

13 MAR 2026

78 Florence Road

London

N4 4DP

12th March 2026

Planning Service

5th floor Alexandra House

Station Road

London

N22 7TY

Dear madam/sir

ref Planning application HGY/2026/0317 80 Florence Road N4 4DP

I have made comments online about this application. these are the same comments in letter form.

PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION AT 80 FLORENCE ROAD N4

Ref. HGY/2026/0317

Having examined the proposal I would make the following comments:-

1. As joint owner of the adjoining property No.78, I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:-

- This is overdevelopment, particularly as No.80 has a larger single storey extension than the original single storey scullery extensions these houses had when built, I am guessing it was built in the 1960`s. There is therefore a larger footprint for installing a kitchen/diner. Was this even considered or is it just an unthinking following of the fashion for side extensions?**
- There will be unacceptable loss of light to my kitchen and ground floor rear room.**

- A structure of this height (I will comment in more detail on the difficulty of assessing this from the poor quality plans online with the application) on my boundary will be overbearing, especially as this will continue past my building line and will abut the garden.

- There will be loss of amenity by enclosing open space and removal of vegetation.

- Surface water drainage - will there be an increase in impervious surfaces, and so increase the load on the sewers?

2. I would like to make the following detailed comments:-

The drawings I downloaded from the Planning website are inadequate for detailed comments. The roof details in particular are impossible to decipher as they are very faint on the drawing and the plan view of the roof layout is unreadable. I have already commented that I would like sight of the 1:50 scale plans. The scale of the plans I downloaded seems to be somewhere between 1:150 and 1:175, which is not useful! It makes it difficult to take dimensions off the plans. From onsite measurements the overall height of the proposed structure would appear to be about 3000mm. at the boundary. The lack of readable roof detail makes it difficult to assess overall effect, but it seems excessive. A section drawing through the rear elevation of the new addition at the line of the rear wall to the existing three storey back addition would be useful.

Within these limitations, given the time constraints, I would make the following comments:-

- The structure is too high. A wall of this height on my boundary will have an overbearing effect, particularly towards the rear where it will extend beyond my building line and be adjacent to the garden. Also it will have an adverse effect on daylight levels in my kitchen/diner (especially through the part glazed back door) and in the ground floor rear room, particularly on Winter afternoons. The addition of a parapet to the rear wall of the existing single storey addition does not help.

I would suggest that the approach taken for the side extension at No. 76 Florence Road, the property adjacent to mine, should be followed if the proposal goes ahead. There the design, based on the same single storey scullery addition I have, is a pitched roof based on the line of the original scullery extension, with a hipped joint at the return into the side extension. This brings the eaves down to about the height of my garden wall, which would be more acceptable. Consideration should also be given to bringing the end wall and roof line into line with my single storey back addition -this may make it easier to construct a hipped roof with a pitch similar to the roof of my single storey addition hence improving light levels, and would gain some garden space. It would also be consistent with maintaining a coherent roof line at the rear of the properties (section 4 "Heritage Statement").

(ref HGY/2026/0317 80 Florence Road cont.)

- I do not understand the comment in the planning application about raising the patio level (how do you "gently raise"?) to the level of the existing french windows (5. Accessibility). The plan of the proposed layout shows a utility room in this area which is entered from the kitchen, so I do not see how this fits. The existing ceiling height in the ground floor back addition is too low to allow any significant raising of the floor level so assume it is proposed to raise the ceiling height just over the new side extension which will add yet more to the height of the structure at my boundary and be out of keeping with the original structure of the house and is unacceptable. The door to the garden at the rear of the proposed extension would be at ground level at the existing floor level in the extension.

-I would expect the garden wall to be rebuilt as existing, reusing bricks as far as possible, any additional bricks to be London Stocks.

-I feel poorly served by the inadequate quality of the plans provided, and reserve the right to make further objections if unsatisfactory features not clear on the plans become evident.

yours faithfully

John Lingford