Skapoullis Jon

From: development.control@haringey.gov.uk
Sent: 22 March 2016 17:34
To: Planning Support
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/0542
Site Address: 57 The Chine London N10 3PX
Comments by: N. Wolfe
From:
26
Cascade Avenue
Muswell Hill
London

N10 3PU
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: I wish to object to the proposed application.

This proposed extension, which fronts onto the street, is visible from Cascade Avenue and from The Chine. New extensions should not be conspicuous to public view. This extension which is at the side rather than the back of the house can be seen from both the Chine and Cascade Avenue. This is in breach of the planning guidelines set by Haringey under Article 4 directive relating to development in the conservation area.

The planning statement suggests that the existing mature hedge will be merely "trimmed back" but, as shown on drawing No. 104, the intention is to remove the existing hedge and wooden fencing separating the garden of 29 Cascade Avenue from the side of 57 The Chine and replace these with a large brick wall. All of the properties throughout the conservation area are separated by fences, hedges or other forms of soft landscaping. The proposed extension would counter this in that the existing thick and mature hedging is intended to be replaced by the walls of the extension itself. This would also mean that any construction or repair work on that wall would necessitate the work to be done from the neighbouring garden of 29 Cascade, which is unacceptable.

As stated in the Rookfield Estate Design Guidelines: ¿ Existing walls, fences, hedges and gates are important design features ¿....and should be retained and repaired.¿ ¿New screenings should be restricted to appropriate planting.¿ ¿New hardstandings are not acceptable¿.

This estate was built so as to give each house its own space with a reasonable surrounding garden area. Building the proposed extension right up to the border with 29 Cascade Avenue is unacceptable, making the properties intrusively close to one another.

I also object to the two rooflights on the east facing elevation which would negatively impact on the design and character of the Conservation Area. Also, new dormers will destroy the uniformity of the existing roof line and should not be made to the front elevation.

This development, if allowed, would create a precedent for future developments on the Rookfield Estate, potentially further impacting on the wider Conservation Area.

Little by little, inappropriate change is the greatest threat to the character and appearance of this conservation area. I hope that the Article 4 Direction, which imposes tighter controls over development in order to safeguard the character of this area, will be adhered to and that Haringey will observe and guard its own design guidelines.