Skapoullis Jon

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/0322 Site Address: 181 Cranley Gardens London N10 3AG
London Comments by: E Gordon JM Gordon
From:
179
Cranley Gardens
Muswell Hill
London
Greater London
N10 3AG
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Emma Williamson
Head of Development Management
Haringey Planning Service
6th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road, Wood Green
LONDON
N22 8HQ
Your ref: HGY/2016/0322
Schedule 2 part 1 Class A.1 (g) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015
Location: 181 Cranley Gardens, N10 3AG
Proposal: Erection of a single-storey extension beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3 m and the eaves height 2.7 m Dear Ms Williamson,
Representation/objection We, Edmund Gordon and Jane M. Gordon, are the owners and occupants of 179 Cranley Gardens, N10 3AG.
This property adjoins and has party walls with 181 Cranley Gardens.
The property deeds also specify that all boundary fences, walls etc between 179 and 181 Cranley Gardens are owned in common by the owners of 179 Cranley Gardens and 181 Cranley Gardens.
Construction of the existing brick wall separating the existing terraces for a distance of just over 4 m immediately behind the two houses was, by agreement with the owners of 181 Cranley Gardens, arranged and paid for by the owners of 179 Cranley Gardens, with the (non-resident) owners of 181 Cranley Gardens subsequently reimbursing 50% of the costs. The bricks were carefully chosen by the owners of 179 Cranley Gardens to match as closely as possible existing brickwork to the rear of 179 and 181 Cranley Gardens.
Our objections based on amenity impacts of the proposed development are listed below.
1) The agreeable appearance of the existing brick wall separating the existing terraces/patios immediately behind 179 and 181 Cranley Gardens for a length of just over 4 m would be substantially impaired by the adjacent side elevation of the proposed development.
The proposed adjacent side elevation could not incorporate or replace the existing brick wall because the wall is 50% owned by us.
In addition the proposed adjacent side elevation could not replace the 50% of the existing wall belonging to the owners of 181 Cranley Gardens without prejudice to the structural stability of the 50% of the wall we own and its current pleasantly weathered appearance on the 179 Cranley Gardens side.
Drainage water from the flat roof of the proposed development could also stain the proposed adjacent side elevation over time, with further detriment to amenity.
2) Similarly the part of the proposed adjacent side elevation extending beyond the existing brick wall would substantially impair the appearance of the existing fence that separates the remainder of the boundary between the two properties.

Drainage water from the flat roof of the proposed development could also stain this part of the proposed adjacent side elevation over time with further detriment to amenity.
The section of the proposed adjacent side elevation extending beyond the existing brick wall could not incorporate or replace the existing fence because the latter is 50% owned by us.
The section of the proposed adjacent side elevation extending beyond the existing brick wall if built immediately adjacent to the existing fence would prejudice the integrity of the existing fence and fence posts. It would make repair or replacement work on the section of fence and the fence posts concerned difficult if not impossible.
3) Outlooks from the rear ground and first floor rooms of 179 Cranley Gardens would be materially visually impaired by the proposed development, which would extend just over 4 m along the entire existing brick wall, approximately 1 m above the top of the existing brick wall, and just under 2 m along the existing fence that separates the remainder of the boundary between the two properties, approximately 1.5 m above the top of the fence.
A six-metre stretch of our terrace/patio and garden would be substantially overshadowed, with adverse effects on our amenity and on existing and potential future garden/terrace/patio plants.
4) The present agreeable domestic outlook from the rear first floor rooms of 179 Cranley Gardens over the next door terrace/patio, outhouses and garden with trees would be replaced by a view over a flat roof over 8 m wide with a utilitarian roof window in its approximate centre.
The scale of the proposed development will have a generally overbearing impact on our amenity.
The scale and likely use of the proposed development is in our view substantially out of character with its surroundings.
5) The proposed development would represent a permanent increased risk to the security of 179 Cranley Gardens, as the contiguity of the flat roof to the boundary between 179 Cranley Gardens and 181 Cranley Gardens would make access to the upper rear windows at 179 Cranley Gardens easy for aspiring burglars.
The presence of anyone on the flat roof, even legitimately, would lead to private areas of our property, in particular the terrace/patio immediately behind the house being overlooked.
6) Although both 179 and 181 Cranley Gardens are generally well constructed we have been conscious since moving to occupy 179 Cranley Gardens in 1972 that sound-proofing between the properties is poor.
Voices, televisions, radios and other activities of owner-occupants and the variety of tenants who for a good number of years now have occupied 181 Cranley Gardens can be audible to extents that have sometimes impelled contact with those concerned, sometimes very late or even in the middle of the night. This has been particularly the case with large social events such as parties. These parties have also extended in good weather into the back garden. We are concerned that this problem may be exacerbated by the proposed development, involving as it does substantial enlargement of a seven-bedroom property that has been tenanted for many years now.
7) We are concerned at the adverse effects this proposed substantial enlargement of a seven-bedroom property may have on privacy.
In good weather occupants of 181 Cranley Gardens use the back garden of the property, like us and all others in similar situations. With normal domestic, family-scale use of the property his would rarely if ever give rise to major difficulties but the proposed development is a substantial extension of a property that already has seven bedrooms. We are therefore concerned that our privacy may be threatened by the proposed substantial development.
8) We are concerned at the adverse effects the proposed substantial development may have on traffic, parking and road safety generally in the area. There are only two parking spaces to the front of this seven-bedroom house, which is situated only two houses away from the busy Cranley Gardens/Park Road junction.
Additional comment
Although we are aware that objections to the proposed development must at this stage be based solely on amenity impacts it is not entirely clear to us whether the proposed development can in fact be regarded as meeting all conditions for a permitted development, in that the width of the proposed development exceeds 50% of the width of the existing property.
This would appear from the Technical Guidance document issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government last updated in April 2014 to make the proposed development one that is not permitted but requiring planning permission. (See pages 21 to 26 of the document.) We are aware however that this Technical Guidance document is currently being reviewed by the DCLG because of changes introduced by The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 which came into force on 15 April 2015.

Our understanding is that Haringey Council will consider this aspect after it has considered all representations by neighbours relating to amenity impacts.
Yours faithfully,
Edmund Gordon and Jane M Gordon