



DDI (London): 0207 692 0643

DDI (Bedford): 01234 834548

E: [stuart@smplanning.com](mailto:stuart@smplanning.com)

W: [www.smplanning.com](http://www.smplanning.com)

*London Office:*

80-83 Long Lane

London, EC1A 9ET

22/09/2023

Sent via email only:

[planning@haringey.co.uk](mailto:planning@haringey.co.uk) / [josh.parker@haringey.co.uk](mailto:josh.parker@haringey.co.uk)

**FAO Josh Parker**

Dear Mr Parker,

**Application address:** 139 Cranley Gardens, London, N10 3AG

**Application reference:** HGY/2023/0850

**Proposal:** Basement extension to existing semi-detached property, to implement a new gym, swimming pool, sauna room, plant room and bathroom.

I am writing on behalf of my clients as part of a continued objection to the above planning application. My clients own and occupy the adjacent properties at Nos. 137 and 141 Cranley Gardens and would be both directly and detrimentally affected by the proposed development. It is understood that the application has been subject to the submission of amended documents, but which fail to address previous objections raised by our clients. Please find our summary below.

#### **Amended documents – submitted**

- Updated Appendix D – Ground Movement Assessment
- Updated Appendix B – Structural Calculations
- Updated Appendix A – Stage 2 Drawings
- Updated Basement Impact Assessment (Rev E)
- Updated FRA and Suds Reports (Parts 1 & 2)

#### **Comments on amended documents**

After a review of the amended documents published on the Council's website, the changes made (those documents listed above) are based on and as a response to technical matters relating to the basement works and flood risk/drainage. However, what is apparent is that no such amendments have been made to substantially change the proposed developments, thus failing to take into consideration our previous objection dated 30<sup>th</sup> May 2023.

In the interests of brevity I do not intend to fully rehearse the detailed objections raised in the previous objection letter but those detailed comments were pertaining to the following matters; character and appearance with regard to size, scale and massing of the proposed basement, inaccuracies contained within the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) (and updated BIA), neighbour amenity in regard to light pollution, noise and ventilation and trees/biodiversity. In addition, matters were also raised in regard missing reports and incorrect certificates being submitted.

### **Character/appearance**

The overall, size, scale, massing or footprint of the proposed development has not been amended in anyway and therefore have not addressed previous concerns in relation to the resulting, disproportionately large extension which fails to appear subservient to the dwelling and which fails to respect the character and form of the existing property. The basement size and scale is tantamount to the size of a subterranean dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to contribute to the piecemeal fashion that the property has previously been extended, further encroaching into the rear garden and which results in an overdevelopment of the site. The proposed development remains contrary to DMPD Policies DM1 and DM18 and SP Policy SP11.

### **Inaccuracies within original submitted BIA/updated BIA**

It was previously identified that the original submitted BIA contained a number of inaccuracies including that the basement was referred to as single storey (misleading when the basement is better described as two storey). The updated BIA still refers to the basement as single storey which we maintain is misleading given the significant depth of the basement.

Please note, in addition to the above, that we reserve the right to comment further subject to the amended BIA being professionally reviewed on behalf of our clients.

### **Impacts on neighbour amenity**

The previous objection highlighted several concerns with regard to neighbour impacts including light pollution, noise and odour which have not been adequately addressed or mitigated. The application still proposes a plant room for the associated swimming pool and no noise impact/vibration assessment has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that any omitting noise or vibration from proposed plant equipment will not have detrimental impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, no odour or ventilation assessments have been submitted to fully consider the impacts to neighbours from the plant or ventilation systems which includes a chemical storage room.

No amendments have been made to the proposed large lightwell to provide natural light to basement. In view that the basement and swimming pool will rely on the use of artificial light and having regard to the central, isolated location of the lightwell in the garden, this will result in a form of light pollution unacceptable to neighbours, particularly when viewed from upper floor neighbouring windows. The impact of light spill from the lightwell will continue to have a negative visual impact on the intrinsically dark, unlit rear garden to the detriment of the area generally. No attempt has been made to address this.

No construction management plan has been submitted with the application. As such, the application fails to consider the impact that construction would have on the local road network as well as the amenity of neighbouring properties. No reassurance on these matters have been provided for my clients or other neighbouring residents.

### **Trees and biodiversity**

The previous objection raised concerns to the scale and extent of the proposed works, and how large-scale excavation of the rear garden will result in the disruption of landscaping and limit future growth potential, particularly where the depth of topsoil above the basement will be limited. The size and scale of the basement has not been amended and this has not been addressed. Furthermore, no Arboricultural Impact Assessment or Method Statement has been submitted as part of the amended documents and it's clear that the application still fails to consider impacts on nearby trees and hedges. Finally, it should also be noted that a flood attenuation tank is still proposed (paragraph 10.8.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment and SUDS Report) and presumably still within the front driveway area but that no assessment on potential impacts to a nearby street tree and neighbouring hedgerow have been undertaken.

### **Procedural**

Notwithstanding the submission of updated structural drawings provided in Appendix A of the amended BIA, this continues to provide details of a retaining wall extending over the boundary with no.137 Cranley Gardens. On the basis that the proposed development therefore extends outside the red line area of the application site, Certificate B should have been completed and notice served on this neighbouring occupier. Our client therefore maintains the position that the application is considered to be invalid and should be withdrawn.

### **Summary**

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development is still considered to conflict with the adopted development plan. Notwithstanding the submission of amended documents for the application (which seek to address technical matters regarding the basement construction and flood/drainage), it has been demonstrated within this letter that the proposed works; will have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the property, will have adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity, the local highway network and trees and biodiversity. There are no material planning considerations that outweigh the identified conflicts with the adopted development plan. In addition, it is considered that the incorrect notice has been served on the application form and that the application is invalid.

The council are therefore respectfully requested to reject the application. If there are any questions or required points of clarification, please contact me as soon as possible.

We reserve the right to expand upon this objection letter in response, as necessary, to any further submissions made by the Applicant.

Yours sincerely

**Stuart Minty**  
**Director**  
**SM Planning**