

Sent: 12 December 2022 22:05

Subject: Objection to planning application ref HGY/2022/4024 -

Application address 52 Onslow Gardens London N10 3JX

My name and address - Adam Fraiss and Jane Garrard, 50 Onslow Gardens London N10 3JX

We live in the semi-detached house that is adjoined to no 52. Whilst I am not in principle opposed to an extension to the property next door the proposal as it stands is not acceptable as below

Headline Comments:

1 Overbearing scale – both height and mass of proposed extension which will result in a significant loss of light to the inside of our property as well as outside on our terrace.

2 Noise and disturbance: Moving the patio doors and kitchen to border the party wall will cause both odour and noise disturbance. The houses were originally built in a way to maximise privacy and minimise disturbance and this is being overridden.

3 Consultation: Due process has not been carried out in respect of this application. We did not receive a letter from the planning department and it is just down to another neighbour that we were made aware of the application at all. Only 1 person appears to have received any kind of information.

Further information on each of these points is below:

1 Height and the mass of the new wall

The height and mass of the proposed building which extends along our party wall line is so significant that unreasonable overshadowing will occur. There will be an unacceptable loss of light both into our kitchen and on our patio.

328.113 shows the existing rear plan. No 50 is on the right-hand side of this drawing and it shows that there is currently only a minimal standard (low level) fence, between the properties, which decreases in height further along the terrace as you move away from the house (not visible on the plan). Above the fence is a sloping glass structure, completely transparent - which slopes away from our property so at no point is it overbearing. Therefore, we currently get natural light into our property. The back of the house faces northeast so light is limited at the best of times.

This plan of the existing structure also clearly shows that it is at a lower level than our house. Our house is sited up the hill and on a higher level to no 52. The fact that the proposed extension includes basement excavation to lower the floor level further and the resulting extension still ends up significantly higher than the current one demonstrates quite how significant the mass of this proposed project is. There is no mention in the design and access statement of the disparity in heights between our properties and the fact that a wall built along the party wall would be significantly more over-bearing on our side.

328.203 details that the planning application is to replace this low level fence with an approx 8- 9ft high (measured from the side of no 50) brick built building which extends along the party wall for approx. 9ft – measured from where it will overbear our window. This is approx. 3ft higher than the existing fence. The proposed brick wall completely dwarfs and overbears our windows to the kitchen (one of them in entirety) and our patio. As above it does not appear that anyone has taken into consideration the height disparity between our properties.

The new building mass will also be built closer to the party wall than the existing glass structure is at its closest point, which is set back from the fence. Our kitchen window is bay shaped in keeping with the original character of

the house. Under the proposal our full height kitchen window closest to and facing the party wall will end up facing directly onto a tall overbearing brick wall and will **lose all of its light** if the plans are approved in the current form. The rest of the bay will also lose significant amounts of light – with only a low level fence being in place at the moment to plenty of natural light.

The planning application also states that the roof will be ‘green’ and covered with grass. This could provide further height to the structure and whilst I am generally in complete support of increasing the green to our environment this could just further impact our loss of light as it grows.

The roof height will also further be increased by the raised glass dome – which will further impact the overbearing nature of the proposed extension.

All of these factors together mean the plan in its current format will be extremely overbearing and result in a significant loss of light to our property.

A reduction in the height of this wall and the distance the building extends outwards could significantly reduce this impact.

Photos to support our plan

We attach 3 photographs in the email copy of this letter to demonstrate these points

Photo A shows from no 50 the height difference between the 2 properties with the existing glass conservatory. In the planning document the new wall is planned to be at height above our patio window (about half way between the top of the window and the top of the roof).

Photo B from the inside of our kitchen. The proposed new wall is a lot taller than the window on the right hand side– so the full window will end up facing a brick wall all the way up and we lose all the light. The new wall will also take up the light from the window to the left due to its height and bulk.

Photo C . The pentagonal glass structure where its furthest and highest parts are currently away from the fence in the centre of the building is being replaced by a high wall that runs all the way along the fence line. (note it is higher than the patio windows in the picture)

Measurements

There are no exact measurements included on the submitted plans so it is difficult to know exactly the height being proposed – proportions above have been calculated by careful extrapolation of the scale of the drawings in the application and my own estimated measurements. I am concerned about the lack of detail and am apprehensive that the reality will be even worse than the drawings suggest – it will be difficult to hold the builders/owners to account without knowing exactly what they are required to adhere to. Every 10cm different in height to such a huge mass will have a significant impact on our loss of light.

Whatever the outcome of this planning process I would like a guarantee that exact measurements are adhered to.

2 Noise and disturbance

Schedule 328.200 shows that the plans include placement of a cooker and hob in the new extension along our party wall close to the bifold doors. This is completely adjacent to the windows to our inside seating area and to our patio table and the resulting noise and odour nuisance are likely to be significant to us.

I am also very concerned where the extractor fan or any vents for the kitchen will be placed. If they are anywhere on the party wall this will pollute straight into both our kitchen and our outdoor areas. If the outlet is on the extension roof this will pollute straight into my office (I work from home) which is adjacent to the roof area. Both are odour nuisance.

I would like to be included within the conditions of any planning approval a condition that any vents, fans or outlets are fed to the side of the extension furthest from our boundary. Currently the external doors to the property are situated on the other side of their house, away from our boundary but moving them close to our party wall represents a significant change and will result in significant disturbance. Semi-detached houses were designed as they were to minimise any disturbance between households.

3 Due consultation has not been followed

Due process has not been followed in this planning application process as documented in the Haringey Statement of Community Involvement (neighbour notification clearly detailed in Appendix 3). We are the direct neighbours to the proposed development, and we did not receive a consultation letter. We were only alerted to the planning application by another neighbour who was sent a single envelope containing a significant number (maybe all of them?) of the consultation letters for those listed on the planning application as having been consulted.

The neighbour put a message on the 'Onslow Gardens residents' whats app group a week after the letter was dated to say that she had received this pile of letters, obviously in error. She added a photo of the letter to the Whats app group. I am on the group but do not regularly read the posts, so it is complete coincidence that I actually saw the message that she posted that day. Or we would have been completely unaware of the proposed plans which will have significant effect on our property. We had not been consulted in any other way.

Anyone not on the road Whats app group (since only some residents are on the group) or who missed the message that day will be completely unaware that they should have received a letter. The one neighbour I questioned had not seen the letter or plans. In addition, the owners of some properties in Woodland Gardens are on the planning application as having been consulted. But their letters were also sent to my neighbour, and they would certainly not have been on our road Whats app group and so will be unaware of the planning application.

Clearly an error in the planning office but it does mean that the consultation process has not been followed and details of those who have been consulted are incorrect on the planning application. So at the very least this planning consultation process needs to be repeated correctly to ensure that all affected parties have been notified and provided with the opportunity to provide comment in line with the Haringey regulations.

This has also been sent via the online response system

ADAM FRAIS





