

Dr Jules Goddard
8 Winchester Place
London

Haringey Planning Department

Date: 29th March 2026

RE: FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION HGY/2026/0337
Elm Court, 55 Cholmeley Park, London, N6 5EJ

Dear Adam,

I write to formally object to the above planning application. This objection is made on the basis of significant harm to neighbouring amenity, combined with a fundamental failure of the applicant to provide the technical evidence required to enable proper assessment of the proposal.

1. Fundamental Absence of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment

The application fails to include any BRE-compliant daylight and sunlight assessment. No Vertical Sky Component (VSC), No-Sky Line, Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH), or overshadowing studies have been provided.

This omission is critical. In the absence of such evidence, the Local Planning Authority cannot reasonably conclude that the proposal complies with policy.

This is directly contrary to:

- Haringey DM1 and DM12
- London Plan Policy D6
- NPPF Section 12

The burden of proof lies with the applicant. That burden has not been met.

2. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

The proposed mansard extension introduces new dormer windows and terraces facing towards neighbouring properties, including 8 Winchester Place. These will create direct and active overlooking.

The basement proposals further intensify this impact through the introduction of new patios and habitable room windows at lower-ground level.

No verified overlooking assessment, section analysis, or line-of-sight study has been submitted. This represents a clear breach of policy and best practice.

3. Photographic Evidence



Figure 1: View from Kitchen & Dining Room – demonstrates clear and direct visual relationship with Elm Court and highlights the risk of intensified overlooking.



Figure 2: View from First Floor Bedroom – demonstrates clear and direct visual relationship with Elm Court and highlights the risk of intensified overlooking.



Figure 3: View from Master Bathroom – demonstrates clear and direct visual relationship with Elm Court and highlights the risk of intensified overlooking.



Figure 4: View from Top Floor Landing – demonstrates clear and direct visual relationship with Elm Court and highlights the risk of intensified overlooking.

4. Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with multiple levels of planning policy:

- Haringey DM1: Failure to achieve high-quality design and protect amenity
- Haringey DM12: Failure to safeguard privacy, outlook and light
- London Plan D4: Failure to respect local context and residential amenity
- London Plan D6: Failure to provide adequate daylight conditions
- NPPF Section 12: Failure to secure a high standard of amenity

In the absence of technical assessments, compliance cannot be demonstrated.

5. Failure of Proper Consultation

We did not receive any formal notification of this application. This raises serious concerns regarding compliance with statutory consultation requirements and procedural fairness.

6. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the application is fundamentally flawed. It fails to provide essential technical evidence and would result in clear and unacceptable harm.

We respectfully request that the application be refused. In the alternative, it should not be determined until full and robust assessments are provided.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Jules Goddard