



Harcourt House, 16-17 Haringey Park, N8 9JB

22.05.25

Technical Statement on “Amended Plans”:

- 1.1 Ashton Architecture, acting on instruction from the leaseholders of Harcourt House, has reviewed the “amended plans” submission pertaining to application ref HGY/2024/0921. This application concerns the erection of an additional storey at roof level of the existing building to accommodate two self-contained apartments, plant, and associated works.
- 1.2 While some minor drawing revisions have addressed prior discrepancies and inaccuracies, the majority of buildability, regulatory, and safety concerns raised in the technical note dated 22.05.24 remain unaddressed and without response. These include:
 - Building Height and compliance with British Building Regulations Part B and the Building Safety Act (Technical Note 22.05.24 Section 2.0)
 - Works to Existing Chimney Stacks (Technical Note 22.05.24 Section 3.0)
 - Design, Amenity, and Buildability Matters (Technical Note 22.05.24 Section 4.0)
- 1.3 Furthermore, the amended and new drawings submitted by the Applicant present additional discrepancies, including:
 - The proposed roof and internal layout plans appear not to match the proposed sections and elevations. For example, if the roof form and fold lines are represented to match elevations and some sections, the internal areas within the flats with reduced headroom (<2.5m) may increase. Consequently, the number and layout of PV panels, roof lights etc will also change.
 - The proposed roof access doors are positioned directly above existing windows. If accurately drawn, their height of 1m limits their practical function.
 - The proposed eastern window for Flat 10, as shown in plans and elevations, faces extended chimney stacks. However, these chimneys are absent from the new section, replaced with parapet instead.

These discrepancies are highlighted in the attached drawing mark-up prepared by an Architect in the leaseholder group.

- 1.4 Should the application be determined in its current form it would be unclear which of the conflicting drawings take precedence (plans or elevations or sections) in the proposed design. Given the discrepancies highlighted above, it is very likely that material planning amendments will be required for the scheme to proceed.
- 1.5 It is incumbent on the case officer to ensure the discrepancies, omissions and errors in the applicant’s submissions are addressed before determining the design viability and impact without reliance on future material amendments.
- 1.6 We trust the LPA will review the information in full and request clarification and consistency from the Applicant in respect of the points raised in this and the previous statements.