

Planning Objection Letter

Anton Dell & Sarah Alexander

106A Colney Hatch Lane

London

N10 1EA

Planning Application.

HGY/2026/0565

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to formally object to the proposed Mansard roof extension at 104 Colney Hatch Lane in its current proposed form.

We are the owner/occupiers of the immediately adjoining property at 106A Colney Hatch Lane. Having reviewed the submitted drawings and supporting statement, we have concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposal on daylight, sunlight, bulk and privacy to our property.

Our main living room at the rear of the property is set below ground level (approximately 180 cm (around 5 feet 10 inches) below external ground level at the boundary. directly above this but set further back is our main bedroom.

A boundary fence of approximately 6 feet in height sits almost directly above this level along the shared boundary. As a result, this main room already experiences constrained daylight, especially during the winter months. To mitigate this, a rooflight has been installed to improve daylight penetration into the space; however, this opening is inherently sensitive to any increase in height or obstruction immediately beyond the boundary.

The rear elevation drawings indicate that No. 104 is already higher than our property, with the existing fence line elevating the effective obstruction at the boundary. The proposed Mansard extension over the current flat roof at 104 would further increase the height and bulk of the building, which appears likely to intensify the existing disparity. It is not possible to be exact by how much as the measurements are not included in the submitted drawings. It looks to be at least an addition of 3.5 plus meters to obtain internal standing height.

From our understanding of the BRE guidance "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice," the proposal may increase the vertical obstruction when viewed from the centre of rear-facing windows at my property. When considering the 25° guideline, it appears that the proposed extension could exceed this threshold, which is typically associated with a noticeable reduction in daylight.

There is also potential for a reduction in Vertical Sky Component (VSC), given the increased massing and proximity between the properties. This could lead to a reduction in natural light to the living room and potentially the bedroom.

In terms of sunlight, the application site lies within the south-eastern to southern path of the sun relative to my property. The rooflight serving our rear living room is particularly sensitive to

obstruction from above, and any increase in height at the rear of 104 has the potential to reduce the amount of direct and diffuse light reaching this opening. During winter months, when the sun remains at a low angle, even modest increases in height can result in extended overshadowing. The proposal may therefore reduce sunlight reaching windows, rooflights, and amenity areas. Given the already constrained light levels within the below-ground living space, even a modest reduction could have a noticeable impact on the usability and amenity of this room.

I note that a detailed Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has not been submitted to support the applicant's conclusion that there would be 'no material impact'. Given the relationship between the properties and the high degree of sensitivity, a site-specific impact assessment would be helpful in fully understanding the extent of any effects.

In addition, beyond the reduced sunlight component is the potential 'Tunnelling Effect' as a Mansard Roof adds bulk to a structure. I feel this would have an overbearing impact at the rear making the rooms dark and claustrophobic.

While I appreciate that similar developments may exist in the vicinity, I understand that each application is considered on its own merits with differences being carefully considered, and in this case the specific relationship of height and daylight access between No. 104 and No. 106A appears to be a particular differential.

Given the existing constrained light conditions within a below-ground living space that relies on a rooflight, I would be particularly grateful if the effect of the proposed increase in height and bulk on this source of light and our overall habitable spaces could be carefully assessed.

I respectfully ask that the Local Planning Authority consider these potential impacts, and whether further technical assessment is required, before reaching a decision.

Yours faithfully

Anton Dell & Sarah Alexander

Photos provided for reference

Photo 1 – Rooflight and sky visibility from rear living space. View from the below-ground living room showing the rooflight and limited visible sky. The adjacent building at No. 104 already forms a dominant vertical edge. This opening is a vital source of daylight to the rear of the room and may be directly overlooked by a window in a Mansard roof impacting on the privacy in this room.



Photo 2 – Boundary condition and existing enclosure

View of the shared boundary showing the existing fence height and the adjacent building beyond. This illustrates the constrained nature of the space and the existing level of enclosure prior to the proposed extension.