

Planning Service

5th Floor, Alexandra House

Station Road,

Wood Green N22 7TY

03 JUL 26

Dear Sirs,

My name is Jeffery L Townsend and I live with my wife, Mrs. J. Paine at no. 61 Princes Avenue N22 7SB, which we and co-own. It is a garden flat located directly below the Applicant's flat at no. 63, which is the address of this application.

Although we do not object in principle to the proposed loft extension, we do object to some design related items of these proposals. I comment further below, by reference to the Application Documents and Drawings

Design & access Statement

Introduction

The subject property is not a terraced house. It is a purpose designed first floor end of terrace flat located directly over our flat. It has a separate front entrance and private internal rear access to its ground level private garden. They were not built as 'maisonette' flats having only one story each. The subject building i.e. nos. 61/63 is located at the end of one of two similar terraces separated by the original access way to their rear gardens. i.e. nos. 29/31 to 57/59 and 61/63 to 97/99.

Description

The proposal includes 3no. rooflights to the front roof slope and not 2no. as stated.

Design and Character

The London Plan and the National planning Policy Framework, are not relevant documents in the context of this application.

The host building is not a particularly large Edwardian 1900's semi-detached property [c.f. Rosebury Road for example] and in our view the roof extension, being full width, would be overly dominant.

In our view, that the addition of a 1.600 diameter spiral stair and landing would result in some material harm. Also, it is not correct to say that similar spiral stair installations have been carried out in Princes Avenue. The straight shared stair from the first floor of nos. 39 & 43 appears to us to be original. From a visual inspection of the rear of both Princes Avenue Terraces, we can see that no other stairs, spiral or straight, have been constructed. From a search of the Haringey Public Register, we did not find any approvals for spiral stairs except at no. 159 Albert Road, which appears to be un-executed. The Albert road flats have a wider frontage and larger gardens however.

We do not think it is correct to say that there are a number larger L shaped roof extensions in the neighbourhood. The Public Register does not save application drawings for reference, however.

Further comments

As-existing drawings

None of the existing elevation drawings show the red brick arched lintols to all the door and window openings to the side and rear walls.

Overall extension size

The 2nd floor additional area of some 40+ sq. m comprising 2 double bedrooms, a bathroom and laundry room, is substantial and is approximately a 65% increase to the total habitable area. Generally, we think the plan dimensions are too ambitious and could be reduced, without detriment to the accommodation.

Extension widths

Ref. dwg. FDB 63 PA AP203 Bedroom 2. Its new wall lining South to its wall is hard against the existing flank wall and follows its plan profile necessitating its Western end, up to grid 4, to be raised level with its flat roof. We would prefer it if the existing gable end profile was maintained which could be easily achieved and the 3.584 internal bedroom dimension maintained. This raised wall would we think, be unprecedented and unnecessary. There would be a material loss of the host building's details e.g. the corbelled end to the parapet wall with its profiled coping stones. This corbelling and the correct profile, is not shown on the Existing Side Elevation dwg. PA AE33. See attached image.

Other local 'L' shaped end of terrace extensions are set back from the flank wall and in the case of no. 57/59, opposite the access way, it is set back by approximately 900mm. See lower photo-

image on dwg. PA P801. Similarly, the vertical 'L' extension to no. 37 Albert Road, has its flank walls well set back.

Similarly, Bedroom 2 's window wall adjacent to grid line 4, is in our view, too close to the eaves, and could be located further back with minimal effect on the room's total area. It's window sill height appears to be approx.. 600 high which is low for a fully opening casement window in a children's bedroom.

Again, in our opinion, the internal width of bedroom 3 at 3.944 mm sets its flank wall close to the eaves, and could be reduced with a minor adjustment to the Bathroom plan. Could not the set-back dimensions for these two walls be the same? The proposed drawing shows differing adjacent gutter heights whereas the existing gutters are continuous. The eaves detail is unclear which may stem from the Existing Rear Elevation dwg.PA AE32, not being accurate in this area, and appearing to show existing guttering at differing heights. See attached image.

Generally, we think that the current proposals would result in dominant roof extension rather than it being subservient to the host building. Together with a loss of Edwardian detail. There is a deep gutter fascia shown to the flat roofs, and the pitched roof eaves detail is also vague. In our view, the deep [timber?] fascia is unsightly and unnecessary.

Loss of chimneys

The loss of two set of chimneys would be in our view, be a loss of period architectural characteristics and not, as stated in the Design Statement, in compliance with paragraph E of Policy DM 12: Housing Design and Quality. The loss of the rear chimney in particular, is also objected to because it would preclude the use of a fireplace in our Dining Area at ground floor level.

The Spiral stairs.

This installation would result in overlooking directly into our Dining Area from close range when in use, as well as providing overlooking to our garden. Its perimeter is located about 1m from our living/dining room area and close to our garden. The original Edwardian design provides for safe internal access to no. 63's private garden and this would be sacrificed for a noisy external stair for the sake of additional width to the 1st floor Dining Area.

Materials

Neither the brick nor the slate specification is mentioned on dwg.PA AE305

Presumably, the materials will be subject to samples being approved.

Should the revised gable wall end revised profile be approved, the additional brickwork should match the original. Copings to this new area of brickwork are not shown.

Apart from a note on dwg. AP304 stating 'vertical hung slate roof tiles' there appears to be no reference to the pitched roof covering specification but both of which we assume to be natural slate, or resembling natural slate. Slate sizes should be adjusted so that smaller slates are used in the gable slopes, for example.

Site Visit by planning officer

We would be pleased to provide the planning officer with access to our garden, so that he can make site inspections from both rear gardens, if desired.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. J. L. Townsend RIBA and Mrs J. Paine

61 Princes Avenue

London N22 7SB



