

APPENDIX 1: COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
	EXTERNAL		
1	Stroud Green Conservation Area Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The principle of building new housing in small rear gardens is unacceptable. - would establish a very regrettable precedent which would seriously compromise the unity and character of the conservation area - remaining garden to No 38 would be too small - whether the proposed design provides sufficient amenity space - concern over effect of basement on groundwater, foundations, trees and landscaping - overlooking onto neighbouring properties - basement bedrooms look onto a lightwell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As discussed above in section 'Principle of Development' - As discussed above in section 'Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.' - Would still exceed minimum as discussed in para. 9.22 - Would exceed minimum for 2 bed unit which is 7sqm – see para. 9.19 - As discussed above in sections 'Impact on Trees' and 'Construction, drainage and flooding' - As discussed in section 'Impact on residential amenity' - It is accepted that the outlook from the basement bedrooms is limited however on balance given the size of the rooms and amount of glazing proposed it would receive an adequate level of natural light and has been successfully implemented on other similar schemes such as The

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wall facing Dagmar Road is over 2500mm high, which is out of character with the surrounding townscape 	<p>lighthouse, Fairfield Road under HGY/2010/2017 – who’s design won Best Home Haringey Design Awards 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This forms part of the front elevation of the dwelling and is discussed in section ‘Design, Form and Layout.’ He wall will not increase in height as the materials have changed.
2.			
	Local residents	<p>Character, Design & Form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Out of character with conservation area - the side wall would not fully conceal the ground floor from view; - Integrity and sustainability of the conservation area would be very seriously undermined; - Garden grabbing; - Unacceptable density; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As discussed above and section on ‘impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area’ - It is accepted that the ground floor will not be fully concealed by the existing wall as the front elevation of the dwelling would extend up from that however as discussed above in the section on the ‘Design, Form and Layout’ - As discussed above and section on ‘Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area’, the surrounding area is not of strict uniformity. The proposal respects the site and openness the site currently affords within the streetscene. - The site is not a protected open space and as such is considered suitable for development. - The building to plot ratio is different to other properties in the area, however the scheme works and makes efficient use of the land in addition to providing much needed housing.

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ugly wall with raised height is not characteristic of area; - Out of character with Victorian terraces in the immediate neighbourhood; - The site is neither vacant nor previously developed but reflects the HMO nature of the house and its management; - Normal maintenance of property would improve situation - Appears as three storey; - Local design precedent misleads - Development is too large for such a small site and would appear cramped; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The building has been re-designed using wood as its materials to soften the impact that the brick may have had so the wall remains the same height - A new design building of high quality can sit alongside older buildings rather than just directly imitating earlier styles. - Noted however it does not appear to be a space that is currently utilised. - Noted that this application is not the only way in improving end of this property - The dwelling is two storey and height is just above the first floor window cill of No, 2 Dagmar Road. The ground floor element is higher than the more traditional height of other ground floors in the area however this allows for high level windows. - This comment is noted and it is appreciated that there are differences in the examples put forward by the applicant to the proposal here. Noted that Denton Road application is not in a Conservation Area. The application here has been considered on its own merits. - The dwelling is set away from both side boundaries with a gaps of 1.35m to No. 2 Dagmar Road and between 4.32m and 11.12m from the rear elevations of No. 38 Oakfield Road. With this space between existing built form the dwelling will not appear unduly cramped - It does not follow the building line of the properties along

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not follow building line; - Loss of open aspect to the approach to Dagmar Road; - Development would cram a jarringly modern house between two Victorian houses of architectural merit; - Not a diverse mix of building types and would stick out like a sore thumb; - Drawings create an illusion of open spaces at the rear and sides of proposed building; - Boundary wall is being raised significantly; - Whole run of windows would be visible contrary to applicant's claim; 	<p>Dagmar Road but it does reference the building line of 38 Oakfield Road and its existing boundary wall along Dagmar Road. If there is scope not to follow an established building line then this can be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The loss of this open aspect is not considered so significant to object to a building in this location. There would be still an open aspect to the side of 38 Oakfield Road. - As mentioned above a new design building of high quality can sit alongside older buildings rather than just directly imitating earlier styles. - It is not required that dwellings reflect the existing building types. A number of these stand alone dwellings have been allowed by both the Local Authority and on appeal. One example is the Light House in Fairfield Road, N8. - The left hand side elevation has been revised to remove this illusion of open space as this is the gap between the proposed dwelling and No. 2 Dagmar Road. There will be more space to the side between the dwelling and No. 38 Oakfield Road. - Boundary wall is not now being raised as materials have been revised to timber cladding. The front elevation of the dwelling however is an extension upwards of the boundary wall. - Noted but not unacceptable

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p><i>Impact on Amenity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed basement courtyard would not receive sufficient or direct sunlight due to orientation and higher first floor; - Poor access to light due to windows facing north east away from the sun; - Would interfere with daylight of No.2 Dagmar Road; - Impact on residents at No. 38 Oakfield Road; - Loss of privacy; - Losing 25% of dwelling not acceptable especially as half is basement and ground floor hemmed in by walls; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See Section 6.4 Layout/standard of accommodation - See Section 6.4 Layout/standard of accommodation - The bulk of the property forward of No.2 Dagmar Road is single storey level only and is not considered to result in a material loss of amenity or significantly affect the living conditions of the occupiers of that property - There will be a loss of some of the garden to that property but over 62m² will be retained. In addition the proposed dwelling would be in excess of 4.3m from the two storey rear projection but more importantly over 11m from the main bulk of the building. - See section 6.6 Impact on residential amenity - The proposed dwelling is uses the space intelligently and is considered to be of a sufficient size and quality to be considered acceptable - There will be a loss of some of the garden to that property but

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of garden space to No.38 Oakfield Road resulting in inadequate size; - Current view into site of trees and shrubs replaced by intrusive house; - Height of wall would negatively impact on light; - Would result in sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers; - Would obstruct view from No. 3 Dagmar Road; - No 36 would be overlooked; - Overshadowing to neighbours; 	<p>over 62m2 will be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The house, given its size, design and proposed materials is not considered to be materially intrusive however it is accepted that the current open view at the rear of the garden will be lost. - It is not disputed that the dwelling will not receive an excessive amount of light however, with a glazed floor forming part of the ground floor level the amount of light into the basement area is improved. - The dwelling would be located at the rear of the garden of No. 38 Oakfield. It was accepted that there could be impact on neighbouring occupiers however the higher element has been moved away from the boundary with the element adjacent to the See paragraph 6.6.3 - There is no right to a view across others land. - There are no windows facing that property - No material level of overshadowing is expected due to size and siting of building and orientation of the building in relation to the neighbouring occupiers. - No evidence to demonstrate it would suffer from damp and building would benefit from an adequate level of light – see

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building would suffer from damp and be dark and cramped; - Noise and disturbance from two separate outdoor entertainment spaces; - Height of wall would negatively impact on lines of sight; - <i>Access, Safety & Parking</i> - Height of wall would negatively impact on lines of sight; - Where would bins be stored; - Bins when left on pavement on collection days would cause significant obstacles to pedestrians, including the disabled; - <i>Environmental Issues</i> - Noise disruption from construction 	<p>section 6.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See paragraphs 6.6.4 and 6.6.5 - The building is single storey level only so the lines of sight from neighbouring dwellings would not be unacceptably compromised - The front elevation projects no further forward than the existing boundary wall so no sightlines would be infringed - revised drawings have been received showing a bin store that can be accessed internally with an exterior hatch that can be opened from the street - secure storage provided - Not a material planning issue

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>works;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lose area of green space with trees and plants; - Gross overcrowding along with No.36 and 38 Oakfield Road being houses in multiple occupation; - Area already contains one large block of flats – this should be the limit on population pressure; - Would affect drainage and water table; - Exacerbate issue of flooding - Hydrological survey does not support reality – many adjacent properties on this side of Oakfield Road experience flooded basements after heavy rains and the development would inevitably impact on this leaving the Council open to legal action for subsequent damages; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not a protected area of open space. An outbuilding could be erected under residential permitted development rights which could also reduce open space. - the residential unit proposed accommodates 2 bedrooms so the number of occupiers is not considered excessive. - Additional housing required in the borough – this adds to existing stock - No objections from Thames Water and not located in a Flood Risk Area. The creation of a basement here is not considered to materially affect the water table – see section 6.9 <p>No objections from the Council’s Building Control Section – see section 6.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This does not form a precedent – see paragraph 6.2.4

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Precedent of building on garden space; - Concern regarding structural alterations; - Structural impact on neighbour at No.2 Dagmar Road; - Lightwell would attract leaves and rubbish; - Impact on foundations of terrace along Oakfield Road; - History of subsidence; - Would involve fatal damage to mature tree outside the property wall on to Dagmar Road – such trees are afforded special protection; - Drawings showing hedging on top of wall surrounding the lightwell 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No objections from the Council's Building Control Section – see section 6.9 - No objections from the Council's Building Control Section – see section 6.9 - Would be the occupiers responsibility to clear if required as it would if leaves and rubbish were on a front garden - No objections from the Council's Building Control Section – see section 6.9 - No objections from the Council's Building Control Section – see section 6.9 - Response from the Council's Tree officer confirms that it is unlikely that the proposal would fatally harm the tree. It would more likely to be damaged by vehicles delivering materials to the site however this cannot be controlled by planning conditions as the tree is not within the confines of the application site. - planters can be inserted into the top of walls to produce plating above

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>are misleading as not clear how these hedge plants can be physically located there;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of existing tree and be no room for trees on site; - Noise and disturbance from two separate outdoor entertainment spaces; - Would not reinstate much needed green space; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No loss of tree – green roof being provided and planting to sides - Considered above and in section 6.6 - The area is not protected open space.