

Mulroy

82 Woodside Avenue, London, N8 9TD
22081-A30-Review of Public Consultation

Item No.	Subject	Public Comment	Mulroy Response	Drawing Reference
Michael Hulme - 84 Woodside Avenue - 10/07/2023 - Object				
1	Loss of light	New high level room These plans involve building a whole new high-level room on top of the existing rear extension at No. 82 Woodside Avenue. This new raised development would have significant and serious adverse consequences for our enjoyment of our property at No 84 due to the resulting loss of light into our conservatory and sitting room, as well as onto our rear patio area. There would also be noticeable reduction of light coming into our first floor rear bedrooms, and especially the one nearest to No. 82. The overall loss of light from this development would be particularly serious for our property because due to the basic layout of these houses, unlike at No 82, our house at No 84 doesn't have any side windows, and hence the only light that reaches into our inside sitting room area can only ever enter from the conservatory, and especially through the glazed conservatory roof. Furthermore due also to the basic layout and arrangement of these adjacent duplex offset houses we already have restricted morning light, ie. from the south and south-east. Fortunately though we do currently have direct sunlight in the afternoons, ie from the south-west, on to our conservatory glazed roof and rear patio area. The planned new development at No. 82 however would be in the direct line of a significant portion of this afternoon light and so would significantly restrict and reduce the amount of light entering our conservatory glazed roof and rear patio area. In other words both areas would become partially shaded by and in the shadow of the new high-level room.	The position and massing of the first floor extension has been carefully considered to minimise overshadowing to the neighbouring property at 84 Woodside Avenue: - The extension falls within a 45 degree line taken from the centre of both the first floor window and the glazed roof over the rear extension. - The extensions is set back greater than 2m from the party wall ensuring no unacceptable overshadowing. For this reason we are of the view that the potential overshadowing as a result of the proposed works falls within what would be considered reasonable for new development.	22081-3-011-P2 22081-3-032-P2 22081-3-111-P1
2	Loss of light	Raising of party wall Although not dimensioned the planning application scale drawing (22081-3-032) clearly shows the party wall between our two rear extensions being noticeably increased in height. The owner tells me he thinks this will not actually be the case, though the above drawing clearly shows otherwise. This height increase would be problematic for a number of reasons, one of which would certainly be the resulting significant loss of light entering our conservatory glazed roof that this would cause, and again especially so in the afternoons.	The party wall would require adjustment to ensure sufficient waterproofing can be provided to both the new extension at no. 82, but also to ensure the protection of no. 84. Please refer to the revised rear elevation drawing and additional side elevation, where this has been reduced to minimise disruption to the neighbouring property at no. 84.	22081-3-032-P2 22081-3-033-P1
3	Privacy	The new high-level room is shown on the plan drawing (22081-3-011) as a 'living area' as opposed to a bedroom, and if this is the case it would represent a potentially significant change of use with consequent potentially increased utilisation. This new room also is shown as having a very large new picture window to the rear, plus also partly to the side. This new window is obviously set further towards the rear of the property than is the case for the existing bedroom window, and this makes this new and very large window considerably closer to our rear garden area, and with therefore a much closer and larger view of that area becoming available. This all leads to a relative loss of privacy for us and a feeling of being much more closely overlooked and on view than currently is the case.	The new space formed within the 2 storey extension is proposed as additional space to serve the bedroom which is planned to be used as by the applicant's young daughter, therefore by nature the use of this space may vary over time. Please refer to the revised first floor plan where this space has been retitled from 'living' to 'dressing' to more accurately reflect its intended usage. The design and massing of the extension have been carefully developed to be directional away from the garden of no.84, while providing obscured glazing to the side facing no.80. These design decisions result in a proposal that minimises overlooking to neighbouring properties while providing much needed natural light into the applicant's property.	22081-3-011-P2 22081-3-111-P1
4	Character and Appearance	The new high-level room proposed represents in our view a highly unattractive development, and one not in keeping with the general character and appearance of the other houses in this development. It also has the highly undesirable result of in effect surrounding the rear conservatory area of our house at No. 84, with high walls which would then be on all sides, and hence giving it the appearance of being both dwarfed and also enclosed, like being in a sort of cave, or recess. This has a most unappealing and unattractive appearance and character, both overall, and particularly as this change would affect our property.	The proposed extensions will utilise a similiar material palette to compliment the existing dwelling, while creating a distinction between the old and new so that the original dwelling can still be appreciated alongside the new proposal. Since their original construction almost all of the buidlings that formed the new development along Woodside Avenue and Holt Close have been altered in a variety of ways including changes to materials and form. As a result, in our view the re-imagination of the buildings by their occupant's has become a defining and attractive feature of this development which we seek to develop further.	22081-3-901-P1
5	Other Concerns	Potential structural support issues for the new high level room We are concerned that the drawings may not accurately reflect all the modifications required for all the various load-bearing issues regarding the proposed new high-level room. Furthermore it is very difficult to see how the builder thinks he would actually support the full weight of the new high level room without somehow utilising the existing party wall, assuming of course that this existing wall would actually have the capacity to do so – and given that this wall is an add-on to the original building it is certainly quite possible and even probable that it does not. Of particular concern here for us at No.84 would be both the future stability of that party wall and/or any potential need to make modifications to it. This would be highly detrimental to our conservatory, and to us, and would be completely unacceptable.	We wish to re-assure that should permission be granted, the stability and condition of the party wall will be carefully monitored and respected throughout the construction period. This will include the appointment of a qualified party wall surveyor to confirm and monitor any proposed works affecting the party wall, as well as a qualified structural engineer to complete the design of the structural elements for the proposed works.	

6	Other concerns	Patio enlargement and our garden wall stability The plan layout drawing (22081-3-010) shows the patio being considerably enlarged where it runs along the other side of our brick garden wall. The way this is shown on the drawing we suspect would be highly likely to cause a stability problem for this wall, and leading to a possible collapse of the wall.	No comment.
7	Other concerns	Consequences of actually carrying out such a large multi-workface project This planned project represents a very considerable amount of work in many quite different areas and trades. Also, we note that in talking to the owner it's not at all clear to us that the drawings accurately reflect all of his wishes, or what he has been told by the builder, or what may in practice be required to achieve what appears to be desired. It seems highly likely to us therefore that there will be numerous unexpected problems encountered in undertaking such a large and multi-faceted project. Furthermore, quite apart from the considerable, and highly detrimental to both neighbouring properties, noise and disturbance and disruption in such a project we also have considerable and realistic concerns that given our immediate proximity then the many problems that will almost certainly be experienced during actual construction will have highly negative consequences for us at No. 84.	No comment.
8	Other concerns	Timing of planning application and short notice period for any comments We only received the council letter on this planning application on 5th July. Comments are required apparently by 19th July, and so giving us only 14 days to suddenly carry out a full review of a quite substantial planned project, and given the immediate proximity to us, one which could very well severely impact us in myriad ways, many of which may not be obviously or immediately apparent. It's not at all clear why such a short review period short be set here, and particularly considering that this is a typical holiday time for many. It is only by chance that we happened to be here to receive the council letter, and we might very easily have been away for a few weeks and hence miss the opportunity to comment at all. This timing issue is problematic, and we therefore state here that this brief review here is not definitive or necessarily complete, and we therefore reserve the right to make any further comments and/or objections as and when necessary at any later date.	No comment.

Michael Hulme - 84 Woodside Avenue - 18/07/2023 - Object (Further Comments)

9	Appearance and Amenity	In addition to the comments and objections already made we would add that the proposed rear first floor extension above the existing ground level creates in our view an overdeveloped and oversized and frankly ugly construction. These houses are already large, on four floors, and with considerable floor area. They were originally all built as four bedroom houses, however no.82 has subsequently removed the partition wall between the two rear first floor bedrooms to make one larger bedroom, and hence currently he only has a total of three bedrooms. The new construction creates a fourth bedroom again but in a way which is both ugly and obtrusive and which has serious downsides and problems for both neighbouring properties, as already described in other comments made so far. The owner of no.82 could instead very simply create a fourth bedroom again simply by reinstating that partition wall to return to the original four bedroom layout. This would then have no detrimental impact on his neighbours, and would then be fully in keeping with the original plans for these houses, and for which planning permission was obviously originally granted.	No comment.
---	------------------------	---	-------------

Councillor Pippa Connor - On behalf of 80 Woodside Avenue - 10/07/2023 - Objection/Comment

10	Loss of privacy	I would like to add a comment regarding this application. The side windows at number 82 are noted to be obscured glass, will this mean that the glass will always have to remain obscured? I have had concerns raised that if the glass was replaced to clear following the finish of the build then the neighbour at number 80 would lose her privacy.	As noted, the side windows will have obscured glazing to prevent any loss of privacy to the residents of no.80, but also to provide privacy to the applicant. Should the application be approved, the applicant is willing for the council to apply a condition ensuring the use of obscured glazing to all the newly proposed side windows at first floor to protect the privacy of the neighbouring property as well as the applicant.
----	-----------------	---	---

Ian Rennie, Director, Rennie & Partners - On behalf of 80 Woodside Avenue - 17/07/2023 - Objection

11	Overlooking and respect of original design	The construction of an additional floor so that the single storey extension becomes a two storey extension extends the rear elevation so that it is level with the rear elevation of no. 80 Woodside Avenue. The original architects detail of stepping the properties, so as to prevent overlooking, is ignored in this proposal.	As confirmed within the report from Rennie & Partners, the houses along Woodside Avenue are set back from the road in a stepped sequence following the line of the road. Therefore, the stepping detail of the properties is considered to be a response to the front elevation, not the rear elevation and in this way the proposed works forming this application are considered to be respectful of this original detail.
12	Loss of privacy	No.80 Woodside Avenue has a single storey extension with a roof light. The additional first floor of the two storey extension of no.82 is provided with a side window which will look straight over into the garden of no.80 and through the rooflight into the rear room of no.80. There is substantial loss of privacy. Although the drawing provides for the side windows to be provided with obscured glazing, there should be no side window to the first floor living room.	Refer to comments against item no. 10.

13	Loss of privacy	On the existing drawings the first floor rear room comprises a large bedroom which spans from side wall to rear wall and has all its windows in the rear elevation. Because of the proposed new two storey extension this bedroom is being provided with two side windows which overlook no.80 Woodside Avenue. These windows are necessary because the original large bedroom has been divided into two and the bedroom therefore has no natural lighting or ventilation. However, this bedroom is open to the first floor rear reception and if this is the plan there is no need for the side windows which overlook no.80 Woodside Avenue. There is no guarantee that the obscured glazing could not be replaced at some time in the future with clear glazing.	Refer to comments against item no. 10.
14	Increase in size	The gross internal area of the house is substantial. Any further increase has a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the original development. The proposal to build a new single storey side extension and additional storey on top of the existing single storey extension is contrary to the original design for which planning permission was granted.	No comment.
15	Loss of light	The construction of the two storey extension and single storey side extension will result in loss of light to the rear rooms of no.80.	Please refer to the revised drawings submitted alongside this document, all proposals fall within a 45 degree angle from all neighbouring windows and rooflights, which ensures the neighbouring property at no. 80 will not experience any unacceptable overshadowing.

22081-3-032-P2
22081-3-111-P1