

Our ref – 13/AR00861

Your ref -

Date 15th March, 2022

Haringey Council Planning Service
Level 6, River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
N22 8HQ
By email: planningcustomercare@haringey.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

HGY/2022/0356 | 22 Colney Hatch Lane London N10 1DU Enlargement of side and rear dormer windows and removal of rear chimney breast. Installation of rear ground floor timber bi-fold doors and creation of rear first floor terrace.

We are instructed by Franziska Arnold-Dwyer of 20 Colney Hatch Lane who objects to this proposal for the additional reasons set out below, to be ready in conjunction with her letter of the same date, to you sent direct.

Our client has pointed out the plans are inaccurate – we add that the ‘description’ is misleading.

The removal of 2 chimneys (still shown on the ‘proposed’ front elevation plans as retained) is a serious concern. Imaging is **attached**. The right-hand chimney (shown retained and the description says nothing about its removal) was by its height and position, a prominent feature of heritage interest to the roof/street scene. The other chimney also removed over the main part of the roof (also shown retained and the description says nothing about its removal) over the gable robs the roofline of yet more interest, leaving the roof bland and unbalanced. The result is lost features of significant character, an important ingredient to the Muswell Hill conservation area heritage asset. No 22 is described in the Appraisal as of a ‘arts and crafts style’ with a large gable end and attic storey with dormers. Above the front hedge the upper half of the building greatly informs character. Demolition of 2 these 2 chimneys so just 2 on the left remain, leaves the house lacking balance and form. Sub area 7 in the Appraisal refers at 10.4 to ‘**prominent chimney stacks**’. That to the right, due to its height in the otherwise open skyline, was prominent until its demolition. 2 have been removed, the proposal fails to ‘preserve or enhance’.

To create **high quality beautiful and sustainable buildings and places**, which is “fundamental” to what planning and development process should achieve¹, development must create **better places in which to live** and work and help make development acceptable to communities. The introduction of a new side dormer facilitating overlooking of our client’s immediate rear private amenity space is clearly contrary to NPPF 130, but in this case there is a second higher hurdle to cross, given the lost chimneys; the **public benefit test** in NPPF 202. The reality is that even if the lost chimneys are concluded to constitute ‘less than substantial harm’, the applicant cannot satisfy the public benefit test. the benefit is purely private.

Conclusions

Scrutiny shows this proposal is flawed, from misdescription and inaccurate plans, to fundamental conflict with the Plan. Per s38(6) PCPA 2004, planning permission must be refused, there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm to fundamental amenity protection, or heritage. These matters are of significant weight tipping the balance firmly against the scheme. Such conclusions are copper-bottomed by the development being unsustainable as defined by NPPF 2021.

Yours faithfully,

Kingsley Smith

Kingsley Smith Solicitors LLP

¹ NPPF 126