

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Application Reference: HGY/2026/2192

Site Location: 83 Priory Road, London

Proposal: Conversion of attic space to create a 2-bedroom/3-person flat, rear dormer, front amenity works, and internal access alterations

Objector: Residents of Second Floor Flat, 83 Priory Road

Introduction I am writing to formally object to the above planning application. While the applicant's Design and Access Statement (DAS) claims the proposal aligns with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) by "optimising the capacity of an existing residential site," national and local policies are explicit that the drive for new housing must not come at the unacceptable expense of existing residents.

A review of the proposed architectural drawings reveals that the applicant's written statements regarding access, safety, noise, and amenity are fundamentally contradicted by the physical reality of their design and its direct impact on our family home.

1. The Falsehood of "Unchanged and Unobstructed" Access

The Applicant's Claim: The DAS states, "Although the second floor would be adapted to accommodate the access stair to the new dwelling, access arrangements for the existing second-floor flat would remain unchanged and unobstructed."

The Reality: This statement is factually incorrect. The "Proposed Second Floor Plan" (Page 14) and "Proposed Communal Staircase Configuration" explicitly show the erection of a new, full-height structural partition wall to enclose a 5.8 sqm private entrance lobby for the new flat. This reduces the existing communal landing directly outside our front door (and the neighboring flat) to a severe **900mm** pinch point.

- **Loss of Amenity:** This creates an oppressive, claustrophobic entranceway and cuts off our natural light.
- **Functional Unworkability:** A 900mm corridor bounded by a solid wall opposite a downward flight of stairs physically prevents us from maneuvering standard furniture (e.g., beds, sofas, or appliances) in or out of our home. Under **London Plan Policy D6**, layouts must be practical and fit for everyday living; this contrived design actively **obstructs our fundamental use of our property**.

2. Contradiction of "Safe and Healthy Living Conditions" (NPPF Paragraph 135)

The Applicant's Claim: The DAS quotes NPPF Paragraph 135, claiming the proposal will "create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and promote health and well-being."

The Reality: The design introduces acute new hazards for our family and our neighbors.

- **Winder Step Hazards (Building Regs Part K):** The proposal replaces safe, flat communal landings with tapered winder steps. Winders present a well-documented trip hazard, particularly on the inner curve where the tread is narrowest. As a family with very

young children, this introduces an unacceptable daily safety risk. It is equally hazardous for parents carrying infants or heavy items.

- **Fire Safety Bottlenecks (London Plan Policy D12):** Constricting the communal escape route to 900mm directly outside our main entrance door creates a hazardous emergency evacuation bottleneck.

3. Vertical Stacking, Flanking Noise, and Unacceptable Disturbance

The Applicant's Claim: The DAS asserts that the development "would not result in unacceptable... noise disturbance."

The Reality: Page 14 of the proposed plans reveals that the new 27 sqm open-plan Kitchen/Dining/Lounge area is positioned directly above the principal bedrooms of our second-floor apartment.

- **Flanking Transmission in a Period Property:** Previous refurbishments in this building have proven that upgrading the floor void alone fails to stop noise transmission between flats. Because of the building's historic construction, impact sound (like footsteps) travels directly down the solid masonry walls (flanking transmission). Placing a high-footfall living/kitchen area over our bedrooms guarantees severe noise transfer, regardless of floor insulation.
- **Policy Breach:** Best-practice residential design mandates the vertical alignment of quiet-to-quiet and active-to-active rooms. Stacking an active living space over a family bedroom directly violates **Haringey Policy DM1**, which mandates the safeguarding of residential amenity.

4. Gross Overdevelopment and Strain on Infrastructure *The Applicant's Claim:* The DAS cites NPPF Paragraph 124, stating the design makes a "modest but meaningful contribution to local housing supply."

The Reality: This proposal represents the gross **over-intensification** of an already maximized building.

- **Excessive Density (Up to 15 Occupants):** The building currently houses 8 residents across the first and second floors. Once the vacant ground-floor flat is refurbished and occupied, the building's occupancy will increase further. Squeezing an entirely new 3-person household into the roof space brings the total capacity to **up to 15 people living in a single building envelope, all sharing one narrowed 900mm communal access route.**
- **Communal Strain & Waste Clutter:** The applicant's own admission that the front garden must now accommodate 16 bins (8x 240L refuse/recycling bins and 8x food waste bins) plus an 8-bike cycle store visualizes the excessive density forced upon this site. This visually harms the street scene.
- **Spirit of Haringey Policy DM16:** Local policy prevents the conversion of single dwellings under 120sqm into flats to avoid over-intensification. Pushing the occupancy of

this building to up to 15 people violates the spirit of this policy, irreparably straining communal areas and infrastructure.

5. Unfeasible Construction Phase and Blocked Access The applicant proposes building a new stair flight directly over the existing communal staircase. It is physically impossible to execute these structural works without obstructing the primary access and only fire escape route for our family and the other residents.

- The application contains no **Construction Management Plan** detailing how we will safely access our home 24/7 during weeks of heavy construction in the central stairwell. Without this, the scheme is fundamentally un-buildable and highly dangerous.

6. Ambiguity of Fire and Acoustic Upgrades (Impact on Existing Property) Forming a new, independent dwelling directly above our property requires a minimum 60-minute fire separation and heavy acoustic flooring build-ups to meet Building Regulations (Parts B and E). Achieving a continuous, compliant fire and acoustic seal between the dwellings conventionally necessitates invasive works to the existing floor joists from *below*. The application provides no technical assurances detailing how this mandatory structural separation will be achieved without **heavily disturbing our existing ceiling or necessitating invasive access into our private home**.

Conclusion The applicant relies on broad planning rhetoric to justify an overdevelopment that fails at a logistical and practical level. The proposal physically obstructs our access, introduces stair hazards for our young children, guarantees noise disturbance through flawed room stacking and structural flanking transmission, forces an unacceptable density of up to 15 occupants onto an already constrained site, and presents an unworkable construction phase.

For these reasons, the proposal fails to comply with London Plan Policy D6, Haringey Local Plan Policies DM1 and DM12, and NPPF Paragraph 135. **We strongly urge the Council to refuse this application.**