

**Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objection to [HGY/2022/3924](#)
for 76 Southwood Lane, London, N6 5DY**

Highgate CAAC welcomes the addition of the document “1242 - Planning presentation” to this application. However, even with the addition of this document we still think this application is vague and inconsistent and should be refused.

The added document “1242 - Planning presentation” is inconsistent with the description of the application and internally contradictory.

The application description states *“4m single storey rear extension in facing brickwork and single sloping artificial slate roof with new bifold doors and roof lights”* whereas document 1242 states that the extension will have *“a flat roof with fi-breglass waterproofing, and glazing to blend in with the existing property as far as possible”*.

The accompanying illustrations show a largely glazed extension with a surround which appears to be some sort of part flat, part sloping grey metal cladding.

In the following paragraph Document 1242 says *“Moreover the proposed roof of this rear extension will have a green sedum roof”*. Neither the application description nor the illustrations are consistent with this statement.

Does the proposed extension have an artificial slate, fibreglass, grey metal or sedum roof? Is it flat or sloping? How can such a vague proposal be permitted?

Also, the application description says the extension will be constructed from “facing brickwork” whereas document 1242 says it will be rendered to match the rest of the terrace.

Further, the large area of glazing does not “blend in” with existing properties as suggested above. This is the first back extension constructed since the hospital was converted into 6 terraced houses in 2004 under application [HGY/2003/1319](#) and the very shallow original extensions to the houses to the north of this one are not glazed.

The description “*The proposed windows are to be double glazed timber sash windows, and the proposed rear doors to the ground floor are to be double glazed aluminium sliding or sliding folding doors with anthracite frame*” also makes no sense, as the application does not appear to be asking for replacement windows. There is no mention of any such windows in the document 1242. Are the windows of the extension partly timber and partly aluminium? That would be quite odd given the illustrations.

In addition, the section on “Sustainability and materials” is extremely vague and makes no specific proposals. It sounds as though the extension is intended to meet the lowest energy efficiency and sustainability ratings possible at the current time rather than aiming for a higher standard or zero carbon outcome. This would be highly regrettable.

Also, the application is not adequate in terms of the footprint of the extension proposed. The drawings describe the boundaries as “Assumed Boundary Lines”. Were exact boundaries between units set when Southwood Hospital was converted to residential? If so, why are those boundaries not known and provided in this application? The proposed extension looks as though it overlaps with the neighbouring property in the plan drawings and compared to the OS Map. This needs to be resolved.

Without knowing the exact boundaries it is also not possible to be certain that the statements made about the effect on neighbours’ light and daylight are correct.

In addition, it seems likely that such a large area of upward facing glazing would cause light pollution for neighbours, contrary to DM1 of Haringey’s Development Management DPD (2017) and could also potentially be contrary to regulations concerning disturbance to birds, bats etc.

Also there is no heritage statement or description. This building has an interesting history. The terrace of six houses was converted from Southwood Hospital, formerly Radlett House, and before that “The Limes” (1815) under planning permission

[HGY/2003/1319](#). The former Southwood Hospital is mentioned in paragraph 4.4.91 in the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal, along with a photo of the terrace, Nos 72-80 Southwood Lane.

Even though the extension is at the rear of the building, consideration of this sort of information should have been included.

The application has a highly provisional look to it, without sufficient detail about materials, sustainability, boundaries and dimensions. It may damage neighbours' amenity and wildlife. No heritage information is provided despite the building being in a conservation area and having an interesting history.

Given that this will be the first back extension added since Southwood Hospital was originally converted, it will form a precedent, so a far more specific, fixed proposal is required.

In summary, Highgate CAAC believes there is not enough detail to grant permission safely and the application should be refused.