Newell Gerzie

From: development.control@haringey.gov.uk
Sent: 05 July 2016 07:58
To: Planning Support
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/1742
Site Address: Alford House Stanhope Road London N6 5AL
Comments by: George Papaeliopoulos
From:
11 Alford House
Stanhope Road

London

N6 5AL
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to this planning application.
I am both a resident ¿ flat 11 - and the co-Chair of the Alford House Residents Association. The Residents Association was not approached directly about this planning, nor does the Association welcome it following discussions with residents. There was a completely minimal attempt at any consultation process at all and no proper engagement with all the stake holders. The first most parties were aware of this was when the letters arrived from the Council and developer stating there was a planning application underway.

Application not fit for purpose.

I believe this application should be rejected out of hand as the applicant has not made a full and honest application. The plans state they are ¿not to scale.¿ If you look at the plans no reference is made of the lift motor/machinery and the cold water tanks. If you look at the top of each Block of Alford House at present you will see an extra metal structure on the roof, resembling a 20ft metal transport container. I am happy to provide photos. This houses the cold water tanks and lift machinery for the Block. There is one on each Block. The applications shows the layout of the rooms etc but does not show where all the cold water tanks and lift machinery will be moved to. In one of the Three - Dimensional drawings you can see a small white area on top the roof of the new 4th floor. The only way to fit in the water tanks and lift machinery is to have a fifth floor installed. This is not made clear, nor are the drawings representative of the actual work proposed as they state ¿not to scale.¿ The drawings appear to show the height of the extension to be lower than they would actually be. While I would not expect the smallest bolt to be specified to a millimetre I do expect a clear, full and honest application to be presented and not one where an extra floor is almost ignored. I do not believe the council should either welcome nor endorse such tactics and refuse any consent on this point alone.
A two floor extension is not in keeping with the area, and its surroundings, especially in a conservation area.

Notwithstanding the above, I object on the following grounds as well.

Drainage and sewage.
The applicant draws on a letter from Thames water in reference to water supply. However the Block¿s main drains regularly block up and have to be pumped out by private contractor otherwise all the flats on the ground flows would suffer sewage backwash from the blocked drains. The drains have also been damaged over time by egresses of tree roots and serious

subsidence. As the drains blocking occurs on private land it is not within Thames Water¿s purview to comment. Any extra flats will further over stress a drainage/sewerage system at maximum capacity. I draw your attention to the applicant not asking about the drainage/sewerage nor does Thames water comment on it.

Having the other owners and resident suffer extra sewage blockages and possible ground floor flooding with associated health & safety, flood damage and costs issues is neither fair nor reasonable when the applicant intends to develop and sell on.

All of the piping, water supply, gas supply, drainage and electrical cabling have been encased in concrete into the fabric of the building and the drains were badly designed and installed. Retro-fitting any extra capacity onto this is a very ill advised, if not dangerous, and puts potentially into danger current residents health and well being.

Daylight - total loss of direct light

The front of the rear Block only gets daylight in the mornings. The extra 4th and 5th floors as proposed will block out all the morning light depriving the front of the rear block of all their natural light permanently by casting a permanent shadow.
Equally the rear facing flats in the front Block only get daylight in the afternoon. This also would be totally blocked by the extra 2 floors on the rear Block, also depriving them of all their natural light. Thus 50% of all current residents/owners would be deprived of all their natural light by the shadow cast by the new floors on each block.
I suspect this is why the applicant has not been precise on the scope, size and scale of the proposed developed because total loss of daylight is a legal point to refuse a planning application.

Parking
The Bocks already have a parking problem with not enough spaces to go around. Several flats have two cars and have to park one car on the road. One of the spaces ¿offered¿ by the applicant is already being used, so at best 3 new spaces would be created. The idea luxury 2 and 3 bedroom flats would only have one car per household is totally false and at the last an extra 8 new cars would be competing with a full car parking causing extra on street parking, congestions, pollution and traffic issues.

Building fabric.

The front block has suffered from serious subsidence. One of the flats on the top floor of the front Block reports serious structural cracks in on corner. I do not see how any planning application can be granted when there are some structural issues can raise serious Health & Safety issues on the safety of any development on all current residents.

Privacy

The new proposed flats will have line of sight into all the flats opposite Alford House, directly into people bedrooms, equally into the bedroom of the neighbours on either side of Alford House, up and down Stan hope Road. The proposed flats would also be able to see into the other bedroom of flats in the opposite Block of Alford House. The proposed flats would also overlook into other neighbouring properties¿ gardens as well.

During any works the lifts would be out of action for some 6-9 months. We have elderly resident as well as family with babies/young children. How does a family living on a second or third floor with twins¿ enter and exit the building? The extra noise, dust, smalls and nuisance would be significant and considerable nuisance to the quality of residents¿ lives.
Financial loses are likely to be incurred by landlords who rent out their properties, especially on the top floor of each Block. Already two sets of tenants have given notice of their intention to quit should the works be done. This application will cause financial losses to existing owners who rent their properties out.

The buildings would be covered in scaffolding during the work. This again reduces the quality of life of residents during the work as well as increases the risk of burglaries and theft.

For these reasons, I object to the granting of any planning permission for the construction of these penthouses.

Yours sincerely,

George Papaeliopoulos