

As the owner and resident of 6 Denmark Terrace that immediately adjoins the application site, with shared party wall and boundary, I wish to object to the current proposal.

I object to these plans as the scale of what is proposed is a gross overdevelopment that is not practical, feasible or viable in either the construction phase or when completed.

The proposal is an over intensive use of a constrained site creating a mass not appropriate for this location.

The applicant has not accurately assessed material planning considerations leading to potential harms. There are numerous inaccuracies and omissions. Furthermore, I wish to highlight the applicant's disregard of the Council's Pre-Application Directive.

I am not opposed to a redevelopment that is proportionate and in keeping with the cramped local surroundings. I could support a development that mirrors the height, depth and architectural profile of the existing terrace. Currently the planned rear massing will lead to overlooking and overshadowing of the surrounding properties with excessive disturbance. It will be overbearing, out of character and will lead to road safety implications.

The following matters are of particular concern.

Basement Excavation And Structural Risk

I am acutely aware of and gravely concerned by the location of the gas supply for the central heating, hot water and cooker in my property no 6 Denmark Terrace as the gas meter and supply pipes are positioned internally on the adjacent wall immediately next to the party wall between the two properties. **I am concerned that extensive vibrations such as those required to dig a basement could affect, potentially dislocate or damage the gas pipework with the obvious extremely serious structural and dangerous implications to my property and to mine and my family's health.** And in addition to the builder's and local residents health and safety. This has not been risk assessed in line with Haringey's Local Plan Policy DM5.

There is a visible structural support (an exposed tie bar) within my rear bedroom, highlighting a complex, historic structural relationship between the property and 6A.

Given the age of these nearby properties, the London Clay ground conditions referred to in the applicant's own documents, local awareness of historic movement (reinforced foundations at No.3 Woodside Cottages) and subsidence issues, the basement element warrants particularly careful planning scrutiny.

To carry out substantial basement excavation adjacent to older properties without a settled, detailed methodology for temporary works, propping, sequencing, ground movement monitoring, trigger levels, sub-surface drainage protections or emergency response is dangerous and unprecedented.

The applicant's submitted Basement Impact Assessment states that no intrusive site investigation has yet been undertaken at 6A Denmark Terrace and that further ground investigations are still recommended before construction. In Appendix A it states that a borehole was constructed at 109 Fortis Green and that this is 10 metres away from 6A. This is incorrect it is between 70 and 100 metres away dependent on where it is on the site and was completed 14 years ago. Since then there have been significant weather conditions

with drought and severe rains which can affect London clay. Therefore the actual ground conditions beneath the site remain unverified.

The impact on neighbouring foundations, drainage and groundwater conditions have not yet been fully demonstrated. This is stated in the Application Form – Assessment of Flood Risk and Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. By failing to conduct site-specific intrusive investigations, the applicant has not demonstrated how the proposed basement structure may affect local groundwater conditions, neighbouring foundation, subsurface drainage patterns, aquifers or flooding. The potential for surface flooding has geospatial implications for the aquifers that drain off this ridge to the north into Twyford Avenue gardens and properties and the hill running into Coldfall Wood. This basement is an inappropriate and likely detrimental structure for neighbours and Coldfall Wood, a key Grade 1 listed Importance for Nature Conservation site.

Scale, Intensity And Overdevelopment

The proposal combines four residential units, significant commercial floorspace, a substantial basement, rear extensions and multiple elevated terraces on a very constrained site. Additionally, permanently relocating the primary commercial office access away from the front high street and into the narrow, shared side alleyway unacceptably intensifies a highly constrained route. This bottleneck is poorly suited to absorbing the combined pressure of new office traffic, staff congregations and additional commercial bins alongside the existing, heavy operational demands of the Rasoi restaurant and the daily residential needs of Woodside Cottages. Moving active commercial operations to the side would materially erode the privacy, quiet outlook and residential amenity currently enjoyed by these properties.

The applicant's disregard of the Council's Pre-Application Directive. Planning Design and Access Statement needs to be considered. In Section 3.10 Planning Officers formally advised revision of the scheme to *"test the option for a more modest, part two storey and single storey new development to respect the established spatial relationship between buildings and their visual hierarchy in views of this stretch of the Conservation Area."*

In the same document, section 5.9 states that *"All of the proposed units will exceed minimum space standards"*. This confirms that the design can be scaled down. Any new design plans must relate positively to the form and scale, and massing of the prevailing site.

Rear Massing, Overlooking, Overshadowing And Loss Of Privacy

My home and garden adjoin the application site. The proposed rear extension extends further to the rear than the existing main building line, by around 2 metres. This uncharacteristic rear projection and increased building mass will intensify development along the shared boundary, creating an oppressive sense of enclosure and significantly impact the rear outlook and open space currently enjoyed by neighbouring gardens and rear windows, most acutely at my property No. 6 Denmark Terrace.

Furthermore, the proposed upper-floor large rear-facing windows and terrace, plus the first-floor terrace/balcony will introduce significant overlooking and direct views by numerous

new residents into our daughter's bedroom, our kitchen/diner, patio and garden which are currently private spaces.

The use of elevated outdoor amenity spaces is likely to generate greater levels of noise, activity and visual intrusion than currently exist.

Construction Impacts On Residents Health And Road Safety

The construction management plan is insufficient and unsafe. It fails to provide an impact assessment or any form of operational consideration for the alley adjacent to the site. The plan continually calls the alley by differing terms such as "access road" when it is clearly a narrow alley. Said alley provides the **sole** emergency access, critical utility services and public right of way for residents of numbers 1,2, 3 and 4 Woodside Cottages. It is also an emergency exit for the Rasoi Restaurant. These issues are documented in the objections of residents of Woodside Cottages which I fully endorse.

Clissold Close

The size of vehicles required for such a build would not have a safe or convenient turning circle. This would be dangerous for the local residents of Denmark Terrace and Woodside Cottages attempting to walk or cross the road. Clissold Close which is adjacent to the Rasoi Restaurant consists of sheltered housing of **20 properties** with elderly and disabled residents who need safe wheelchair access to Denmark Terrace and Fortis Green. Their restricted mobility eg wheelchair use on the pavement has not been considered or assessed and their safety will be severely compromised.

Construction Impacts

I have lived here for 20 years and being situated on the road have full view of the parking and traffic situation on Fortis Green all the time.

The plan states that it is wide enough for a delivery area and for 2 way traffic to pass at the same time. This is impossible and there are always parked cars on both sides of the road due to the local businesses transient trade and local resident parking. There is a chicane in the road, and with it also being a double decker bus route I witness traffic jams occurring frequently.

Should Mr Silverwood allow a permanent delivery area to be designated numbers 5 and 6 Denmark Terrace this will further impact significantly on local business and residents.

The applicant's proposal states that there is parking available for one builder's van on site.

This is inaccurate as demonstrated by all diagrams. Likewise portable WC facilities.

Furthermore construction workers are frequently sole traders and carry their tools with them therefore cannot travel by public transport and need parking on site.

Noise

The applicant frequently states that they will restrict site working hours to reduce noise however their working hours are longer in the evening and at weekends than current joiners workshop hours therefore there will be more noise and disruption – this will not minimise disturbance but increase it.

Health and employment disruption

The length of time for the redevelopment has not been determined and the final construction methodology will be determined later following contractor appointment. However, the proposal already indicates an **estimated** construction programme of approximately 18 months involving demolition, basement excavation and rebuilding. This length is therefore inaccurate and questionable.

Such a prolonged build with the associated dust may have a devastating impact on my daughter who suffers from asthma.

My husband works from home and will be unable to carry out his required duties such as online meetings due to noise.

I am a dog fosterer for Battersea dogs home but will be unable to accept any dogs due to the noise and vibrations.

Conservation Area Character, Biodiversity And Existing Planting

The front elevation appears to attempt to reflect the character of Denmark Terrace and the Conservation Area despite introducing bay windows to the first floor which is not in keeping with all other properties of Denmark Terrace or Field Cottages. However, this has not been applied to the rear of the building with reference to "Rear massing, scale, intensity and overdevelopment" above.

With respect to the National Planning Policy Framework I am also concerned about the impact of excavation and construction works on existing mature boundary planting, shrubs and trees which currently provide privacy, support wildlife and contribute positively to the character of the area. There is a large tree adjacent to the site which can be clearly seen in the applicant's "*Rear of the property note 2.4*" but there has not been any assessment of potential uprooting.

The Haringey Local Plan requires new developments to contribute to wildlife and ecological habitats and, where possible, include green and brown roofs, rainwater harvesting, green walls, bird and bat nesting/roosting opportunities.

None of these have been proposed.

The proposal states 11 trees will be introduced but no mention of what type of tree. In such a confined space there is not enough space for 11 trees of any significant size to grow.

Daylight, Sunlight And Future Living Conditions

I note that the applicant's own Daylight and Sunlight Assessment identifies a loss of winter sunlight to my rear kitchen/diner at No. 6 Denmark Terrace. The report presents this as an expected consequence of redevelopment. However, I do not believe that an identified loss of light should automatically be accepted if alternative and less harmful design options remain available. This impact should be considered alongside the increased rear massing, overlooking and general loss of openness created by the proposal.

Noise and unknowns eg Heat Pumps

The submitted plans indicate several air source heat pumps positioned throughout the development, including locations on elevated terraces. The increased activity associated with multiple residential units and commercial uses, and the cumulative effect that these changes

will have on noise levels has not been assessed. I am particularly concerned that one of the proposed locations is the proposed terrace adjoining my daughter's bedroom. Whilst I support sustainable technologies in principle, I have not seen sufficient evidence demonstrating that appropriate safeguards have been either assessed or detailed. This should be required before approval is granted.

Future impacts

The National Planning Policy Framework 198 (a) states that new developments should “mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life ⁷²;

The applicant's proposal states in Section 8.22 of the Planning Design and Access Statement that replacing the current joinery business with residential and office space “is likely to result in less noise and disturbance to local residents.”

This is not the case as i have lived in the adjoining property for 20 years.

The existing joinery business operates under strict, controlled parameters: a small team of three (originally five) works inside a commercially fit-for-purpose building with proper sound insulation, restricted entirely to standard business hours.

In contrast, introducing four residential units with numerous bedrooms will dramatically increase the density of people on the site. This introduces constant, uninsulated outdoor residential activity (particularly on the proposed first and second-floor terraces) that is not restricted to working hours. The shift from a controlled daytime operation to a 24/7 high-density residential use will result in significantly higher noise, disturbance, and privacy intrusion than the current use, directly violating the noise protection mandates of *Policy DM2*.

Conclusion

I would like Mr Silverwood to be aware that number 1 Woodside Cottages, that is directly impacted and is the closest Woodside Cottage to the site has in recent weeks been vacated (due to the potential build) and the property is managed by an agent who has not informed the owner of the proposed development. The proposed development rear windows, balcony and terraces will enable residents of the development to look into the bedroom and living room of number 1.

Furthermore the commercial premises at number 3 Denmark Terrace is not currently operating following recent refurbishment and consequently may not have received notice of the plans for 6A Denmark Terrace.

Therefore absence of comments from these addresses must not assume that there are not any objections or negative impacts on such properties.

Please also consider the validity of the applicant's agent, Ms Young's, plans for such a complicated redevelopment which will be at immense cost with so many inaccuracies and such lack of attention to detail, and in particular not following the Council's own guidance.

I am gravely concerned that there has not been sufficient planning or restrictions put in place for regulation of the site. Residents do not have any redress should regulations not be adhered to or problems arise from the build.

My objection is not to redevelopment itself. I believe the current proposal is too large and intensive for such a constrained site and would place an unreasonable burden on the wellbeing, privacy and living conditions of neighbouring residents during construction and following redevelopment.

I fully support and agree with the comments made by all residents of 2, 3, 4 Woodside Cottages, 54 Twyford Avenue.

I respectfully ask Mr Silverwood to refuse the application in its current form and encourage a revised scheme that better reflects the more modest approach previously suggested by planning officers whilst still allowing appropriate redevelopment of the site.