

### **Application HGY/2023/0850**

We strongly object to this application.

We rely on the report of Stuart Minty as commissioned by ourselves in conjunction with our neighbours at 141 Cranley Gardens

### **HGY / 2022 / 0746**

A previous application was made as recently as last year for a 25 meter long basement pool and associated items. Of particular significance was the objection from Cllr Pippa Connor . She states in her letter that the council was in the process of developing a new basement policy and she asked that no major basement proposals are progressed until the policy is in place. We agree with the Councillor. Decisions concerning development of this nature – basements - in neighbourhoods that historically have never featured them - should be subject to strategic, planning guidance to ensure consistency in the design etc. These matters that change the very nature and character of the neighbourhood that make them distinctive and attractive.

Guidance should cover the limits to siting and maximum dimensions of proposed basement development, and provide for safeguarding biodiversity by requiring development for example to be set back from neighbouring boundaries by at least 1 meter.

We therefore ask that consideration of this new application be delayed until consultation and guidance has been completed. That, in our submission would be the proper course to take. Only then, could informed and transparent consideration be confidently given to an application such as this.

Cllr Connor's objection can be found at PDF, 24 42 KB

### **Current Application: HGY / 2023 / 0850**

In this application, the pool size is 12.5 meters by 3 meters In addition, a new gym ,sauna room , plant room changing room and bathroom is sought. partly under the footprint of the house. The pool has two meters or less under the footprint of the house , the rest ,i.e. approximately 10 meters is under the garden . Hence this application is a hybrid , part basement , but mainly garden development.

### **Encroachment**

This application is part of a sequence of applications made incrementally since 2015 . Nos.139 and 137 are semi- detached and are among the smallest houses in the road. 139 has a loft development, a conservatory and an outhouse none of which is part of 137. The accumulation of these additions is a substantial encroachment into the garden. It is well beyond that seen in gardens of neighbouring properties and impacts negatively on the character of the area. See photo below

**HGY / 2014 / 3181** was an application made and granted for an out- house with dimensions of 7.5 m in length 3.5 meters in width. This photograph taken after this development shows the extent of the encroachment into the garden of 139 which is well beyond that seen in any other neighbouring garden.



### **GYM**

The gym as permitted by application 3181 has dimensions of 6m by 3m giving 18 square meters for use in all. The 'gym' now being sought is a 3m by 3m a reduction of exactly a half of what is currently available.

### **GARDEN STORAGE**

The present basement garden store area is 7m by 3m giving 21 square meters. The new application seeks provision for storage space of 1m by 3m i.e. 3 square meters. Most family houses can accommodate this modest size of storage without needing to excavate tons of earth.

In this residential area, excavation for this purpose is a totally unacceptable use of land.

### **CHANGING AREA**

Why is a changing room requested when the house is connected to the basement / pool area via underground stairs and passages ensuring privacy to the family? We note and endorse the remarks made by Ruby Sewell "it sounds more like a commercial undertaking than improvements to a house in a street in a suburban London area." Also, the remark by Angela Evans, "The extent of the proposed application is not in keeping with a domestic dwelling in a purely residential street, and suggests the likelihood of a fitness/leisure business being carried out in the future".

## **SAUNA**

The plans that appear in the DAS do not provide for a sauna. We presume this facility is no longer being contemplated.

## **SWIMMING POOL**

This is the heart of the application and the most contentious part. The applicant seeks to argue that he should be entitled to change the normal use of his garden yet further. It has little or no regard to climate change, potential increase flooding risks, danger to the very structure of 137 Cranley Gardens to which it is attached, and to the character of the area. More than 75% of the garden of 139 Cranley Gardens is unusable as a garden. Less than 25% of the garden is now available for the planting of trees shrubs or flowers. There is not a single tree in the garden, all have been removed by the applicant over time. The garden currently has a 16.5 meter artificial grass pitch surrounded on 3 sides by wire fencing. There are two distinct cement block covered terraces as well as a large concrete terrace the width of the house. There is a wide concrete slab path running from a substantial concrete staircase close to the house to the artificial pitch. There is also a large concrete L shaped settee fashioned on one of the terraces.

As a general observation, we note the proposals pay no heed to the requirement for Sustainable Development in that the numerous staircases, both to access the development and within it, would exclude the disabled and elderly as future occupants or owners.

## **FLOODING**

The occupants and residents of Cranley Gardens experience saturated gardens for months each winter, when the water table causes widespread surface pooling for prolonged periods. Climate change is recognised as threatening all flood risk presumptions and forecasts. The nature of these challenges confronting policy and decision makers are obvious. There will be more extreme weather the timings of such events will be totally unpredictable. For example, in May 2021, the Ground Inspection report submitted with the Applicant's last attempt to obtain permission, stated that the risk of flooding was 'low'. That assessment was proved to be completely wrong. Two months later, in July 2021 there was widespread flooding in Haringey, specifically at the junction of Cranley Gardens, Park Road and Muswell Hill. These events were examined in a Section 19 Report prepared by McCloy Consulting in January 2022.

The BIA submitted, is routinely contradicted by the experience of those living here. The reality is that we live for months with flooded back gardens. To read, therefore, an expert telling us that the chances of flooding are low, challenges sanity. Nothing short of a properly independent inspection and appraisal of ground conditions and taking place throughout a full the year is required; and not one produced by agents commissioned by the Applicant's developer ( in the summer months ).

## **BASEMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

This BIA is the same as the one provided for the previous application and has not been updated. First and foremost, no further empirical investigation has been conducted since May 2021. At that time, a single borehole monitored over a two week period was dug in relation to the issue of drainage, potential flooding etc. We are surprised to say the least, in view of our comments in the earlier application, that no further efforts were made within the intervening 2 years to conduct this investigation in the winter months.

In our opinion the BIA is incomplete presumptuous and superficial in content.

The Applicant has done nothing to demonstrate compliance with the guidance set out in DM 18, for example, that the development will not harm the setting of the property or the established character of the area. The work proposed will significantly increase congestion and pollution, and will place unreasonable inconvenience impacting on the day to day lives of those living nearby. We note the estimated time for this development is one year. A realistic estimate given the common delays in sourcing material and labour will be a minimum of 2 years.

#### **DM 18 on residential Basements**

#### **GOOD RELATIONS ?**

At paragraph 7 : 4 of the application , it is stated that the owners of 139 want " good relations " with their neighbours .We have never been asked by them to discuss their proposals. Quite the reverse.

In view of a number of incidents both very recently and in June last year, we will be writing to the agents so as to give them an opportunity to withdraw this misleading comment.

#### **IN CONCLUSION**

This is a selfish and audacious application to destroy the natural fabric of what was a lovely garden not to say anything about the pollution, air quality, traffic congestion and noise in the general area which would inevitably occur.

The area is renowned for its open spaces, many sports clubs and gyms, at the centre of which lies the Park Road Pools and Fitness Centre. It offers a fully equipped gym, one of the largest heated Lidos in London ( 50 x23m) as well an indoor pool measuring 25 x 12.5m - all this within a few minutes' walk of the applicant's address.

Dora Belford and Jeremy Ornstin