Development Management Support
LB Haringey
Planning Service
Level 6
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Haringey Council
Place & Sustainability
Planning, Regeneration & Economy
24 MAR 2016
Received
6th Floor River Park House
225 High Road N22 8HQ

Ref: HGY/2016/0542

21st March 2016

For the attention of:
Ms Sarah Madondo (Case Officer) and the Conservation Team

Objection to Planning Application for 57 The Chine, London, N10 3PX

Thank you for consulting me about the proposed development for 57 The Chine which my property looks on to. I note the planning application has been revised but I still have a number of concerns and wish to object for the following reasons:

- This proposed extension, which fronts onto the street, is visible from Cascade Avenue and The Chine. It would also be prominent when viewed from my house impacting on my visual amenity.

- The existing (east facing) elevation, which my property looks onto, would in part be lost. This would impact on the architectural composition of the Conservation Area and the symmetry of the existing pair of houses (55 and 57 The Chine) would be destroyed.

- The position and proportion of the three proposed velux rooflights on the roof of the new extension have not been fully considered in terms of the design of the side (east facing) elevation, visible from the street, or the garden (north facing) elevation. None of these rooflights appear to be of Conservation Area design.

- I strongly object to the two rooflights on the east facing elevation which would negatively impact on the design and character of the Conservation Area. I note these rooflights, which are being proposed in addition to large front and rear windows within the proposed extension, are not a functional requirement of the design. I hope that if you are minded to accept this application it will be on the basis that these rooflights are omitted.

- The loss of garden at 57 The Chine would affect the visual amenity of myself and other neighbours while also impacting environmentally on the garden estate.

The planning application information is not fully clear and I note that:

- The proposed development is described as including 'a new window to an existing bathroom' although I am not able to see where this new window is proposed.

- The perspective views of the proposal show a high hedge (noted on the plans as being 3.5m) adjacent to the east facing elevation of the extension. I note however that the proposed extension extends to the boundary of 57 The Chine. This hedge is not part of the proposal but within the adjacent garden. The existing well established hedges would be vulnerable during the construction work and likely to be damaged.

- The inclusion of the hedge on the above noted perspective views means an illustration of the side (east facing) elevation of the proposed extension cannot be seen or fully understood.

- Although the design and access statement suggests that the extension is being requested to accommodate the owner's mother, 'now in her mid eighties', the proposal does not appear to have been designed for an elderly ambulant or disabled person in mind with the downstairs bathroom, and the door opening to this, unusually small and inappropriate for the use that is being suggested.

I have lived on the Rookfield Estate for fifty years and greatly value the quality and design of the architecture and the streetscape. This development would be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area. It would furthermore create a precedent for future development on the Rookfield Estate potentially further impacting on the wider Conservation Area.

Piecemeal and inappropriate change is the greatest threat to the character and appearance of a conservation area. I hope that the Article 4 Direction, which imposes tighter controls over development in order to safeguard the character of the area, will mean the Rookfield Estate can be protected.