

Eunice Huang
Planning, Regeneration & Economy
Haringey Council
Level 6
River Park House
Wood Green
N22 8HQ

22nd May 2024

Dear Ms Huang,

Re: Harcourt House, 16-17 Haringey Park, N8 – Objections to Planning Application HGY/2024/0921

I am the leaseholder of Flat 5 Harcourt House, 16-17 Haringey Park, London N8 (“My Flat”)

I bought my flat in June 2003 and I wish to object to the above planning allocation in the strongest possible terms. In doing so I hereby adopt the letter from Diana Thomson of Savills who has been instructed by the leaseholders of Harcourt House.

In addition to the objections outlined by Ms Thomson, I would like to add the following comments.

1. Lack of Consultation:

I was only informed of the planning application when it was submitted. I was not consulted by the applicant and was not asked my views on the matter at any point.

2. Proposed extension will compromise the safety of the existing building:

In 2018, after carrying out damp works to my flat, it was discovered that there were significant defects in the structure of the building such that internal structural walls had to be rebuilt and foundations retrospectively strengthened as well as significant work carried out to the slab. After these works were completed, the flats above experienced significant new cracks in the walls. This all points to the fact that any further load on the building could further compromise its structural integrity. The applicant has provided no details on how the existing structure will withstand a further extension and the consequent increased load on the building as a whole. In order to make the building safe, for example proving horizontal and vertical ties or excavation and underpinning, it would inevitably be necessary to vacate my flat for an extended period of time.

Drainage and Sewers – in addition to the above point, Harcourt House is served by Victorian sewers which have caused significant and on-going problems and are prone to blockages. My flat has experienced flooding on numerous occasions as a result of blocked drains, resulting in foul water entering into the flat from the side door of the building. Clearly introducing more dwellings and the accompanying increased load on the already struggling sewers will only exacerbate this problem and inevitably lead to further and more frequent blockages and therefore an increased risk of foul water ingress into my property. This is obviously completely unacceptable and risks not only directly damaging my property but also presents a significant health risk.

Fire Safety – the proposed extension will increase the building height to above 11m and 4 storeys. As such Building Regulations would require the installation of sprinklers, smoke vents and protected fire lobbies throughout the building. I am extremely concerned that these considerations have not been included in the proposals and clearly a change in layout and appearance in the building are matters to be considered at the planning stage.

3. Conservation Area:

Harcourt House sits within the Crouch End conservation area and is already the tallest building on the north side of Haringey Park. The proposed development will increase the height of the building further, ruining its unique aesthetic. The development would also be unsympathetic with the surrounding buildings and would mean that the stepped parapet, one of the only remaining historical features, is removed.

4. Loss of Amenities:

The addition of two flats would increase the pressure on the communal outdoor spaces. Both the front and rear gardens of Harcourt House are at eye level with my flat and therefore more people using the outdoor space would have a significant detrimental affect on the privacy of the occupants. Increasing the height of the building will also further rob the gardens of light, reducing the value of the amenity.

In summary I am deeply concerned about multiple aspects of this proposal as outlined above, and in the letter submitted by Diana Thomson of Savills on behalf of all leaseholders of Harcourt House.

I therefore ask that the proposed planning application be comprehensively rejected.

Yours Sincerely,

Nicholas Ullmann