

Planning Application Reference: HGY/2026/1355

Site Address: 6a Denmark Terrace, London, N2

Proposal: Demolition of existing workshop and erection of residential/commercial development

Objector Details: Lee Peterson, 6 Denmark Terrace, London, N2

Submission Type: Objection

Support for Redevelopment (in Principle)

I do not object in principle to the redevelopment of 6a Denmark Terrace, nor to a well-designed building that repairs the street frontage, restores the terrace form and broadly reflects the height and roofline of the existing terrace. I recognise that the existing commercial/workshop building is capable of improvement and that a carefully designed residential scheme could make a positive contribution to the conservation area. My concerns are therefore not objections to redevelopment as such.

However, acceptance of redevelopment in principle does not mean acceptance of every aspect of the current proposal. In particular the excessive scale, rear depth, basement, 2 new outdoor terraces, construction approach and commercial access arrangements raise significant planning concerns that have not been adequately resolved.

Objection - Current Intensity and Overdeveloped Design

The proposed development represents an over-intensive use of this constrained site. While a building matching the terrace height is acceptable in theory, the current scheme combines a three-storey building, a substantial full-storey basement, a rear extension, 2 elevated terraces, commercial floorspace and multiple residential units. The proposal creates four residential units plus 50 sqm of commercial floorspace, with the basement flat alone measuring an exceptionally large 143 sqm. The fact that the scheme depends so heavily on a substantial basement to deliver this amount of accommodation by providing roughly 40% of the total proposed residential floorspace demonstrates that the basement is not a minor or incidental element, but central to the intensity proposed.

The cumulative effect is a scheme that pushes the development up, down, and rearwards to maximise floorspace, rather than responding sensitively to the original scale, rhythm, and residential character of the adjoining properties. I understand from the pre-application neighbour meeting that the applicant's architect described the basement excavation as the key element that makes the overall scheme financially viable. However, the applicant's financial preference and desire to maximise the site's financial return cannot by itself justify an over-intensive form of development that gives rise to unacceptable, insufficiently assessed impacts on a constrained site.

I note that the applicant's own Planning Design and Access Statement records that pre-application advice encouraged the exploration of a more modest form of development that better respected the character and spatial constraints of the site. In considering this

application, the Council should satisfy itself that the submitted scheme appropriately responds to that advice.

Objection - Rear Massing, Privacy Outlook, and Enclosure from Rear Windows/Terraces

It appears from the submitted drawings that the proposed building extends further to the rear than the existing main building line, possibly by around 2 metres. I request that officers carefully check and compare the existing and proposed plans and 'section' drawings to verify this depth. If confirmed, this uncharacteristic rear projection 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 create direct and oblique overlooking into our rear bedroom, patio and garden which are currently private spaces. The extensive rear glazing further intensifies the visual presence of the development and increases the perception of overlooking when viewed from neighbouring gardens.

My concern is not simply the number of future residents, but the way the proposal concentrates multiple units, 2 new terraces, rear amenity spaces and commercial access on a tight site directly adjoining existing rear gardens. This introduces a much greater risk of noise, disturbance, and privacy loss than a less intensive, single-family or smaller-scale redevelopment. The use of elevated external amenity spaces is materially more invasive than standard sized rear windows because terrace spaces encourage prolonged outdoor occupation, conversation and direct views into our private spaces.

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.

If a separate commercial entrance can only be achieved by concentrating these operational impacts within a narrow residential alleyway, then this layout represents a clear overdevelopment of a site that is simply too constrained for this specific mix of uses.

Objection - Basement Excavation, Demolition, and Structural Risk

As the immediately adjoining property, **No. 6 Denmark Terrace** is uniquely exposed to the severe risks associated with the demolition of the existing workshop and the excavation of a new basement. **No. 6 Denmark Terrace** was originally the end of the terrace before the adjoining workshop building was added. 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.

Essential utility services serving No. 6 Denmark Terrace are located immediately adjacent to the shared boundary with the application site. This includes the property's gas supply infrastructure, which rises vertically through the building close to the party wall and forms part of the essential services relied upon by my household. Any structural movement, service strike, excavation-related damage or failure affecting these installations could have serious consequences for the continued occupation and safe operation of the property. Whilst I recognise that utility protection measures may ultimately be addressed through detailed design and construction procedures, their proximity to the proposed basement excavation further underlines the need for particularly robust scrutiny of the structural and engineering implications of the development at the planning stage.

Furthermore, a full-storey subterranean build of this scale introduces critical drainage, groundwater and surface water flood risks. Under Haringey's basement development policies and guidance, subterranean developments are expected to properly assess and demonstrate that they will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on local drainage patterns, groundwater conditions, flood risk, neighbouring structures or surface water run-off.

The applicant's Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) is merely a Phase 1 desk study. It explicitly confirms that there have been no previous intrusive ground investigations undertaken on-site at **6A Denmark Terrace** and instead relies partly upon an historic ground investigation at **109 Fortis Green**, which the report describes as being approximately 10 metres from the application site. However, no borehole location plan or coordinates have been provided within the BIA to substantiate this distance, and the address associated with that historic investigation appears to be located on the opposite side of Fortis Green. The report also repeatedly recommends that pilot holes should be excavated before full construction to confirm geology and assess whether unexpected groundwater is encountered. This demonstrates that the actual ground conditions beneath the site remain unverified.

By failing to conduct site-specific intrusive investigations, the applicant has not yet demonstrated how the proposed basement structure may affect local groundwater conditions, subsurface drainage patterns and neighbouring foundations.

Furthermore, the submitted foundation and retaining wall drawings (**DT30** and **DT31**) are explicitly marked "Preliminary" and leave numerous critical safeguards for later contractor resolution, including site verification, trial pits to confirm existing structures and contractor-designed shuttering/propping.

The submitted Planning Statement acknowledges that the basement will extend foundation depth relative to neighbouring properties and notes that a monitoring plan should be prepared "at design stage". I strongly argue that this is too important to be deferred. While I recognise that Party Wall procedures are separate from planning, the repeated references (in the structural notes) to excavation within 3 metres and deep foundations within 6 metres underline how sensitive these works are. The existence of later civil procedures should not be treated as a reason to avoid robust planning scrutiny now. The Council is being asked to grant planning permission for a 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.

Objection - Construction Impacts (est. 18 Months) and a need for Strict Controls

The proposal raises major environmental health and logistical concerns regarding the scale of demolition and construction activity required on this highly constrained conservation-area site. The provisional Construction Management Plan (CMP) states that the final programme and construction methodology will be confirmed only after the appointment of a contractor.

An estimated 18-month construction period involving deep basement digging will subject the local area to prolonged, high-impact structural noise, heavy vibration and severe dust emissions. This presents a direct threat to the health of local residents, particularly those with respiratory conditions such as asthma and completely disrupts the surrounding residential environment.

Furthermore, the logistical arrangements pose an immediate and severe risk to highway safety and local economic viability. The site is already heavily constrained in terms of access, servicing and parking. The surrounding area experiences regular congestion associated with commercial deliveries and local businesses. Forcing heavy plant machinery and heavy construction and spoil-removal vehicles to reverse out onto a main road like Fortis Green will generate immense traffic congestion, worsen pre-existing parking stress and block essential access.

This stretch of Fortis Green already suffers from severe operational disruption during routine supermarket and commercial deliveries. Introducing an 18-month influx of heavy construction traffic is likely to significantly worsen existing congestion and operational difficulties along this stretch of Fortis Green. Furthermore, the inevitable loss of vital parking bays outside **Nos. 5 and 6 Denmark Terrace** will have a significant adverse impact on both local residents and the independent commercial businesses operating along Denmark Terrace (including the **local restaurants, independent clock shop, hair salon** and the **funeral directors**). These businesses rely heavily on short-stay customer parking and unobstructed servicing access to survive.

Official TfL data reveals a documented cluster of personal injury collisions on this stretch of Fortis Green (e.g. Collision ID 1200277092). While some construction traffic would inevitably be associated with any redevelopment of the site, the scale of excavation proposed, together with an estimated 18-month construction programme and the removal of substantial quantities of spoil arising from the basement works, is likely to generate significantly greater vehicle movements and associated risks than a more modest scheme. The Council should therefore be satisfied that robust traffic management and construction logistics arrangements are in place before any permission is granted.

Objection - Daylight and Sunlight Impacts

I recognise that any redevelopment restoring the terrace form is likely to alter daylight and sunlight conditions to neighbouring properties to some degree and I accept that some change may result from a reasonable scheme. However, the Council must scrutinise whether the additional impacts caused by the full-depth development, rear massing, 2 new terraces and privacy screening are proportionate and whether less harmful design options have been properly explored.

The applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Assessment explicitly confirms that the rear rooflight/window at my property, **No. 6 Denmark Terrace**, would fail the BRE winter sunlight criteria, completely reducing from 5 to 0 winter sunlight hours. The report describes this as an "expected" impact arising from redevelopment. The Council should not treat expected harm as automatically acceptable; any avoidable loss caused by excessive rear depth and massing must be minimised. This measurable loss of light must be weighed cumulatively with the proposed basement intensity, rear massing, overlooking and construction impacts on my immediately adjoining property.

Objection – External Plant Equipment and Heat Pumps

The submitted plans indicate multiple air source heat pumps (HP units) distributed throughout the development, including units positioned within private gardens and on elevated first and second floor terrace areas. In particular, the first-floor terrace heat pump is positioned close to neighbouring residential amenity areas and private outdoor spaces.

No detailed acoustic assessment appears to accompany the application demonstrating that the cumulative operation of these units will not adversely affect neighbouring residential amenity. Whilst I support the use of sustainable technologies in principle, the Council should be satisfied that all external plant equipment can operate without causing unacceptable noise, vibration or disturbance to neighbouring residents, particularly during evening and night-time periods.

I therefore request that any approval be subject to detailed acoustic assessment, specification of equipment, noise limits and any necessary mitigation measures prior to installation.

Objection - Conservation Area and Terrace Character

The proposal raises serious concerns regarding the scale and intensity of development on a constrained conservation-area site. The adjoining properties on **Denmark Terrace** possess a modest domestic scale and a distinct historical rhythm.

The proposed development, although adopting some superficial terrace references in elevation (such as bay windows and matching roof forms), introduces a much more intensive apartment-based form of development interwoven with basement accommodation and commercial floorspace. This risks creating a building that appears superficially related to the terrace on paper but is materially heavier and more intensive in form, depth and daily use. It fails to respond sensitively to the original scale and residential character of the adjoining terrace and the wider conservation area. Furthermore, the Council should carefully scrutinise the adequacy of the replacement employment provision, ensuring it aligns with strict town centre policies and does not act as a pretext for over-intensifying the site.

Objection - Boundary Planting and Landscaping

Existing mature boundary planting, established shrubs and mature trees within our garden currently provide an essential natural privacy screen, contribute to local biodiversity and form an important part of the established garden character of the conservation area.

The proposed garden works, extensive excavation, new boundary walls and heavy construction activity close to the property line pose an immediate threat to this vegetation. Digging up to the boundary line may irreparably damage existing root systems or require the outright removal of this screening, severely worsening the impacts of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Requested Amendments and Conditions

Because my goal is to ensure a safe, balanced and compliant development rather than blanket refusal, I ask the Council to thoroughly scrutinise the scheme and push for the following vital amendments and robust pre-commencement conditions:

- **Rear Massing & Layout:** Require a significantly reduced or redesigned rear element that pulls the building back to the established rear building line to preserve neighbouring outlook and eliminate the sense of enclosure.
- **Privacy & Terraces:** Remove or alter the first-floor rear terraces/balconies that would overlook into our private spaces, set them further away from the boundary, use mandatory fixed obscure privacy screening (in place before occupation) and legally prevent access to any other flat roof areas for leisure use.
- **Basement Scrutiny:** Mandate a full, site-specific Phase 2 intrusive ground investigation at 6a and secure an independent review of the Basement Impact Assessment before works start.
- **Structural Safeguards:** Require full, finalised engineering details of the demolition methodology, temporary works, underpinning/retaining wall design, ground movement assessments, monitoring trigger levels, baseline condition surveys of adjoining properties and emergency action plans via strict pre-commencement conditions rather than deferring them to a contractor.
- **Window Redesign:** Reconsider the position, size, and glazing of rear and side-facing windows, incorporating obscure or fixed glazing where appropriate to restrict invasive side-facing views.
- **External Plant and Heat Pumps:** Require a detailed acoustic assessment of all proposed air source heat pumps and external plant equipment, together with enforceable operational noise limits, vibration controls and any necessary screening or acoustic mitigation measures prior to installation.
- **Robust Construction Management:** Enforce a strict, binding Construction Management Plan that restricts the use of construction vehicles to sizes appropriate for the constrained nature of the site and surrounding road network, defines safe traffic routes, mandates continuous real-time noise/vibration monitoring and establishes strict seasonal dust-suppression measures.
- **Commercial Restrictions:** Place clear limitations on the commercial unit, including permitted use classes, restricted operating and servicing hours, signage controls, and strict noise, vibration, and kitchen extraction/ventilation limits.
- **Landscaping & Boundaries:** Require a comprehensive boundary treatment and landscaping protection plan. This must mandate root protection measures, guarantee zero removal or damage to neighbour-owned planting, outline details for new boundary structures and ensure all privacy screening is fully in place before building occupation.
- **Highways & Parking:** Enforce permit-free/car-free obligations on the future residential units to prevent adding further parking stress to an area that already experiences significant parking pressure.

Conclusion

As the immediately adjoining property, **No. 6 Denmark Terrace** will experience the greatest direct impacts from demolition, basement excavation, construction activity, rear massing, overlooking and winter sunlight loss. While a total of 81 addresses across the wider area were notified of this application, the actual structural risks and significant amenity impacts are heavily concentrated on my immediate property line.

I respectfully urge the Planning Officer and Committee to give substantial weight to these localised impacts and either require significant amendments to the scheme or refuse the application in its current form.

I request to be formally notified of any amendments to these plans, the officer's recommendation and the date of any committee meeting.

Yours faithfully,

Lee Peterson

6 Denmark Terrace