allow for related ancillary structures as can be seen from historic OS maps of 1938 across Highgate and Hampstead.
17. The reason for this is related to the history and popularity of tennis itself. "British sport in the twentieth century have continued to emphasise the upper-middle- or middle-class roots of tennis, harking back to the days when it was played on suburban and vicarage lawns¹". Provision of cricket, bowling and tennis clubs within new middle-class suburbs was extremely fashionable and considered a benchmark. These were accessible only for the residents, thus adding a sense of 'exclusivity' to their use and membership.
18. The Rookfield Estate tennis courts were no different and were designed as part of the estate representing a fashionable recreation amongst the middle-classes, especially during the inter-war years. Their existence would have made the Estate more attractive to several residents and forms an inherent part of the intended development.
19. The tennis court site also defines both street frontages along Cascade Avenue and The Chine, where they slope gently towards Etheldene Avenue. The houses within this part of the Estate are of a similar style with a unified character. All buildings share consistent features such as casement windows, clay tiled roofs, and red brick. They are generally two storeys with pitched roofs, although it is noted that many have rear dormers and there are some gable ends with accommodation in the roof. The Courts form a central piece of this complex.
20. Due to continued and deliberate neglect of the tennis courts, these now appear unkempt. However, they remain a defining aspect of the original intention of the suburban Estate that adds to the special interest of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

c. Proposed development

21. The proposed development is for:

"Redevelopment of site including conversion of existing pavilion into 1.no residential dwelling and erection of 8.no residential dwellings, associated landscaping and cycle storage"

22. The Applicant states that it has been difficult to market the Courts in their existing condition and as such there is no alternative than to redevelop them. They also state, that in their current unkempt form the Site detracts from the Conservation Area and its development could add positively to its character.
23. In doing so, the Applicant's architects, Robert Adams, has undertaken a careful analysis of the architectural details and form within the area and proposed 9 units in total, to a large extent, following the architectural treatment of the wider area. In their own words, the design is "traditional" and "in keeping with the design ethos of the Rookfield Estate".

¹ Joyce Kay. 19 Feb 2019, Grass roots: The development of tennis in Great Britain, 1918-78; Routledge Handbook of Tennis, History, Culture and Politics; Routledge
Accessed on: 18 Sep 2023 <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315533575-3>

24. Indeed the architecture does pay a homage to the Free English Domestic style. However, it is the principle of development which is to be questioned in this instance, given the integral role the Courts play within the Estate.
25. To inform the proposals, a separate appraisal by Mr Martin O'Rourke on the history of the Estate. Here Mr Rourke suggests that the Estate differed from the other garden city suburbs such as Hampstead, Letchworth and Welwyn as it "had no masterplan of planned facilities other than a gradual residential expansion."
26. Whilst this may be factually correct, the idea of the Courts was integral to the "offer" of suburban housing to the middle classes and therefore very much part of the Estate, even though there may not have been a masterplan. Additionally, the Estate was fundamentally inspired by the garden city movement with various elements incorporated including the exclusive sports facilities fashionable during the time, accessible only to residents.
27. Mr Rourke also draws a comparison between the OS maps of 1914 and 1938 where a large open area at The Chine and Cascade Avenue is referred to as being tennis courts. However, the 1914 map does not show the 'block' designated to be for tennis courts but is merely open with the streets laid out. Part of that same 'block' appears to be named as 'Tennis Courts' in the 1934 OS Map. The conclusion that Mr Rourke draws is that the comparison is "an indication of the ad hoc nature of their decision is shown by the fact that a major section of the tennis courts was sold off in 1934 to another builder, who proceeded to build Nos 57-69 Etheldene Avenue."
28. This appears rather conjectural, since, by his own admission there was no masterplan of the area and as such it is difficult to establish that the whole of the "block" was supposed to be tennis courts. Within the same block, to the north of the Courts is the "U" shaped development along The Chine, which is also reflective of the "U" shaped development at erst while Rookfield house, now renamed as "Rookfield Close". As such, the absence of a masterplan or the parcels of land being sold off separately does not necessarily mean that there was speculation about the provision of Tennis Courts.
29. On the other hand, a comparison of the same maps show the nascent stage of the Estate in 1914 compared to that in 1938 where the Estate is almost entirely developed. Having built in that short period of time by the same family meant that there was continuity in there layout, architecture and the general ethos of providing middle class housing inspired from garden city movements of the time. Provision of the Courts was part and parcel of the same vision and therefore integral to the character. Its redevelopment would be considered to be harmful to the area's special interest.
30. Putting the principle of development to one side, whilst the architecture of the proposal does take direct references from the wider area, the scale of the resulting buildings is somewhat incongruous.
31. The context elevations along Cascade Avenue and The Chine appear visually appropriate, following the topography of the area. However, the development of the basements mean that their rear elevations appear much taller in scale. Indeed, the rear elevation (west) diagram along Cascade Avenue, shows the terrace to be four storeys tall which is incongruous in scale with the wider Estate.
32. Additionally, both in front and rear elevations, the number of dormer windows and rooflights give away the relatively greater volume of the properties when comparing with the immediate

surroundings, where many of the houses do not have any roof accommodation, at least not to the front.

33. The rear elevation is not visible from public pavements- but that does not justify the larger scale of the proposal which is incongruous to the Estate's. This is specifically evident in the longitudinal site section that shows the extent of the height to the rear of the terraces.
34. Overall, it is considered that the principle of development of the Courts would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as it is integral to the original intention of the Estate i.e to provide suitable middle class housing based on garden suburb principles including sports facilities for exclusive use of the residents.
35. The existing unkempt nature of the Site is regrettable but is clearly a result of deliberate neglect and cannot justify acceptance of development (NPPF para 196).
36. Notwithstanding the above two points, the proposal, despite best efforts by the architects, is incongruous to the established scale and volume of the wider Estate. The rear elevations in particular, alongside the evident roof accommodation, exacerbate their excessive scale that would harm the character and appearance of the Rookfield Estate Conservation Area.

d. Legislative and Policy Framework

Legislation

37. The Council's overall approach is to manage growth in Haringey in a sustainable way so it meets Haringey's need for homes, jobs and services, in a way that conserves and enhances the features that make the borough a special and attractive place to live, work and visit. Policies SP11 and 12 set out the Council's approach to ensuring that design in the borough is of the highest possible quality as well as being sustainable, also that schemes include measures to minimise the effects of, and adapt to, climate change as well as conserving the borough's rich and diverse heritage.
38. Primary legislation under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 states that:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Local Plan, Strategic Policy (2013-2026)

39. Policy SP11 requires all development to "Be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity".
40. Policy SP12 states that "The Council shall ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment." It further states that "The Historic Environment should be used as the basis for heritage-led regeneration and as the basis for good design and positive change. Where possible, development should help increase accessibility to the historic environment'.

Development Management DPD

41. With regards to Heritage, Policy DM 9 states:

- A. *“Development that conserves and enhances the significance of a heritage asset and its setting will be supported.*
- B. *Proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance. Applicants are required to submit with their planning application a statement describing the significance of the heritage asset(s) concerned, including any contribution made by its setting, along with an assessment and justification of the impact of the new development on the asset and its setting.*
- C. *When considering the impact of proposals on the historic environment, the Council will have regard to:*
 - a) *The priority given to sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and its setting;*
 - b) *Character appraisals and management plans or other guidance, where they are available;*
 - c) *The preservation or reinstatement of original or historic form, fabric, function or character of the asset and its setting;*
 - d) *The relationship with adjoining and neighbouring uses, particularly where these are heritage assets of significance in their own right;*
 - e) *The desirability of securing a viable use for a heritage asset consistent with its conservation;*
 - f) *An understanding of and respect for significance of heritage assets as parts of measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change; and*
 - g) *The contribution that the sensitive utilisation of heritage assets can make to sustainable regeneration.*
- D. *Subject to (A-C) above the Council will give consideration to, and support where appropriate, proposals for the sensitive redevelopment of sites and buildings where these detract from the character and appearance of a Conservation Area and its setting, provided that they are compatible with and/or complement the special characteristics and significance of the area.”*

National Planning Policy Framework

42. Paragraph 199 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It emphasises that the weight given to an asset's conservation should be proportionate to its significance, and notes that this great weight should be given irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

43. Paragraph 200 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
44. Paragraphs 201 and 202 address the balancing of harm against public benefits. If a balancing exercise is necessary (i.e. if there is any harm to the asset), considerable weight should be applied to the statutory duty where it arises. Proposals that would result in substantial harm or total loss of significance should be refused, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss (as per Paragraph 201). Whereas, Paragraph 202 emphasises that where less than substantial harm will arise as a result of a proposed development, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
45. Paragraph 203 requires a balanced judgment for proposals that affect non-designated heritage assets, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
46. Paragraph 206 encourages opportunities for new development within, and within the setting of, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, to enhance or better reveal their significance. It requires favourable treatment for proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset or which better reveal its significance.

e. Assessment against Policies

47. The Proposal does not accord with Haringey Development Management Plan Policy DM 9 which requires development to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by harming its special interest, derived from the garden suburb inspired middle class housing built in early 20th Century.
48. In NPPF terms, this harm would be at the mid to high level of less than substantial harm. As per the framework, this harm should be given great weight and should be assessed against any public benefits.



Nairita Chakraborty, BA MSc (Hons) IHBC, RTPI

Founder, Revive & Tailor Ltd