Cordell Paul

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: 76A Carlingford Road HGY/2015/1110

From: Eva del Rey
Sent: 25 June 2015 13:53
To: Concannon Eoin; Alpay Beler
Subject: 76A Carlingford Road HGY/2015/1110

Dear Mr. Conncanon,

I have heard from my partner that the decision for the planning application reference no. HGY/2015/1110 is still pending.

Having revised your emails I still don't understand how the issue of amenity has been assessed in the case of our property.

Please forgive me for my late reaction to your two emails sent on the18th of June. I am very disappointed and I think the stress of this situation is affecting me.

I have seen the amended plan for the extension sent to us on the 18th of June and to me this extension is still enormous, given the size of the gardens in our street. In my opinion it needs to be shortened by at least half a meter. The house already has a 1.5 meter extension, an addition of 2 meters would be overbearing from my kitchen sitting area.

You have seen the size of our kitchen during your visit, so I don't need to tell you that there is no other space to relocate our chairs and table within the area.

Besides since there are no extensions of that size in the whole street, it will break with the aesthetic of the whole area which can also be seen in Google maps.

I have searched for those aerial photographs of my street you said you use to determine whether my neighbours extension is 'original' (before 1948) or not. I did my research at the British Library with the help of one of their maps librarians, who happens to be a good friend of mine, and we couldn't find any for my street. Perhaps you could show us the photos you say your office has.

In your last email you wrote:

Our planning assessment will take account the further comments you have made below in regards amenity however it is my officer's level opinion that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact on your amenity to warrant a refusal. The National Planning Policy Framework has presumption in favour of development. This is supported by Haringey's Local Plan policy SP0 which has a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site is a non-designated area where there is scope to extend. The proposal would continue to appear subordinate to the main building given its height and depth it is considered acceptable design. Whilst the reduction in depth and height reduces the impact on the nearest neighbouring kitchen window.

I understand you are doing your job following the policies. I am writing from the point of view of the experience of our own property. This is not sustainable development but interference into our individual right to enjoy our property peacefully and to defend the value and amenity of our home.

Furthermore, finding out from you last email that the definition of house does not include residential flats at this late stage is utterly confusing.

I personally think this matter of oversized extensions, which started in 2013, deserves some public clarification and dissemination through the media for people to see how distressing and hopeless the so called 'consultation process with neighbours' can be for those neighbours opposing to extensions, in addition to the cost of time and money that they will have to face.

The reason I am writing today is about your assessment of AMENITY. I hope you understand and I apologize in advance for what I am going to say, but it would be very helpful if you could please explain to me why when you assessed the issue of amenity in our property you didn't consider the impact of the extension in terms of visual intrusion, and why you didn't take into account the overbearing and oppressive impact it will have upon the way we currently enjoy our property as we pointed out in our numerous letters of objection.

I may be wrong but it appears that according to your emails you have contemplated the issue of amenity in this case only from the point of view of loss of light coming through our main kitchen window, and the fact that we have a secondary window is enough to solve our amenity issue.

On the 18 June you wrote:

A decision will be made on the 23rd June. Based on the amended plans, the site orientation (south facing) and the fact that there is a secondary window serving the kitchen space, I consider that there is no longer an amenity issue to this room. As noted private garden space would not receive the same level of protection as a habitable room.

However I have noticed that in other planning applications submitted to the Haringey Council in cases of strong objections from next door neighbours, the assessment of amenity has covered other criteria besides the reduction of light such as the visual intrusion of the extension and the impact of an extension when viewed from neighbouring properties. As a consequence of that consideration the applications have been rejected after concluding that the extension would result in a material loss of outlook which would detract from the amenity of the occupiers (meaning the neighbours objecting). See for example HGY/2015/0896

As I wrote in my first letter and besides the recent amendment of the plan, I see the planned extension as an over-imposing brick structure of high density, which will look like a monumental cube erected in front of my kitchen window. It will break with the existing aesthetic of the garden area, reduce the green space available and overshadow my flat and a third of my garden.

In summary, I don't understand why in our case our outlook is not considered as a part of our amenity and I hope you can explain this to us before the decision is made.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks,

With best wishes,

Eva del Rey and Alpay Beler

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com