Argles James

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2015/3213
Site Address: Land adjacent to 1 Crouch Hall Road London N8 8HT
Comments by: Philippa and Simon Thomas
From:
Flat 2
28 Coolhurst Road

London

N8 8EL
Submission: Objection
Comments: We have the following observations / objections in respect of the proposed application:

1. USE

Clause 4 (Planning History) of the Design and Access Statement refers to the applicant's previous application made on 26th March 2014 (HGY/2014/0888) for the erection of a residential studio home. It confirms that following a site visit by Haringey Planning Authority, Haringey wrote to the applicant on 21 November 2014 to confirm the following points:

(a) the site does not lend itself to an independent residential unit; and

(b) the site would be suitable to have some form of ancillary structure (home office, gym, workshop etc) used incidental to the enjoyment of the current flat.

In our view, the proposal for the site is not as an ancillary structure to be used incidental to the enjoyment of the current flat but rather an independent residential unit which Haringey have confirmed is not an appropriate use for the site. The proposal provides for:

- a kitchen;
- a bathroom (including WC, hand basin and shower);
- a bedroom;
- a seating area;
- a private entrance and access (separate from the current flat); and
- a private garden (separate from the current flat);

all of which are indicative of the site being used now or in the future as an independent residential unit separate from the current flat. In fact, if you compare the floor plans for this and the previous application it appears that they are identical, save for a dining area. It is therefore difficult to see what difference there is between this application and the applicant's previous application in respect of use. This would have a significant adverse impact on the use and enjoyment of our garden if it was let or sold separately from the current flat.

We also note that the applicant does not own the site for which the permission is sought. Accordingly there will be significant cost/investment to realise this project and presumably, to justify the investment/cost, there will understandably be a desire to obtain the maximum benefit from the site. Given that it is designed for full time occupation we presume that it will inevitably be occupied on a permanent basis or sold. To have someone living full time in such intimate proximity to our private garden is a material change of use and utterly inappropriate.

2. OVERLOOKING AND LOSS OF PRIVACY

The proposal includes fixed glazing at the front including glazed sliding doors, which when opened will result in overlooking by affording a clear view into our garden, particularly given that the proposed building will be on our boundary. This will lead to complete loss of privacy which will have a significant adverse impact on the use and enjoyment of our garden.

3. LOSS OF LIGHT AND OVERSHADOWING

The garage is adjacent to our garden and at its current height it has no impact on the amount of light coming into our garden. The proposal for a single storey building however will significantly obstruct our main source of natural light which will have a material adverse impact on the use and enjoyment of our garden.

3. NOISE AND DISTURBANCE

The proposal includes a front garden area adjacent to our garden which, coupled with the proposed sliding doors at the front of the building and the fact both are on our boundary, will result in more noise and disturbance than its existing use. This will have a significant adverse impact on the use and enjoyment of our garden.

4. INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHT OF WAY

Our garden is adjacent to the garage which is accessed by a right of way over the driveway via a gate in the fence. The proposal unilaterally moves our right of access without any right to do so. Whilst we understand this is a private issue it is relevant to the application because we will not consent to our right of access being moved on the basis proposed, which means even if planning consent is granted, the proposal will not be able to be implemented.

5. OVERDEVELOPMENT

In our view, the insertion of a tiny, one storey building on this very constrained site is over-bearing, out-of-scale and inappropriate. The building would have the appearance of being shoe-horned into the plot and would loom over our garden.

6. CREATION OF A PRECEDENT

There are a number of derelict garages in Crouch End and if permission is granted it would likely lead to a proliferation of applications for similar development in the Crouch End Conservation Area which the Local Authority would find difficult to refuse.

Philippa and Simon Thomas
Flat 2, 28 Coolhurst Road
N8 8EL