

Objection to Planning Application

Ref: HGY/2026/1355

Address: 4 Woodside Cottages, Fortis Green, N2 9HE (locally listed property)

Stance: Objection

I object to this application due to the material planning harms, omissions, and factual errors outlined below. As an immediately proximate neighbour, I also endorse the comments submitted by the resident of 6 Denmark Terrace. I am not opposed to the principle of residential development on this site and would withdraw my objection if the following alterations are secured and the material planning harms fully addressed.

Before setting out the requested alterations and material planning harms, I draw the Council's attention to two critical factual errors that run through the application's supporting documents. These errors are not minor drafting oversights. They fundamentally undermine the validity of the impact assessments on which the application relies and must be corrected before it can be lawfully determined.

Critical Factual Errors and Omissions

Error A: Omission of a Uniquely Affected Neighbouring Property, 4 Woodside Cottages, from Impact Assessments

Section 4.3 of the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment incorrectly states: 'To the north are the rear gardens of the properties at Nos. 1-3 Woodside Cottages, accessed via the aforementioned passageway.' **This completely omits our property at 4 Woodside Cottages, which completes the locally listed row (Nos. 1–4).**

Our property is uniquely impacted: it is the only one in the row with active, south-facing windows and a main entrance that directly confront the proposed rear elevation. Because our property is absent from the baseline assessment, the severe overlooking, loss of privacy, and intrusive visual massing into our primary living spaces (main entrance, daughter's bedroom, kitchen, and private garden) have been entirely ignored. **This major omission invalidates the application's conclusions on residential impact** and renders the assessments non-compliant with **Policy DM2**.

Error B: Omission, Misrepresentation, and Misidentification of the Shared Access Alley

The shared access alley serving Woodside Cottages is the sole residential and emergency access route for Nos. 1–4. The application's supporting documents contain multiple errors regarding this critical piece of infrastructure:

- *CMP Figure 2.1 (Site Location Plan)* **falsely shows the alley blocked and terminating at 1 Woodside Cottages**. In reality, the easement continues to No. 4, actively serving Nos. 2, 3, and 4.

- *The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment* entirely omits the alley from its analysis, despite the proposed two-storey height and roof on this narrow side. The impact of which is clearly visible in *Figure 2 of the Daylight and Sunlight Report* yet neither assessed nor considered.
- *Basement Impact Assessment Section 3.3* incorrectly refers to the alley as a '*small access road Denmark Terrace*.' This error is repeated in *Section 6.0*, where proximity to highways is assessed considering only Fortis Green, completely ignoring the alley.
- *CMP Section 5.13 (Emergency Services)* contains no impact assessment for this narrow, single point of access.

Because the alley is omitted, misrepresented, and misidentified throughout the application, the developer has failed to identify, assess, or mitigate the critical risks to emergency access, structural integrity of the sole access route, the underlying Victorian drainage & utilities, and overhead telecommunication lines serving Woodside Cottages. The risk and impact assessments are therefore fundamentally invalid.

Requested Alterations

Alteration 1: Removal or Redesign of Rear Terraces and Substantial Reduction of Rear Windows

As established in Error A above, our property is incorrectly omitted from the applicant's assessments. The proposed rear elevation first and second-floor terraces and the oversized glazing must be removed or materially redesigned. The terraces and windows serving two separate residential units create unacceptably close-proximity overlooking, noise incursion, and severe loss of privacy to our main entrance, our daughter's bedroom, kitchen, and private garden, as well as 1–3 Woodside Cottages and 6 Denmark Terrace, breaching **Policy DM2**. Both elements are entirely out of character with the rear profiles of Denmark Terrace and the surrounding Conservation Area, creating an unacceptable contrast with the late-1800s locally listed Woodside Cottages and breaching **Policy DM9**. This stands in stark contrast to the front elevation, which was appropriately adapted to fit the street scene. (See *Harms 2 and 3 for full evidence*.)

Alteration 2: Reduction of Two-Storey Height on the Alley Side (West Flank)

As established in Error B above, the alley is incorrectly omitted from the Daylight and Sunlight Report. The proposed two-storey height and roof on this narrow side (currently a single storey flat roof), will cause a tunnelling effect of overbearing overshadowing, critical loss of daylight, and adverse skyline impacts, breaching **Policies DM1 and DM2**. This reduction is explicitly supported by the Council's own pre-application feedback: *Section 3.10 of the Planning and Design Access Statement* records that Officers advised the developer to '*test the option for a more modest, part two storey and single storey new development*.' The proposal has ignored this directive on the western flank. (See *Harm 4 for full evidence*.)

Alteration 3: Removal or Comprehensive Reassessment of the Proposed Basement

The excavation plans completely fail to account for the shallow foundations of Woodside Cottages (Nos. 1–4), our property's documented history of subsidence and underpinning, or

the fragile Victorian utilities running through the alley (see Error B). The basement must be removed or subjected to a comprehensive, independent structural audit. Introducing a subterranean level is entirely absent from the established architectural typology of Denmark Terrace, breaching **Policy DM9**. (See *Harms 2 and 5* for full evidence.)

Material Planning Harms

1. Road Safety, Access, and Traffic (Invalidation of Construction Plans)

As established in Error B, the application's plans and representations of the alley are fundamentally invalid. In addition to the errors set out above:

- **Unacceptable Access Obstruction:** *CMP Section 5.20* states '*A channel will be formed in the concrete hardstanding adjacent to the site entrance.*' If 'adjacent' refers to the alley, this is entirely unacceptable. Breaking or channelling this ground could compromise emergency access, personal safety, and shared utilities.
- **Dangerous Traffic Misrepresentation:** *CMP Figure 2.2* states '*The road is wide enough to allow for a delivery area and still have two way traffic pass in front.*' Even today, without the delivery area, two-way traffic is not possible at this chicane when a vehicle larger than a car is passing, which is particularly acute given multiple bus routes and large delivery vehicles on Fortis Green.
- **Understated Residential Density:** The *Parking Survey* states the development comprises 3 residential units. The actual statutory description is for 4 units (1×1-bed, 1×2-bed, 2×3-bed plus office). Understating unit numbers invalidates the parking, trip-generation, and traffic data.

2. Out-of-Character Development and Heritage Asset Impacts

The *Heritage Assessment* asserts the proposal '*optimises*' the site, while *Section 5.9 of the Heritage Report* states any new building must '*harmoniously blend with the adjoining context, reflecting existing window patterns, materials and roof designs.*' In reality, the proposed basement, western flank, and rear elevation represent an unacceptable overdevelopment causing severe harm to the Conservation Area and the adjacent late-1800s locally listed Woodside Cottages. The overbearing rear massing (clashing storey heights, oversized modern glazing, and large open terraces) stands in jarring conflict with the sympathetically adapted front elevation. These elements fail to follow existing building lines or complement the special architectural characteristics, directly violating **Policies SP12** and **DM9**.

The **Basement Impact Assessment** is fundamentally incomplete: in addition to misidentifying the alley (see Error B), it entirely omits the verified shallow foundations of Woodside Cottages (Nos. 1–4), our property's documented subsidence and underpinning history, and the shared Victorian drainage and utility lines beneath the alley. This fails to demonstrate safe execution of the basement excavation.

We have also been made aware of a potential risk to critical aquifers and drainage that has not been identified or assessed. Specifically the impact to Twyford Avenue gardens and Coldfall Wood, a Site of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINC) and listed as Grade 1 importance for Nature Conservation. The absence of ground investigation and reliance on

historic (2014) and distant previous bore hole information leaves this risk entirely unassessed.

Furthermore, basement development is entirely absent from the established typology of Denmark Terrace, representing a clear failure to protect the historic environment under **Policy DM9**.

3. Severe Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

As established in Error A, our property is omitted from the baseline assessment. The rear first and second-floor terraces, coupled with oversized glazing, create direct, unmitigated overlooking and noise incursions into our main entrance, daughter's bedroom, kitchen, and private garden, as well as Nos. 1–3 Woodside Cottages and 6 Denmark Terrace.

The terraces serve two separate residential units, significantly multiplying the frequency and volume of outdoor activity. Crucially, the second-floor terrace directly connects to the maisonette's primary dining and living area acting as a primary entertaining space, generating significantly higher noise and guest occupancy than a standard balcony. This intensified, dual-household use breaches **Policy DM2**.

Rebuttal to Section 8.22

The assertion that replacing the joinery with residential use *'is likely to result in less noise'* is incorrect. As a resident of over twenty years, my experience is that the existing joinery operates with a small team inside a sound-insulated building during business hours only. Four residential units with uninsulated outdoor terraces will generate significantly more noise, disturbance, and privacy intrusion on a 24/7 basis, breaching **Policy DM2**.

4. Overshadowing, Loss of Light, and Enclosure

As established in Error B, the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment omits the alley entirely. The proposed two-storey height and roof on this narrow side will cause a tunnelling effect of overbearing overshadowing and critical loss of daylight, creating a darkened, isolated environment degrading amenity and introducing personal safety risks.

As acknowledged in *Section 3.10 of the Planning and Design Access Statement*, Officers explicitly requested the developer to reconsider the scale and test a more modest profile. By ignoring this guidance, the proposal's inflated envelope causes severe, unmitigated overshadowing and overbearing enclosure.

Section 12.3 of the Daylight and Sunlight Report admits the basement patio areas *'do not comply with the criteria on 21st March due to their compromised location.'* Sub-compliant light is unacceptable for a standalone, single-level basement residential unit, failing to provide adequate living conditions.

5. Landscaping, Tree Protection, and Infrastructure

The scheme proposes sixteen new trees but provides no information on managing their proximity to the shared Victorian drainage and utility infrastructure beneath the alley (see Error B). As residents who support biodiversity enhancements, we welcome green initiatives, but they must not introduce unmitigated risks to critical infrastructure.

There is no demonstrated compliance with **British Standard BS 5837:2012** (*Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition, and Construction*), which requires service and drainage

layouts to be reconciled with new planting zones. Without this assessment, the Council lacks evidence to confirm the landscaping is sustainable or safe, failing **Policy DM1**.

Conclusion

In summary, I am very supportive of a residential development at 6A Denmark Terrace by the owners, especially as it will provide necessary housing, however I cannot support the design plans in their current form for the reasons described above.

Yours faithfully

James Beverley, 4 Woodside Cottages, Fortis Green, N2 9HE