

Mr Simon Fedida  
21 Barratt Avenue  
Wood Green  
London  
N22 7EZ

Mr Matthew Gunning  
Planning Service  
Haringey Council  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, River Park House  
225 High Road Wood Green  
London N22 8HQ

03 October 2023

**Re: R/O 132 Station Road N22 7SX, Non-Material amendments to a planning permission, ref HGY/2023/2321**

I make the following objections to the above application for approval, as follows:

1. These amendments are not non-material amendments to the planning permission HGY/2020/3036:
  - The proposal extends the basement level towards the boundary to increase the plan area. Replacement of a limited number of light wells with skylights the length of the boundary will be a source of light pollution impacting the amenity of neighbours.
  - A substantial plant room, a new building in its own right containing surface and foul water tanks and associated pumps and plumbing, is introduced. It encroaches on and utilises private amenity space taken from the sunken courtyard of House 5 and from the Community Garden public amenity space.
  - The introduction of an external balcony to the Coach House and changes to the layout of House 1 results in overlooking of the living room and terrace of House 1. House 1 would also suffer negative impacts on daylight and its outlook from this introduction.

***Change #1 Amendments to the retaining wall***

2. This amendment is a material amendment to the permission HGY/2020/3036 for the following reasons. The original proposal envisaged three small lightwells, open to the air, at Houses 1 to 3, to service the rooms labelled 'Office'. The lightwells were external. The adjacent bathrooms and bedrooms did not have lightwells.
3. The amendment extends the basement level towards the boundary, encroaching nearer to the dwellings in Barratt Avenue. The plan area is substantially increased.
4. The proposed skylight running the length of Houses 1 to 5 will be a light pollution nuisance for neighbours in Barratt Avenue, whose boundaries are only 0.5m distant. In particular, the skylights above the bathrooms will be source of illumination at irregular times throughout the night. The amenity of neighbours would be adversely affected.

5. The original permission included three lightwells to the 'Office' rooms, with windows looking into the wells, for the basement level accommodation. Bedrooms and bathrooms did not have such. The reason for the design as approved was to retain the residential amenity of Barratt Avenue, particularly with respect to light pollution and potentially noise.
6. The skylights should be limited to the 'Office' rooms as per the original permission, and opaque elsewhere, so as to protect the amenity of neighbours.
7. The basement pit volume, when excavated, was lined walls and floor with ~450mm thick reinforced high strength concrete (source: applicant's communication with residents). Stability of the soil after these works cannot be at issue. The applicant's stated justifications for this amendment are questionable.

### ***Change #2 Proposed garden at House 5***

8. The granted permission HGY/2020/3036 has the sunken courtyard area around House 5 to be private amenity space for the occupants of House 5. The proposal is to use part of this amenity space together with green space annexed from the Community Garden to construct a plant room. The plant room would hold surface and foul water storage tanks and associated pumps and plumbing.
9. It is proposed to supply a stairway from the sunken courtyard of House 5 to the roof of the plant room: some 12 steps or ~ 2.4m height. A second stairway from the plant room roof: some 5 steps or ~1m height, connects to an elevated landing and an entrance to the living room of House 5.
10. The sunken courtyard amenity space of House 5 is thus reduced and replaced with a split level area. The plant room would encroach. Replacement of this amenity space with access to the roof of the plant room half way up in the air is not a fair trade. Activities on the plant roof must of necessity be severely curtailed in comparison with what might be expected from a family enjoying their private courtyard on solid ground. While the roof area may be larger than the courtyard area consumed, it is essentially useless.
11. The notion that this amounts to 'extending the garden to house 5' when it was already private amenity space for that dwelling is a distortion. Rather, the amenity space of House 5 has been substantially reduced in order to accommodate plant associated with surface and foul water storage. Access to the plant room for maintenance, servicing and repair further reduces the privacy and amenity of House 5.
12. The idea of children playing on top of a sewage tank 2.4m up in the air cannot be seriously entertained. House 5 is already an extremely cramped dwelling: the applicant must be required to find an appropriate location for the drainage plant that does not degrade the accommodation further.
13. The Community Garden was proposed to alleviate the impact of this large development on the surrounding dwellings. Annexing part of this green space at its widest section of what is a very long and narrow garden can only reduce its amenity value.

14. The granted permission HGY/2020/3036 shows the curved roof of the housing block extending past House 5 and its basement courtyard, and descending to ground level. This was a noted, lauded and important design feature of the development during the original examination of the permission.
15. It is doubtful whether the plant room building and staircase to House 5 could be accommodated under the rapidly descending roof as planned in the granted permission. Adoption of the plant room and stairway may well preclude the roof being completed as planned. It should be noted that the descending part of the roof has not yet been fabricated. This issue has not been addressed in the application. Failure to complete the roof as required in the permission would be a very material amendment.

***Change #3/4 Modified bridge/ Spiral staircase***

16. The proposal is to relocate the access ways of Houses 1 and 2, ostensibly to reduce overlooking into the sunken courtyard of the Coach House. Additionally, an external stairway and protruding balcony is proposed at the Coach House.
17. Relocation of the House 1 access way requires the internal layout of House 1 to be rearranged. The net effect is that the full height curved window of the living room and terrace now faces directly into the proposed balcony of the Coach House. The scheme as originally granted specifically avoids this. Residents of the Coach House sitting on the new protruding balcony would view directly into the living room and terrace of House 1. The amenity space courtyards of House 1 and of House 2 would also be in plain site from this balcony.
18. The outlook from the curved living room of House 1 faces toward a blank wall, while the original permission has the living room window facing out into the central area of the wider development. This degraded outlook for House 1 represents a serious loss of amenity and will involve a loss of daylight. This is against the Borough's policies in respect of daylight and amenity.
19. The result of this proposal would be that a mild and transitory overlooking during use of the access way has been swapped for a more serious and intrusive overlooking into the living quarters of House 1. This cannot be acceptable design. The proposed changes should be refused.
20. The justification for the external balcony and stairway at the Coach House is to avoid using the bedroom to access the courtyard. All the houses in the development access their courtyards through the basement bedrooms. The permission was granted for the development of the houses this way, and was regarded as one of the innovative features of the development. It is not a non-material amendment when the basis of the permission is sought to be overturned.

Yours sincerely

Simon Fedida