

Dr Hannah Yip
21D Methuen Park
London
N10 2JR

14 November 2023

REF: HGY/2023/2703
23 Methuen Park, London, N10 2JR

To whom it may concern,

In response to your letter dated 16 October, we are writing to express our objections to certain aspects of the proposed development at 23 Methuen Park.

Firstly, there is historic precedent. We note that a planning application for the erection of a rear roof extension with balustrade at this exact address was refused on 3 March 2006 (HGY/2006/0031). The objections were provided by the Muswell Hill CAAC, the Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association, and the Haringey Conservation Team. Our own objections therefore centre on the proposed construction of the dormer window and balustrade as per historic precedent.

The proposal for the dormer window and balustrade, by reason of overlooking, would result in a loss of privacy and amenity to the adjacent residential property contrary to Policy DM18 B.¹ As the drawings currently show, both the dormer window and the balustrade would look directly into the living room of 21D Methuen Park, thereby contravening Policy DM3 and Policy DM18 E. 3.11 (see also *Figures 1 and 2*, below). As *Figure 2* below shows, privacy is currently maintained by means of a chimney which blocks the view of the Velux window of 21D Methuen Park. The drawings propose that the Velux window at 23 Methuen Park will be replaced with a wider dormer window.

In addition, noise and disturbance relating to new use of the balustrade may not adhere to the 'Sound Control for Homes' noise standard (Building Research Association and Construction Industry Research Association, 1993) and would therefore compromise the quiet character of the area; see Section 7.2 of the Sustainable Design & Construction SPD.²

¹ https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/development_management_dpd_final_lc060215.pdf

² https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/sustainable_design_and_construction_spd_adopted_march_2013.pdf



Figure 1: Proposed location of the balustrade. Photo taken from the Velux window in the living room of 21D Methuen Park. 4 November 2023.

Velux window at 23 Methuen Park
(which will be replaced by a wider
dormer window; proposed location
circled in red below)



Figure 2: Proposed location of the dormer window. Photo taken from the Velux window in the living room of 21D Methuen Park. 4 November 2023.

The ‘Planning Advice for Common Projects’ section on the Haringey Council website states that extensions should be subordinate in scale to the original building and should respect its architectural character; see also Policy DM18 E. 3.12. Dormer windows are present at 13, 15, 17, and 19 Methuen Park; however, these windows are confined exclusively to the rear of the properties in question. Judging by the drawings provided, the proposed extension at 23 Methuen Park is visually obtrusive as its position does not preserve the dominance of the main pitch or its silhouette but will threaten the integrity of the roof form. As the property is part of a terrace, this alteration will have a negative impact on the terrace’s balance and the architectural integrity of the skyline, thereby detracting from the character of the Conservation Area. In sum, as was found in 2006 (HGY/2006/0031), the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact on the amenity of adjacent properties.

We would like to draw attention to the fact that we have managed to hold an informal discussion with the freeholders at 23 Methuen Park, who have stated that the dormer would be constructed in such a way that its window would not overlook the living room at 21D Methuen Park. However, it is difficult to be convinced of this claim from the drawings alone.

John Crompton of the Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association has highlighted the fact that a design statement and a heritage statement, which constitute two requirements for planning applications within a Conservation Area, have not been uploaded to the website for consultation by all parties. The residents at 21A and 21D Methuen Park would like to second John Crompton in requesting that these two statements be shared in order that the matter of the dormer window can be further clarified.

Finally, the freeholders at 23 Methuen Park have informed us that they are not sure as to whether they would ultimately go ahead with constructing the balustrade. It would give us peace of mind if this intention *not* to erect the balustrade were to be given in writing by the freeholders, along with submission of a formal amendment to the drawings. If this request is not addressed, we would ask that the proposal to construct the balustrade be formally refused by Haringey Council. We trust that the freeholders at 23 Methuen Park appreciate that we would prefer our concerns to be addressed in writing as opposed to an informal, unwritten assurance. Moreover, to have the plans for the balustrade withdrawn or rejected would also provide us with reassurance that this building work would not take place in the future, should successive freeholders decide to go ahead with the construction of a balustrade.

Should the construction of the side dormer be ultimately approved (which would be an unfortunate precedent), we would like to propose that the freeholders at 23 Methuen Park alter the design to a flat roof skylight. This would enable 23 Methuen Park to have ample access to light, while simultaneously ensuring that the privacy of the adjacent property is not compromised.

Yours faithfully,

Hannah Yip and David Ingamells