



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove, Highgate London N6 6BS

Planning Department
London Borough of Haringey
River Park House
225 High Road,
London , N22 8HQ.

For the attention of Laina Levassor

By email

Dear Sir/Madam

Rear extension and basement to 45 Cholmeley Crescent. London N6 5 EX Ref HGY/2023/2257

Th Highgate Society is writing to strongly object to the above applications. The reasons for objection are listed below

1. This property is part of a pair of a semi-detached house with no 47 Cholmeley Crescent. The proposals shown here will impact considerably and imbalance the integrity of the pair, thus negatively impacting on the Conservation Area.
2. However, the main objection is to the basement. Although an original lower ground level at the front of the house exists, this takes in the slope of the land and is effectively at ground level. It houses a garage and ancillary accommodation. The proposed basement extends, not only beyond the footprint of the existing house but also under that of the extension and considerably beyond that. The net result is a basement three times the area of the existing , and taking into consideration the upward slope of the garden, effectively a sub- basement at the rear.
3. This will have considerable impact on the hydrology of the area. Although a hydrology report and BIA produced by Maund Geological Consultancy are produced, the seem to dismiss the issue of potential flooding in this area and are based on results of measurements from one borehole over a limited period of time. However, even that does show evidence of moisture and also of ground water at 0.94m below ground level but does not explain the impact of this. This area is notorious damp and prone to flooding, being within the basin of the Cholmeley Brook draining down from the upper slopes of Highgate and, as such, presents an extremely unstable hydrological condition. We would refer the applicant to the Government Long Term Flood Risk map which clearly shows the risk of surface water flooding present in this location. The impact of a basement of this extent will be to displace ground water and surface water to adjoining properties with the possibility of waterlogging and damage to vegetation and trees in neighbouring gardens as well as damp problems in the houses. No assessment of this is given either in the Basement Impact Assessment nor the Hydrology Report.
4. What is not mentioned in the application documents are any SuDS measures which will be taken. The basement and extensions, as stated above extend considerably beyond the original line of the house. In addition, there are no landscaping drawings showing extent of hard landscape to the rear and levels beyond the basement. It is likely there will be extensive areas of paving beyond this which will result in considerably increased water run-off

from this steep site which will inevitably end up in the already overloaded combined sewage system or the neighbour's gardens.

5. The rear extension extends considerably beyond the rear wall of the house and is built to the boundary of the adjoining house, no. 47. This will have a negative impact on the neighbours, increasing the sense of enclosure and impacting on sunlight and daylight in the garden of this property and the rooms adjoining. No assessment of the impact of this has been submitted with the application.
6. The drawing information is incorrect. The basement proposed plan refers to the basement bedroom as bedroom 4 when this already is located on the first floor. In fact this is bedroom 6, the master bedroom suite taking up the entire top floor. The bedroom in the basement will provide extremely poor amenity for the occupant with an outlook onto a deep well which will be possibly a floor and a half below external ground level. It is assumed this will be staff accommodation in which case it will be occupied for more than just sleeping.
7. The Society is at a loss to understand why the occupants of this property did simply not buy a larger property which would meet their needs rather than trying to expand a relatively modest family home to the extent that it damages both the conservation area, causes extreme disruption for all around them for the duration of the works and possibly longer term damage in the future.

For the above reasons the Society confirms its objection to this over ambitious scheme.

Yours faithfully,

Elspeth Clements

Highgate Society Planning Group