

June CHOI
31 Cromwell Avenue
Highgate
London N6 5HN

21st May 2026

For the attention of Adam Silverwood

Dear Adam,

Re: Application Reference HGY/2026/0944 – 29 Cromwell Avenue

I write to register my strong objection to the above application on the grounds set out below.

The Application proposes the following:

- Addition of a single-storey ground floor rear infill extension
- Minor infill extension to the side (closet wing)

1. Single-Storey Ground Floor Rear Infill Extension

I object to this element of the application. A careful review of the applicant's own drawings reveals that the proposed extension roof would project significantly above the shared boundary level in two distinct respects: by approximately 1.6 metre in the section immediately adjacent to the main rear wall (at the "new minimal frame glass box"), and by approximately 1 metre above boundary level across the remaining two thirds of the extension. This is particularly striking given that the floor level of No. 29 sits approximately 1 metre lower than that of No. 31: one would therefore expect any extension at No. 29 to remain comfortably below, or at most level with, the shared boundary. Instead, the applicant's own section drawings confirm the contrary. The proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy DM1 in respect of its impact upon neighbouring occupiers. Specifically, it would:

- Give rise to an unacceptable sense of enclosure as experienced from the neighbouring living room and kitchen, with a roof mass projecting between 1.0 and 1.6 metres above the shared boundary directly within the neighbours' outlook;
- Materially obstruct sunlight to the neighbouring courtyard. The proposed extension roof directly intercepts the sunlight envelope to No. 31;
- Create a significant risk of surface water run-off causing water ingress and physical damage to the existing timber boundary fence and timber conservatory at No. 31. With the extension roof projecting between 1.0 and 1.6 metres above boundary level, rainwater would inevitably be directed towards the neighbouring property;
- Introduce a rooflight in close proximity to the neighbours' first-floor bedroom window, resulting in unwanted light intrusion at unsociable hours;
- Create a material risk of noise disturbance at all hours of the day and night, should the rooflight above the proposed staircase or any other rooflight within the side extension be openable.

I also draw attention to the relationship depicted in Section AA (Proposed) between the existing french doors and fanlight in the main rear wall and the applicant's proposed "new minimal frame glass box". The applicant should be mindful that the resulting view from the living room into the kitchen would represent a significant deterioration from the current

agreeable outlook. My objection regarding the height of the “new minimal frame glass box” and its impact on the neighbouring property is addressed under point 1 above.

2. Minor Infill Extension to the Side (Closet Wing)

I am not aware of any comparable precedent for this type of extension elsewhere along Cromwell Avenue or in the wider Cromwells and Winchesters area, and I consider that its approval would set an unacceptable precedent for similar structures. Whilst a small number of sheds exist within comparable re-entrant spaces in the vicinity, these are impermanent structures that cannot, in my view, provide justification for the grant of planning permission for a permanent built extension.

Were the proposed shed to be omitted from the application or removed at a later date, the extension would become visible from the public realm and would thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The application must be refused on this basis.

In light of the foregoing, I respectfully but firmly urge the Council to refuse this application in its entirety.

Yours sincerely,

June Choi