

Planning Service
London Borough of Haringey
Level 6
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
N22 8HQ

24 May 2024

Dear Eunice,

Re: Planning Application HGY/2024/0921

Subject: Construction of an additional storey atop the existing building to accommodate two self-contained apartments, plant installation, and related works

I am an owner and resident at Harcourt House and am writing to express my objection to the above-mentioned planning application. My objections are as follows:

1. Negative impact on the conservation area

The proposed extension to Harcourt House, currently the tallest building in the northern Victorian section of Haringey Park, presents a significant challenge to the area's architectural integrity. Originally expanded in the 1920s from two Victorian Villas, this new roof extension would exceed the heights of neighbouring structures, directly violating the 2023 NPPF's guidelines on airspace development, which stress the importance of consistency with surrounding properties. Specifically, Harcourt House's elevation to five storeys contrasts starkly with the nearby two-storey mews properties to the north—Primezone Mews, Pinehurst Mews, and 21-24 Haringey Park—as well as the 2-3 storey locally listed buildings at 13-15 Haringey Park. This discrepancy in height risks creating a canyon-like effect, enclosing the mews properties between the towering Harcourt House and the six to seven-storey Town Hall apartments. The application's drawings fail to accurately convey this impact, neglecting to depict the true relationship between Harcourt House and its surroundings as stipulated by the Haringey LPA's application validation checklist. Moreover, the proposed extension's design deviates significantly from the traditional Victorian architecture prevalent in the area, with its asymmetrical form, metal cladding, and windows, contrasting sharply with the neighbouring buildings' Victorian proportions and timber framed windows. This deviation risks creating visual dissonance and detracting from the conservation area's overall aesthetic appeal. Additionally, the proposal lacks the necessary detail in elevation drawings to assess the quality and appropriateness of materials, such as cladding joints and fenestration details, crucial for ensuring compatibility with the conservation area's character. In summary, the proposal's failure to integrate with the prevailing architectural context and its lack of detail raise significant concerns about its potential negative impact on the conservation area's character and appearance, in contravention of the mandates outlined in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. Adverse Effects on Neighbouring Properties:

The addition of an extra floor to Harcourt House, situated south of Primezone Mews and Pinehurst Mews, raises concerns regarding the obstruction of southern daylight reaching the habitable rooms and private gardens of these properties. A comprehensive assessment of daylight, sunlight, and overshadowing impacts is imperative to fully

comprehend the proposed extension's effects. Additionally, the inclusion of new balconies in the extension exacerbates the issue of overlooking into the habitable rooms and private gardens of Primezone Mews, Pinehurst Mews, and 21 Haringey Park, significantly compromising residents' privacy. Despite claims of a careful assessment by DLBP in their planning statement, discrepancies arise, such as the misidentification of neighbouring properties like 21 Primezone Mews and the omission of three houses at Pinehurst Mews from the assessment, indicative of a lack of thoroughness and accuracy. Furthermore, inaccuracies in proposed drawings, notably the depiction of garages at the back of Harcourt House, replaced by three private houses (Pinehurst Mews) two years ago, and misleading representations of neighbouring structures like Ravensdale Mansions instead of Primezone and Pinehurst Mews, highlight a deliberate attempt to misrepresent the extension's impact. To ensure a genuine assessment, these drawings must be corrected to accurately depict the nearby structures most affected by the proposed extension.

3. Loss of Amenity:

The proposed extension of Harcourt House presents significant challenges for current residents, particularly in terms of the loss of essential amenities and privacy. Currently, 7 out of 8 flats within Harcourt House lack private outdoor spaces, relying instead on access to communal gardens situated to the north. However, the extension threatens to overshadow these communal areas, significantly diminishing their usability and appeal while reducing sunlight and daylight for residents. Moreover, the extension, notably the addition of new balconies, will overlook the habitable rooms of Flats 3, 4, and 8, as well as the private terrace of Flat 7, all within close proximity (<10m). This intrusion compromises the privacy of current residents. Additionally, the applicant has neglected to provide details on how noise and sound transmission from the proposed flats into Flats 4 and 8 will be managed, nor have they outlined plans for ensuring adequate sound isolation within the proposed shallow floor build-up. This lack of information raises concerns about potential noise pollution and disruptions for residents in Flats 4 and 8, further diminishing the overall quality of life in these residences if the extension proceeds as planned.

4. Non-Compliance with Building Regulations and compromising the safety of residents:

The proposed roof extension for Harcourt House faces significant challenges in meeting building regulations and ensuring the safety of existing residents. Primarily, the drawings inaccurately depict the new extension resting directly on the existing timber roof, which is likely unbuildable. Structural support, as advised by the structural engineer's calculations, would require steel beams approximately 400mm deep, along with floor voids for drainage, not currently aligned with existing systems. This discrepancy raises concerns about the feasibility of the proposed extension and its compliance with building regulations. Furthermore, the proposed section drawing also raises red flags regarding compliance with various building regulations. For instance, the depiction of a ~0.5m deep landing for the new stairs to the 4F flats is not feasible and violates Building Regulations AD Part K requirements. Similarly, the extended chimneys, including those with operating flues, do not appear to meet the height requirements stipulated in Building Regulations AD Part J, posing potential safety hazards related to smoke dispersal. Moreover, the proposed location for the water tank above 16 Haringey Park presents significant safety concerns due to the narrow walkway without any edge protection. This configuration contravenes both Health & Safety legislation and Building Regulations AD Part K, which mandate safeguards to prevent falls and ensure safe access for maintenance and inspection. Additionally, the proposal fails to comply with several Building Regulations, necessitating alterations to ensure compliance. The extension triggers the need for additional safety measures, such as sprinklers, smoke vents, and protected fire lobbies, which are not adequately addressed in the proposal. The lack of details on how the existing structure will accommodate the extension and fire and safety regulation be met, raises significant planning matters. A comprehensive structural and fire safety assessment is required.

5. Non-compliance with London plan and not aligned to Planning Policies

The proposed flats fall short of compliance with the London Plan and fail to align with Planning Policies, necessitating substantial revisions to ensure adherence to regulatory standards. According to Haringey's Local Plan 2017 SP2, new homes must meet Building Regulations AD Part M4(2) and AD Part M4(3). While the applicant claims compliance with AD Part M4(2), supporting details are lacking, and the submitted plans demonstrate non-compliance. For instance, the plans lack level access to private outdoor space and sufficient clearance for the principal private entrance, necessitating revisions to ensure full compliance. Furthermore, the claim that the proposed two 1-bed flats will be dual aspect, as defined by the London Plan, is inaccurate. The east-facing window of Flat 10 directly faces extended chimney flues, rendering it non-compliant with Building Regulations. Additionally, the proposed balconies fail to meet the minimum depth requirement stipulated by the London Plan Housing Design Standards. The actual usable depth of the balconies, when accounting for the brick parapet, falls short of the required depth. Moreover, the ceiling height of the flats appears to be less than the 2.5m requirement set by the London Plan Housing Design Standards. There are also inconsistencies in the applicant's Design & Access Statement regarding floor to ceiling height, necessitating updates for accuracy. Lastly, the proposed new flats, situated on the 4/F and 5/F, lack lift access, contravening the London Plan's requirement for accessible and inclusive design. Therefore, the applicant must undertake substantial revisions to ensure compliance with the London Plan and Planning Policies, including addressing accessibility concerns and rectifying discrepancies in floor plans and design statements.

6. Lack of transparency and consultation

The lack of consultation over the past five years regarding the proposed extension is a significant concern, contravening planning guidance outlined in the 2023 NPPF. The NPPF emphasizes the importance of early discussion between applicants, local planning authorities, and the community to clarify expectations and reconcile local and commercial interests. Despite initiating the pre-application process in 2019, there has been no effort over the past five years to engage or consult with residents, leaseholders, or the wider community who will be directly impacted by the proposed extension. This absence of consultation not only disregards the NPPF's guidance but also deprives affected stakeholders of the opportunity to voice their concerns and provide valuable input into the design and style of the emerging scheme. Moreover, the applicant's decision to inform owners via statutory notice only after submitting the planning application to the Haringey LPA further demonstrates a lack of proactive engagement and consultation, presenting the application as a fait accompli rather than involving stakeholders in the decision-making process from the outset. Therefore, it is imperative that the applicant initiates meaningful consultation with the community and affected stakeholders to address concerns, gather feedback, and ensure that the proposed extension aligns with local expectations and interests as outlined in the NPPF.

In conclusion

In conclusion, the objections raised against Planning Application HGY/2024/0921 concerning the construction of an additional storey atop Harcourt House are multifaceted and significant. The proposed extension not only poses challenges to the conservation area's architectural integrity but also risks adversely affecting neighbouring properties and compromising the safety and amenity of existing residents. Furthermore, non-compliance with Building Regulations and failure to align with the London Plan and Planning Policies raise concerns about the proposed development's regulatory adherence and suitability for the area. Moreover, the lack of transparency and

consultation over the past five years underscores a fundamental disregard for community engagement and the principles outlined in the 2023 NPPF.

Thank you for considering my objections.

Sincerely,
Sam Milburn