

PLANNING STATEMENT

– PLANNING and LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION –

For: REPLACEMENT WINDOWS

**At: PRINCESS ELIZABETH HOUSE, 18 Winchester Place, Hornsey,
LONDON N6 5BQ**

Contents

Subject:	Page:
1. Background	2
2. Heritage Statement	4
3. The Proposals	7
4. Policy Considerations	8
5. Conclusion	13

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1** This Application involves the installation replacement windows, as detailed in the accompanying documents. They are basically in the same format and design as the existing windows, and are straightforward replacements, requiring no amendments to openings, or new openings. The existing windows are generally not in acceptable condition, and also not thermally efficient.
- 1.2** This proposal follows an energy efficiency survey, commissioned by the building owners, relating to all of their buildings in Central London. This resulted in a set of proposals which are designed to render the buildings significantly more energy efficient and lower their carbon footprint.
- 1.3** The first phase of the project was to be the installation of solar panels, which will be the subject of a Planning Appeal, following Refusal by the Council.
- 1.4** Chartered Architects, Mulroy Architects Ltd, were employed to survey the existing windows and to develop the Application proposals. This Application includes an extensive set of drawings.
- 1.5** The following documents form this Planning Application:
- Planning Portal Planning Application Form
 - **SD1**: Planning Design and Access Statement (this document)
 - **SD2**: Location and Block Plan ref 3-15-001-P1
 - **SD3**: Lower Ground Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-110-P1
 - **SD4**: Ground Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-111-P1
 - **SD5**: First Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-112-P1
 - **SD6**: Second Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-113-P1
 - **SD7**: Third Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-114-P1
 - **SD8**: Fourth Floor Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-115-P1
 - **SD9**: Roof Plan Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-115-P1
 - **SD10**: NW Elevation Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-130-P1
 - **SD11**: SE Elevation Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-131-P1
 - **SD12**: Side Elevations CC and DD Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-132-P1
 - **SD13**: Proposed Replacement Window Elevations ref 3-15-200-P1
 - **SD14**: Window Sections Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-201-P1
 - **SD15**: Window Photography Existing and Proposed ref 3-15-202-P1
 - **SD16**: Window Schedule for Reference Purposes
- 1.6** The subject building is Grade 11 Listed, and located within the Highgate Conservation Area.
- 1.7** In designing the proposals, the Applicant has had general regard for the following Policies:
- The National Planning Policy Framework (2023)
 - The London Plan (2021)
 - Haringey's Local Plan – Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2017)
 - Haringey Development Management DPD (2017)
 - Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017)
 - Planning Practice Guidance
 - Highgate Conservation Area.
- 1.8** The following Policies will be considered particularly pertinent:
- The National Planning Policy Framework;

- Section 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change
- Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment.
- London Plan:
 - D4: Delivering Good Design
 - HC1: Heritage Conservation and Growth
 - HC3: Heritage and Local Views
 - SI 2: Minimising Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Haringey's Local Plan;
 - SP4: Working Towards a Low Carbon Haringey
 - SP11: Design
 - SP12: Conservation
- Haringey Development Management DPD;
 - DM1: Delivering High Quality Design
 - DM9: Management of the Historic Environment
 - DM21: Sustainable Design, Layout and Construction
- Highgate Neighbourhood Plan;
 - DH2: Development in Highgate's Conservation Area.

The Applicant has taken full regard of these Policies.

- 1.9** For avoidance of doubt, the Council describes the site and its context thus; *The subject site contains Princess Elizabeth House, a four-storey (with roof accommodation) student hostel, located at the south-western end of Winchester Place, N6. The surrounding uses are mixed, with the playing fields and buildings of Channing School for girls located to the immediate west of the site.*

The two-storey terraced properties on Cromwell Avenue are located to the east, with the mix of commercial and residential buildings located further to the south on The Bank/Highgate Hill. The site is located within Highgate Conservation Area, within the 'Archway Road' sub-area as identified within the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2013. The building itself is Grade II listed.

- 1.10** Sufficient information has been submitted herewith to demonstrate the proposals meet with the specific Policies. It is therefore my opinion that the proposed development constitutes acceptable Development.

2.0 HERITAGE STATEMENT

Building Summary

- 2.1** Elizabeth House (which in recent years reverted to its original name, from Greenview Court) is a three storey building with extended basement and attic with a butterfly plan, it is a Grade II listed building, within the Highgate Conservation Area. Under its recent ownership, it has been the subject of much alteration, as agreed with the Council, basically since 2016.
- 2.2** The building was designed in a Neo-Georgian style by the notable firm of architects Richardson and Gill. The building is in red brick in Flemish bond with brick tile dressings, metal-framed Crittall windows and hipped mansard tiled roofs and brick chimneys. The floor plans have been altered only to the extent agreed with the Council. The Basement has been significantly altered and extended, to provide accommodation.
- 2.3** Originally called Elizabeth House, the building was built in 1928-30 for the Mothercraft Training Society (formerly the Babies of the Empire Society), opened by its namesake, the Queen Mother. The building was commissioned to be occupied within the grounds of Cromwell House, a 17th Century mansion that was already in the ownership of the organisation. The building therefore also has group value with Cromwell House.
- 2.4** The National Heritage Record (List Entry Number 1391376, first Listed 30-Aug-2005) states: 'It merits listing at Grade II as an attractive Neo-Georgian building by an important firm of architects that survives well externally in its original purpose-built form to accommodate the nationally significant work of the Mothercraft Training Society that promoted then-innovative techniques in baby rearing and holds an important place in the history of mother and child welfare'.
- 2.5** The site lies within a residential area, with Channing School located to the north and west.
- 2.6** The building is in extremely good condition externally and internally, having benefited from the highest standards of restoration and conservation, by a specialist team employed by the current owner.
- 2.7** The building has benefitted from various Planning and Listed Building Permissions, most notably HGY/2015/3425; and HGY/2016/0489.

Details from Listing Information

- 2.8** *800/0/10108: WINCHESTER PLACE Highgate Elizabeth House 30-AUG-05*
- 2.9** *GV II Former Princess Elizabeth Hostel for the Mothercraft Society, now residential use. 1930 by Richardson and Gill. Red brick in Flemish Bond with brick tile dressings, metal-framed Crittall windows and hipped mansard tiled roofs and brick chimneys. 3-storey-plus-attic and basement with a butterfly plan in a Neo-Georgian style.*
- 2.10** *EXTERIOR: Principal elevation to south east has central block of 5 window bays and 2 flanking wings, these projecting at a 45 degree angle and of 4 window bays. Prominent feature of 2-storey colonnaded veranda with 6 pairs of concrete piers then concave curved return to wings finishing in single engaged pier. Iron railings at first and roof level of this, in a revivalist diamond design. Fire escapes*

to each side are later additions. Roof in the south wing was rebuilt to original designs following WWII bomb damage. 5 sets of French doors with leaded panes and overlights with an arched detail open to the veranda at ground and first floor; a simpler single door to central bay of top level. Stall board lights at first and second floors provide additional light. Windows throughout are original rectangular metal casements with hoppers and leaded panes, these under tightly spaced brick tiles arranged to resemble finely gauged flat arches. The side and rear elevations have similar windows, as well as a pair of oval windows also with layered tile surrounds. To rear, on west side, a 1950s extension with arched opening that has similar tiled surround to the west, and a later concrete lintel; on north side, an original 2-storey tiled arch emphasising the stairwell, with a later entrance of brick piers capped with stone urns, reached by a sweeping stone staircase with metal railing.

- 2.11** *INTERIOR:* Ground floor plan altered by partitioning larger former sitting rooms in central section into bedrooms. First and second floors largely retain original plan, with some rearrangement. 2 open well staircases with metal balusters.
- 2.12** *HISTORY:* Elizabeth House was built in 1928-30 to the designs of Richardson and Gill and at the instigation of the Mothercraft Training Society (formerly the Babies of the Empire Society). The commission followed a public subscription appeal in 1928 which raised £25,000 for a new building in the grounds of the C17 mansion, Cromwell House, which the organisation had occupied since 1924. The new building was originally called the Princess Elizabeth Hostel and was opened by its namesake (the wife of George VI and mother of Elizabeth II) in 1930. The building remained in the Mothercraft Society's ownership until 1951 when it was sold to the Metropolitan Police and was used to house police officers. Since the late 1980s Elizabeth House has been in private ownership.
- 2.13** *The Mothercraft Training Society built Elizabeth House to encourage innovative methods of baby-care. New and prospective mothers would stay in the hostel for a fixed term and, under the tutelage of live-in nurses, learn to breast-feed at regular intervals, look after babies in airy and light surroundings, follow dietary plans which enriched breast-milk, and recognise symptoms of common causes of infant mortality such as malnourishment and diarrhoea. A programme of lectures and open-days also trained external nurses and local new mothers in the principles of baby care. In addition, the Society managed a health clinic and day-centre. The matron of Elizabeth House was Mabel Liddiard CBE, author of The Mothercraft Manual (1924), president of the Royal College of Midwives and founder of the Mothercraft Training Society. Liddiard trained under Sir Truby King, a pioneer of child welfare movement. Royal patronage was important for the Society, particularly in their aim to encourage new baby-care techniques which demanded a change in attitude amongst new mothers. Princess Elizabeth, herself a new mother when Elizabeth House opened in 1930, visited the site in the 1930s and 1940s and was the President of the Mothercraft Training Society from 1923.*
- 2.14** *ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE:* The former Princess Elizabeth of York Hostel was built in 1930 for the Mothercraft Training Society, and opened by its namesake. It was designed in a clean and well-crafted Neo-Georgian style by the notable firm of architects Richardson and Gill. It survives mostly intact, with some internal alterations, and features a wide multi-storey veranda and suntrap plan as a formal representation of the work the Society promulgated. This work was the

post-World War I campaign to build up the nation's stock of healthy babies through teaching techniques of regular breast feeding and fresh air. It merits listing at Grade II as an attractive Neo-Georgian building by an important firm of architects that survives well externally in its original purpose-built form to accommodate the nationally significant work of the Mothercraft Training Society that promoted then-innovative techniques in baby rearing and holds an important place in the history of mother and child welfare. The building also has strong historical links and group value with the Grade I Cromwell House.

- 2.15** In summary, the Heritage significance of the property has been very much enhanced under its present ownership. The owner is also the owner of several such buildings, and has decades of experience of restoration of Heritage buildings.

3.0 THE PROPOSALS

- 3.1** The proposals are to replace the existing windows, with design and materials as indicated on the accompanying drawings, and in the designs stated thereon.
- 3.2** The Council being entirely supportive of such measures as the maintenance of Heritage buildings. This does not mean that they are 'preserved in aspic', and clearly the most important matter for consideration is whether the proposals sustain the Heritage importance of the building.
- 3.3** Chartered RIBA Practice, Mulroy Architects are Heritage specialists, who are retained by the Applicant to design all proposed works to his buildings in London. These include several major Listed Buildings in Conservation Areas. Mulroy were chosen to oversee the Heritage works to the building when it was first acquired by the current owner.
- 3.4** The list of drawings at 1.4 indicates that the Architects have considered the proposals from all possible significant angles.
- 3.5** For a building of both its size and number of windows on each elevation, in order to make a significant positive difference in terms of the energy generated, a comprehensive replacement solution required.
- 3.6** As can be seen from the drawings, no expense has been spared in developing and proposing a high quality solution that is acceptable both in its own right, and in its context. The originality, such as currently understood, is retained.
- 3.7** In appreciating the setting of the building, it is important to understand both its highly elevated position, and the shape and extent of its elevations.
- 3.8** In preparing the proposals, the Architect has particularly had regard to the following Policies;
- NPPF December 2023: Section 16 – Preserving the Historic Environment
 - London Plan: Policy HC1 – Heritage Conservation and Growth
 - Haringey Local Plan: Policy SP12 – Conservation
 - Haringey DM Plan: Policy DM1 – Delivering High Quality Design
 - Haringey DM Plan: Policy DM9 – Management of the Historic Environment
 - Highgate NP: Policy DH2 – Development Proposals in Highgate's CAs
- 3.9** In summary, the Applicant considers that the Heritage aspects of the building are suitably preserved.

4.0 POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 As mentioned in 3.8 herein, in preparing the proposals, the Architect has particularly had regard to the following Policies;

- NPPF (December 2023): Section 16 – Preserving the Historic Environment
- London Plan: Policy HC1 – Heritage Conservation and Growth
- Haringey Local Plan: Policy SP12 – Conservation
- Haringey DM Plan: Policy DM1 – Delivering High Quality Design
- Haringey DM Plan: Policy DM9 – Management of the Historic Environment
- Highgate NP: Policy DH2 – Development Proposals in Highgate’s CAs.

NPPF – Section 16

4.2 The proposals are designed to respond to the necessities of a modern built environment, whilst preserving the character and appearance of the subject building, in accordance with Policies at all levels.

4.3 Given this intent, it is therefore clear that proposals are entirely consistent with the relevant regulatory framework. Importantly, with respect to the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (s.7, s.16 & s.66), by means of the approach described above, the Listed Building, its special interest and setting would remain fundamentally preserved.

4.4 Indeed, its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest (including that of the overall property, and the contribution made by its setting toward this character) would in no way be affected except positively. Conversely, public benefit in the form of the optimum viable use of the application site would result (para. 208, NPPF).

4.5 Further to this, for the reasons given above, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation has been taken into full account, as has the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (para. 203, NPPF).

4.6 In turn – again for the reasons given above – great weight has been given the asset’s conservation, although no degree of harm is acknowledged to result (para. 205, NPPF). Equally, it is considered that the opportunity has been taken for new development within the setting of the heritage asset, to enhance this and its significance (para. 212, NPPF).

LONDON PLAN – POLICY HC1- HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND GROWTH

4.7 This Policy requires, inter alia, that proposals deliver positive benefits, that conserve and enhance the historic environment. The requirements of Policy HC1 are effectively incorporated into Local Plan Strategy.

4.8 Policy requires that; *‘development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets’ significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process’.*

- 4.9** It is considered that the proposals conserve the Heritage significance, by presenting as entirely sympathetic in all respects. They preserve the asset, whilst providing enhancement.
- 4.10** Policy D4: *Delivering Good Design*, is also appropriate, although clearly part of the Local Policy set. This requires, inter alia, that maximum detail appropriate for the design stage is provided. The appropriate detail is considered to be provided here. The requirements of D4 are incorporated into Local Plan Strategy.

HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN: POLICY SP12 – CONSERVATION

- 4.11** This is the most significant Policy, in terms of the acceptability of the proposals.
- 4.12** The Council's prime objective is to ensure the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their setting, and the wider historic environment. This obviously includes Statutory Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, etc, etc, including all matters of Heritage interest.
- 4.13** The Council will achieve this objective by using the historic environment' as the basis for heritage-led regeneration and as the basis for good design and positive change.
- 4.14** Within the supporting paragraphs 6.2.10 to 6.2.13 to the Policy, the Conservation Area and its salient features are described.
- 4.15** Whilst there are no precise requirements of this Policy as regards the proposals, the obvious point is that such changes preserve and where possible enhance the assets involved.
- 4.16** The drawings herewith clearly indicate that the proposals have been very carefully designed in order to ensure very minimal visual change, whilst achieving the Applicant's objective of renewing windows and improving the building's thermal insulation.

*HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN:
Policy DM1 – Delivering High Quality Design*

- 4.17** This Policy is divided into two distinct parts - *Haringey Development Charter* and *Design Standards*. The latter involves three separate subject sections.
- Haringey Development Charter*
- 4.18** To paraphrase, all new development must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. More specifically, development must make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area. They must incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.
- 4.19** The proposals have been very carefully prepared, by a specialist firm of Chartered Architects with prior experience of the building, and bearing firmly in mind all of the above requirements.
- 4.20** The quality of the proposals, especially in terms of their appropriateness as a replacement, is obvious from the accompanying drawings. As with previous phases of building, the proposals have not been constrained in any way by cost.

Design Standards – Character of Development

- 4.21** This sub-section requires that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to several physical considerations. In this case, 'g'; *'Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials'* is the relevant part.
- 4.22** As can be seen from the accompanying drawings, the style and detailing of the windows are effectively unchanged. The materials are the best possible specification to serve as replacements, without affecting the views of the building.

Design Standards – Landscaping

- 4.23** There is nothing in this sub-section that is relevant to the proposals.

Design Standards – Privacy and Amenity

- 4.24** There is nothing in this sub-section that is relevant to the proposals.

HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN: Policy DM9 – Management of the Historic Environment

- 4.25** This Policy is divided into five sub-sections – three of which are potentially relevant to the subject proposals.

Haringey's Heritage Assets

- 4.26** Point A states that: *Development that conserves and enhances the significance of a heritage asset and its setting will be supported.* For the reasons stated herein, the Applicant is content that his proposals meet the twin requirements of conservation and enhancement, both in terms of design and materials.
- 4.27** Point B states that: *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.*
- 4.28** The Applicant's design team has duly assessed the proposals as per this sub-section, and have stated herein and in the accompanying drawings all that is reasonably required to be stated. Should the Council require any further information, then it can be provided upon request.
- 4.29** Point C is divided into seven parts named a to g, each of which the Council will take regard, and each of which is worthy of individual discussion.
- 4.30** Point Ca relates to: *The priority given to sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and its setting.* Here, it can be seen that, in terms of the undoubted quality of the proposed design and materials, and their relevance, both in relation to the existing building and its context, the Applicant's and the Architect's priorities have been very high.
- 4.31** Point Cb relates to: *Character appraisals and management plans or other guidance, where they are available.* Neither is available in this case.

- 4.32** Point Cc relates to: *The preservation or reinstatement of original or historic form, fabric, function or character of the asset and its setting.* This has been at the centre of the design intent, the core principle being that when the proposals are completed, they represent the least possible change to the building and its setting, across the above considerations.
- 4.33** Point Cd relates to: *The relationship with adjoining and neighbouring uses, particularly where these are heritage assets of significance in their own right.* This is important since, as previously discussed, the surrounding area contains heritage assets of significance. Also, the subject building is sited at a high point. The proposals respect all of these features.
- 4.44** Point Ce relates to: *The desirability of securing a viable use for a heritage asset consistent with its Conservation.* This is relevant since the continuing present Use of the building depends partly upon the quality of its fabric. The Use is only attractive to potential users if the subject building presents as having the required quality of living arrangements.
- 4.45** Point Cf relates to: *An understanding of and respect for significance of heritage assets as parts of measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change.* This is extremely important relative to the proposals. The energy use of the building is presently far too high. Windows occupy a large part of the wall areas, and the proposals seek to improve thermal insulation.
- 4.46** Point Cg relates to: *The contribution that the sensitive utilisation of heritage assets can make to sustainable regeneration.* This responds to Point Cf, related to the Use of the building. When it was declared as redundant by its previous owner, the current owner purchased it and invested very heavily in order to refurbish and repurpose it for modern Hostel Use.

Conservation Areas

- 4.47** Point D discusses redevelopment, and is not relevant here.
- 4.48** Point E states that; *Proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.* For the reasons stated herein, the proposals very deliberately complement the existing building in all meaningful respects.

Listed and Locally Listed Buildings

- 4.49** Point F relates to the opportunities for the future of such buildings, and is divided into four parts named a to d, each of which the Council will take regard, and each of which is worthy of individual discussion.
- 4.50** Point Fa relates to the need to ensure that proposals; *Do not lead to substantial harm or total loss of their significance.* Quite obviously, the proposals do not lead to any such issues.
- 4.51** Point Fb relates to the need to; *Retain and repair existing features and fabric, or, if missing, replace them in a sympathetic manner.* The proposals directly relate to this critical point. The objective of the proposals is to replace part of the existing fabric to the highest possible standards, and consistent with the achievement of sustainability objectives.

4.52 Point Fc relates to this requirement; *Do not harm the structural integrity or stability of the building or that of adjoining buildings or structures.* There are no such issues with these proposals.

4.53 Point Fd relates to extensions, which is not relevant here.

4.54 Point G is not relevant, as it relates solely to Locally Listed Buildings.

Archaeology

4.55 This is not relevant.

Enabling Development

4.56 This is not relevant.

4.57 It is considered that the proposals meet all of the requirements of Policy DM9.

HIGHGATE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Policy DH2 – Development Proposals in Highgate’s CAs

4.58 This Policy states: *Development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate’s conservation areas, and respect the setting of its listed buildings and other heritage assets. Development should preserve or enhance the open, semi-rural or village character where this is a feature of the area.*

4.59 There is supporting test to this Policy which is critically relevant to the proposals. It reads; *Original windows and doors are integral to Highgate’s special character, and should be retained and repaired wherever possible. Replacements should match the originals in terms of materials, design and detail.*

4.60 The existing (whether original or not) windows are beyond economic repair and /or upgrading to modern insulative standards. It is critically important to the overall proposals to make the building more thermally efficient, and lower-maintenance, that the (correctly designed) replacements are utilised.

4.61 This concludes the Policy considerations, and it is considered that they are all met within the proposals.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1** Having reviewed the provisions of the relevant Policies, at all levels, the Applicant's Chartered Architects have devised a scheme of replacement windows, which suits the various facades of the subject building, whilst achieving the low-energy objectives of the overall proposals.
- 5.2** As the Council is aware, the Applicant has embarked upon a significant scheme of energy consumption improvements, which commenced last year with a (Refused) Application for rooftop PV installation.
- 5.3** Sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate the proposals accordance with the Policies outlined. For the reasons set out above it is our view that the proposed development is acceptable in all respects.
- 5.4** I trust that this Application provides all the information required to assess the proposals, but please do not hesitate to contact us should you require any further information.

Dr. R.J. NEWELL May 2024 V1