10A SOUTH GROVE
HIGHGATE
LONDON
N6 6BS

13 May 2016

Valerie Okeiyi
Planning Department
Haringey Council
Civic Centre
High Road, London N22 8LE

By e-mail only

Dear Valerie,

4b Winchester Place HGY/2016/1122

I am writing on behalf of the Highgate Society to object to the proposal for a loft extension above the existing attic floor at 4b Winchester Place, N6. Our objections are as follows-

1 Impact on Conservation Area

1.1 Throughout this part of the Highgate Conservation Area the houses are, apart from some corner houses, semi-detached. The topography is dealt with by stepping up the ridge lines on the house uphill or, as is the case here where the gradient is less steep, carrying the eaves and ridge lines across the gap between the semi-detached pairs. It is important to retain this design principle as otherwise the integrity of the original street design would be seriously compromised. The proposal to raise the ridge, such that it is higher than both its neighbours, breaks this design principle and so to permit this development on this ground alone would be unacceptable.

1.2 When the applicant visited our Planning Surgery at 10a South Grove, we made the following comments:

- raising ridge by 450mm is unacceptable in the Conservation Area. The chimneys would also have to be raised.
- we would prefer an original pattern dormer at the front rather than a 'bomb damage' version and suggested research at the local history archives to fine early photographs of the house.
- the dormers proposed at rear are not subservient to the rear elevation.
- we were unhappy about the principle of a 'double storey loft'.
- there are concerns of overlooking of neighbours' garden from the proposed Juliet balcony.
- in view of the location design sensitivity, we recommended that they should appoint conservation architects rather than surveyors.

It states in the Design and Access Statement that a mansard at the rear was suggested in a pre-app meeting with Haringey planners. When we saw the applicant, that was not discussed, and we cannot agree that this form of roof would be sympathetic or reflect the character and context of the Conservation Area. Not only does it involve raising the flank gable wall and party wall to No. 2 to a substantial extent, but the raised gable would also be visible from the street; the party wall parapet would introduce an alien structure as viewed from the rear. Added to this bulk and

protruding brickwork is the large area of flat 'crown' roof which has no precedent in this part of the Conservation Area.

1.3 The double-height dormer is quite evidently not subordinate to the rear elevations in Winchester Place and Cromwell Avenue of which this property forms a part, so we are surprised to note the applicant's assertion that it was supported at a pre-app discussion on the basis that it becomes more acceptable if set in a mansard roof. Our view is that the mansard roof simply adds unacceptable bulk at roof level and only worsens the impact of the proposal for a double-height dormer. It does not meet the following emerging policy:

DM9 E Proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.

1.4 We therefore do not consider this proposal is acceptable, due to its scale, bulk, uncharacteristic design and alteration of the ridge line contrary to the inherent design of this part of the Conservation Area.

2. Quality of accommodation

2.1 This property already has an attic floor set in the eaves. The proposal involves inserting a loft above the existing attic, lit by rooflights and dormers. The proposed ceiling heights on each floor are 2.1m. The London Plan Housing Policy 3.5 states:
(https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/housing_standards_malp_for_publication_7_april_2016.pdf)

"*The nationally described space standard sets a minimum ceiling height of 2.3 metres for at least 75% of the gross internal area of the dwelling. To address the unique heat island effect of London and the distinct density and flatted nature of most of its residential development, a minimum ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the gross internal area is strongly encouraged so that new housing is of adequate quality, especially in terms of light, ventilation and sense of space."*

The proposed ceiling heights for each floor in the double loft are 2.1m. and therefore not compliant.

3. Amenity of neighbours

3.1 The effect of the double-height dormer with its Juliet balcony will result in a reduction of amenity and privacy for neighbours.

3.2 By reason of the scale and bulk of the proposal it will impact on the amenity of neighbours

For all the above reasons, The Highgate Society objects in the strongest possible terms to this application.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Hammerson
for and on behalf of the Planning Group of The Highgate Society

Disclaimer:
The Highgate Society is an unincorporated association established for the public benefit. It endeavours to ensure that the information it provides as a free service is correct but does not warrant that it is accurate or complete. Nothing in this correspondence constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such. In no event will the Society be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation indirect or consequential loss or damage or any damage whatsoever arising from the information it provides.