

RE: Planning application HGY/2024/0766

Objection from:

Mr Ibrahim Ussef

129A Granville road

N22 5LS

Status of the comment: Object!

I am a share of freehold with the applicant for 129 Granville Road. I have not given consent to the work .

- Our shared title deed has a covenant that restricts extending past the existing building line

- The applicant has stated in their application that they have notified all owners with a stake in the application boundary of their intent to submit an application. This would include owners of 129 & 127 Granville Road due to works raising the party wall. We would like to know whether the council has seen proof in writing of notification from all stakeholders. I have not received the requisite notice stated by the applicant in the application - Certificate B.

-Overlooking - Whilst the applicant has removed the terrace in this application they propose to knock down the existing second floor pitched roof and replace it with a flat roof. This seems unnecessary, unless the applicant intends to create a future terrace. I request that the pitched roof should remain. Access to Sunlight/Daylight - I would request that a daylight/sunlight analysis be provided by the applicant to ascertain whether there is any impact to our and our neighbour's windows. Relevant Planning Policy

- Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires that development should be sustainable. Replacing the existing pitched roof with a flat roof does not constitute sustainable design when the existing roof could easily be retro fitted to meet modern thermal standards. - DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality – This application is none of these as it's massing is not in keeping with the existing terrace of buildings which none have 2nd floor rear outrigger extensions – it is over bearing and will have an oppressive impact on the nearby properties. The applicant proposes raising the party wall which will make it out of character with the group of 8 similar terraced houses. It should be noted that the extension will be visible from Ellenborough Road and will impact the public realm. - DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality – As above, I do not believe the extensions relates positively to its locality. I also note that demolishing the existing

outrigger roof and replacing it with a flat roof at first floor level is not in keeping with the existing property pitch roof nor is it in keeping with the age of the building. The existing building does not have any flat roofs - Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance – As above. - DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours

– The ugly removal of the existing pitched roof or cut diagonally in half Juliet balcony by the same roof is not high quality design.

-The proposed development is in the middle of terrace and there is no altered outriggers on the second floor level.

- Planning guidance on the planning portal states that loft conversions should achieve 2.2m clear head height, the height states on the application drawings is 2.1m.