Argles James

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2015/3094
Site Address: Flat 1 54 Church Crescent London N10 3NE
Comments by: Stephen Anchor
From:
56B
Church Crescent
Muswell Hill
London
London
N10 3NE
Submission: Objection
Comments: I Stephen Anchor and Paula Ebbinkhuysen, owners of flat B at nr.56 Church Crescent N10 3NE, write to object to the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension at flat 1, 54 Church Crescent, N10 3NE by Mr. Peter Miller.
We have examined the plans and we know the site well. We wish to object strongly to this proposed development.
Initially, we would like to point out that the Design and Access statement claims in (Scale and Appearance) that the neighbouring owners have been consulted prior to submittal. This is absolutely not true in our case and the first we learned of this development was Haringey's letter of 21/10/2015. We are arguably the most adversely affected by this development.
The Heritage statement claims that "the rear elevations are developed to varying extent, with many properties featuring single storey rear extensions".
We would like to question the accuracy of that statement. We are unaware of any extensions of any kind existing between numbers 54 to 68 Church Crescent inclusive.
The private section of the rear garden belonging to flat 1 at number 54 is extremely small, one of the smallest in Church Crescent and the 3 meter extension will in fact swallow a high percentage of the garden.
There is also a large mulberry tree in this garden, a remarkably rare tree in London. The tree is protected and we fear that this development threatens the tree. The land on this side of Church Crescent was formerly an orchard and much of that arborial character remains, the mulberry being a significant contributor. This tree is also visible from the adjacent nature reserve of Parkland Walk.
As the garden is so small the bulk and impact of the development will be out of scale and out of character for the neighbourhood within this very limited space of this garden.
The proposed upper ground balcony is quite alien and of a completely different nature to the supposedly "common balconies" found along the rear elevations of Church Crescent. Balconies are in fact rare and invariably situated at 2nd floor level integral to the original architecture. Number 54 already has such a balcony found at 2nd floor level.
There is always 1 balcony per house and there is a harmony and repetition to the architecture at the rear incorporating this original feature. This balcony in no way respects or reflects this tradition and is not within the character of this conservation area.
The balcony on top of the proposed extension will not be used by the owners of flat 1 nor will it be owned by them. It will belong to the upper ground floor flat. It does not in any way constitute a necessary part of the proposed development as the beneficiary/user is another property and another owner. We can see no justification for this as the statemenf for the development is to "accomodate much needed living space" at flat 1.
The balcony size is the equivalent of a roof terrace and bigger than the original balconies. It would be massively intrusive on the 2 bedrooms at 56B (our flat).
From that balcony one would be able to look into one of our bedrooms which is parallel to it and literally just a few feet away. It also looks down into the other lower bedroom, again just feet away.
We would lose our most essential privacy in 2 cases and would be certain to endure noise and disturbance from very close proximity.
The current original architecture which incorporates the houses' balconies permits much greater privacy.
It is proposed that the roof of the extension should have a glass section at the point closest to one of our bedrooms. We find this unacceptable. We would unavoidably be looking into the room through the glass as it would be so close to our window, despite the proposed slope of the roof. Additionaly there could well be a noise issue so close to our bedroom.
The general impact of the extension would still be overbearing due to the land at nr.54 being markedly higher than at nr.56. The sloping roof in no way compensates for the mass of the structure in such a small garden space.
In conversation with the new owners it has become clear that their preferred use of the property would be "high end serviced appartment". The nature of this business plan is based on short stay, 1 to 2 weeks, business and recreational users. It is therefore a development with commercial/residential aspects, akin to a boutique hotel. This

inevitably brings greater disturbance and noise to a purely residential street than would be the case for a purely residential development. The intrusive aspects we have detailed would be magnified further should they take this option.
In conclusion, we request that the planning department rejects the proposals on the basis of:
1. The balcony is a significant part of the development but will not be owned by or used by the proposer of the development. It has no relevance to the Design and Access statement's proposal for flat 1. It is gratuitously introduced by stealth.
2. A loss of privacy, with overlooking impacting on both our bedrooms due to inapropiate proximity.
3. Noise and disturbance due to the above.
4. A loss of garden land in a conservation area.
5. Out of scale development due to the small relative size of the garden and the higher land topography at nr.54.