

James Argles

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Objection to planning permission application [HGY/2023/0464]

Sent: 12 May 2023 14:07

Subject: Objection to planning permission application [HGY/2023/0464]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the planning permission application [HGY/2023/0464] for the proposed construction of a new office block, including covered bin and cycle stores in Broad Lane, N15. My objection is based on the following material considerations:

Contrary to development plan:

- This project is not compliant with Haringey's Local Plan DPD: Policy DM6: Building Heights. Policy DM6 bullet point C clearly states that "Tall buildings will only be acceptable in areas identified on Figure 2.2 as being suitable for tall buildings."
- Proposed building is significantly outside the "Locations Suitable For Tall buildings" area as shown in Figure 2.2 in Haringey's Local Plan DPD. In addition, Tottenham AAP Document Policy 4.24 clearly states that "there are a number of areas that are suitable for taller buildings because of their characteristics and accessibility. Equally, other parts of the AAP area comprise established residential "suburbs" characterised by conventional 2 storey housing, which are proposed to be retained and protected." As per the Policy, the proposed building is not in line with local authority policy.
- References: https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/final_haringey_tottenham_aap_dtp_online.pdf
- https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/final_haringey_dmp_dtp_online.pdf

Overbearing & out of character:

- The proposed development is significantly taller than the neighbouring buildings and would create an overbearing presence in the area. It is clear from the design plans and drawings that it does not fit in with the overall look and feel of the area, and would be a visual blight on the community. Proposed massing is simply not sufficient enough to mitigate overbearing building effect as argued by the developers. Please refer to "Proposed West Elevation" and design plans as show on <https://broadlane.communityuk.site/howitwilllook>

Overlooking:

- The proposed development would have large windows & rooftop, which would overlook neighbouring gardens and properties. This would invade the privacy of nearby residents and reduce their quality of life. Proposal wrongly states that only 8 windows would overlook the gardens. This is simply not correct as it is evident from the drawings that at over 20+ windows would have direct visibility into gardens and bedroom windows of Esin Court. This is visible in the Daylight and Sunlight Report submitted by the applicant. It is evident that proposed building will result in significant loss of privacy of the local residents. Especially of those living in Esin Court, Lea Court & Bramble Close.

Loss of light & overshadowing:

- The proposed development would result in a significant loss of natural light for neighbouring properties. As per the statement in the "Daylight & Sunlight Report" submitted by the applicant, the building is non-compliant BRE recommendations for Esin Court 1 & 2 (wrongly labelled in the report as Bramble Close 1&2).
- Comments on the report: Report provided by the applicant wrongly labels Esin Court properties as Bramble Close. It also states that "The assessment is based on the information listed in section 2 of this report and a

site visit undertaken on 10 June 2021". Which contradicts the previous statement " The assessment is based on the various numerical tests laid down in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice, 3rd Edition' by P J Littlefair 2022."

Based on the above reasoning, I strongly object the planning permission application "Construction of a new office block, including covered bin and cycle stores." under planning application reference "HGY/2023/0464". It is evident that this proposal did not take into account the quality of life of the local residents and planning guidance that was carefully thought out by the Haringey council. This is proved by the public consultation survey carried out by the applicant where 80% of the survey participants were against the building of the proposed site. Survey link: <https://broadlane.communityuk.site/dashboard> . Proposal "HGY/2023/0464" is – due to above points – significantly different than the previously approved plan "Demolition of the existing car wash, construction of a new office block including, covered bin, cycle's store and parking – approved 24/03/2017. " under planning application "HGY/2016/2232 ". I strongly believe that this proposal is clearly not in line with Haringey Council's Values & Commitments of "*developing a better understanding of our residents and what matters most to them* as well as *building stronger relationships with residents.*" and hence will be rejected by the council who are well known to care about their residents and values.

Many thanks,
Utku Kalkan

Full name: Utku Kalkan
Address: Flat 8 Esin Court, 1-9 Ventnor Terrace, Broad Lane, n15 4qr, London, UK