

1 Sam Milburn
2 8 Harcourt House, 17 Haringey Park
3 London, N8 9JB
4 [redacted]
5 23/05/2025

6 Dear Eunice Huang,

7 **Objection to Planning Application for Additional Storey at Harcourt House**

8 I am writing to formally object to the planning application proposing an additional storey at Harcourt
9 House (HGY/2024/0921). As a leaseholder of the existing top-floor flat directly affected, I have grave
10 concerns about the detrimental impact this development would have on my property and living
11 conditions. My objections are as follows:

12 **1. Inaccurate, Misleading, and Unbuildable Drawings**

13 The submitted and subsequently amended drawings remain fundamentally flawed:

- 14 • The drawings introduce new inaccuracies, have not rectified previous errors, and present
15 contradictions between sections, plans, and elevations.
- 16 • Specific unbuildable elements, such as roof access doors indicated at 1m high, are clearly
17 non-compliant with regulations.
- 18 • The absence of a structural assessment by the applicant is highly concerning. Our
19 independent structural report demonstrates a necessary redesign will inevitably result in a
20 taller structure, significantly impacting visibility and the surrounding conservation area.
- 21 • The proposed shallow floor build-up is practically unfeasible, as it does not account for
22 essential drainage and soundproofing, further necessitating a height increase and
23 subsequent planning amendments.

24 The council should not approve an application that is evidently incomplete and will require future
25 substantial modifications.

26 **2. Severe Impact on Daylight and Sunlight**

27 The proposed development would significantly harm the amenity of communal gardens:

- 28 • Harcourt House's north-facing communal gardens, essential for the residents' well-being,
29 will suffer dramatically reduced sunlight due to increased overshadowing.
- 30 • The communal gardens serve eight family-sized flats, making the preservation of sunlight
31 vital for quality of life. This impact has been inadequately assessed by the applicant.
- 32 • Additionally, negative impacts have also been acknowledged by the applicant regarding
33 Pinehurst Mews' private outdoor spaces.

34 This loss of vital outdoor amenity space and daylight significantly diminishes residential enjoyment
35 and well-being, warranting rejection of the application.

36 **3. Fire Safety and Structural Safety Risks Unaddressed**

37 Critical safety issues remain unresolved:

- No fire risk assessment or fire strategy has been submitted. Given the clear non-compliance with fire safety regulations, the application in its current form is unbuildable.
- The risk of structural instability, including potential disproportionate collapse following the proposed extension, has been raised in our professional reports and entirely ignored by the applicant.

Approval under these circumstances would knowingly permit significant risks, inevitably requiring future amendments and materially altering the scheme.

4. Poor Quality of Proposed Flats

The proposed flats do not meet essential planning and building standards:

- Flats are predominantly north-facing, single-aspect, on the fourth floor without lift access, severely compromising habitability and accessibility.
- A critical window faces directly onto active chimney flues, breaching regulatory standards.
- One flat entirely lacks an external view, significantly diminishing residential amenity.

The design clearly fails to meet established planning policies regarding habitability, adaptability, and accessibility, and thus should be rejected.

5. Inadequate and Unsafe Bin and Bike Storage

The bin storage arrangements are unacceptable:

- Proposed waste storage is inadequately detailed, impractically located in the landscaped communal garden, and visually intrusive.
- The health and safety implications of improperly maintained bin storage further undermine the proposal's viability.

In conclusion, this application is fundamentally flawed, incomplete, and would severely harm resident amenity, safety, and property values. It clearly fails multiple crucial planning tests and should be refused outright.

Thank you for considering these serious concerns.

Yours sincerely,

Sam Milburn