

For the attention of Planning Officer Nathan Keyte

**London Borough of Haringey
Development Management Team
BY EMAIL**

Re Application Ref. 2023/2886: Flat A, 30 Shepherds Hill, Hornsey, London, N6 5AH

20th March 2024

Dear Mr Keyte

I write on behalf of my father, Paul Quinn, who lives at No. 22 Shepherds Hill (Flat 11, Nuffield Lodge) who has brought the above application to my attention. He wishes to object to the application in the strongest possible terms, and having reviewed the proposals, considers the proposals to conflict with a number of key planning policies. We set out our grounds of objection below:

1. Noise, disturbance and highways impacts in relation to the proposed basement excavation

The main grounds for objection relates to the disruption caused by the proposed development, and in particular the impacts resulting from a further basement excavation to this property. While a Basement Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application, which looks at the structural implications in digging out a further area beneath the garage/ main dwelling, there is little to no information about its impacts on the wider area in terms of noise generation during construction, and highways impacts.

You'll no doubt be aware that Shepherds Hill, despite its close proximity to the A1 and connections to Highgate and Crouch End, is a relatively quiet street which doesn't tend to have loads of traffic – it is a pleasant, suburban-style road and this is enjoyed by my father and other surrounding residents, a lot of whom are elderly. He enjoys a daily morning walk into Crouch End, and this ritual plays a big role in his overall health and wellbeing. The prospect of contending with noise and activity from HGVs and other lorries, vans coming in and out of the site on a daily basis – and for a considerable period of time given the typical duration of this type of work – quite frankly fills him with dread, and is a genuine worry to me and the rest of his family.

Parts H and I of Policy DM18 (Residential Basement Development and Light Wells) states that:

“Householder extensions to existing basements, and the construction of new basements, including in existing dwellings will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal:
h Will not cause harm to pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and road safety, adversely affect bus or other transport operations, significantly increase traffic congestion, nor place unreasonable inconvenience on the day to day life of those living, working or visiting nearby; and
i Will minimise construction impacts such as noise, vibration and dust for the duration of the works.

The planning application fails to address these points adequately, and we therefore strongly argue that the application should be refused on this basis.

2. Impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and the Highgate Conservation Area

Policy DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan states “the gaps between buildings, often providing views of mature rear gardens, are an important feature of many residential streets of Highgate and contribute positively to the conservation area.” Policy DH4 stresses the importance of the positive and negative spaces between buildings and why this should be safeguarded.

It is clear that while reasonably sympathetic side extensions have been constructed to houses along this part of Shepherds Hill, the proposed 4-storey extension (including the basement level) would be wholly dominant and out of keeping with the main dwelling and in the wider context of the conservation area. The proposal is now to build a 4-storey house (including basement) on the right-hand side of the west (front) elevation replacing the one storey garage, therefore completely closing the gap on both sides of the building. The application would therefore clearly be unacceptable in design and conservation grounds, and should also be refused on this basis.

3. Other issues

We also support the grounds for refusal raised by adjoining residents’ in relation to impacts of the proposals on privacy grounds, matters of drainage and subsidence, and party wall issues which directly affect them. The proposals fail to adequately address these issues and exacerbate the harm caused by the two points raised above.

We respectfully request that officers’ takes full account of the objections raised and refuse planning permission for this development, for the reasons set out above. I trust that the above information is clear, but please contact us if you require any further clarification on the issues raised.

Yours sincerely,

Neil Quinn MRTPI

On behalf of Mr Paul Quinn, Flat 11, 22 Shepherds Hill N6 5UZ