

**GAIL WALDMAN
48 CROMWELL AVENUE
HIGHGATE
LONDON N6 5HL**

21 May 2026

For the attention of Adam Silverwood

Dear Adam,

HGY/2026/0944: 29 Cromwell Avenue

I strongly object to this application for the reasons I set out below.

This Application proposes the following works:

- Original front porch reinstated
- Addition of single storey ground floor rear infill extension
- Minor infill extension to the side (closet wing)
- Addition of new zinc-clad rear dormer and re-roofing at the rear
- Addition of new conservation rooflights
- Replacement of existing windows with new double glazed timber ones to match existing
- Associated internal and external alterations

I consider the evaluation of this Application by the Applicant is flawed on several points as set out below. I note many clauses are repeated frequently in the combined Heritage, Design & Access Statement.

Original front porch reinstated

Whilst the proposed work would enhance Highgate Conservation Area there are Building Regulations implications which are likely to make this work problematic. You will note that the wall between the ground floor front room and what was the original porch is only a 113mm thick wall (half a brick thick). The existing front door turned the porch into a draught lobby. If the front door were located to its original position as proposed that would cause heat loss from the living room.

Addition of single storey ground floor rear infill extension

I object to this part of the Application. Whilst the roof to the greater part of it would be set below the level of the extension to no. 31, the section closest to the main rear wall would not meet the requirements of DM1 regarding the impact on neighbours. The impact would be to:

1. Create an unacceptable sense of enclosure from the neighbours' Living room.
2. Create a light source in the roof, namely a rooflight over a flight of stairs, close to their bedroom window on the first floor.

3. If that or the other rooflights in the side extension were openable the neighbours would suffer from noise at any time of day or night. See also my comments below on design.
4. Section AA (proposed) shows the height of the existing french doors and fanlight in the main rear wall. The applicant proposes “New minimal glass box” the width of the existing French doors over a flight of stairs to the lower kitchen level but beyond that is the roof to the proposed side infill extension. There would be just 2m vertically from the floor level in the main ground floor rooms and the higher part of the ceiling in the kitchen. The roof/ceiling of the proposed ground infill steps down a further two times so the view from the main ground floor rooms though to the rear garden would be extremely limited and would seem to be very unsatisfactory. The uneasy relationship is proposed in order to achieve a by-pass from the main ground floor front rooms to the kitchen to avoid using the existing flight in the hall. This does not have Planning or Conservation Area implications but the applicant may wish to be aware of the very awkward view from their living room into their kitchen compared with the pleasant view they have at the moment. My objection to the level of the proposed “New minimal glass box” in relation to the neighbouring property is covered under point 1 above.

Minor infill extension to the side (closet wing)

- *Maximum height of 2.5 metres in the case of a building, enclosure or container within two metres of a boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.*
- *On designated land* buildings, enclosures, containers and pools at the side of properties will require planning permission.*
- **Designated land includes national parks and the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, conservation areas and World Heritage Sites.*

Although the proposed height of the shed appears to be around 2.3m, it is presumably because of the requirement on the planning portal that the Applicant has applied for planning permission. Please note the definition of ‘designated land’. It is clear a very high bar for Decision-making for applications in Conservation Areas is required given the other areas where ‘designated land’ applies. The curtilage in this instance is the boundary between no. 27 and no. 29.

The proposed shed would be visible from the public realm with the resulting harm to Highgate Conservation Area. It must be refused.

Addition of new zinc-clad rear dormer and re-roofing at the rear

The Case Officer should be aware that the following statement about the proposed dormers of which there are in fact two on the rear pitch of the main roof is potentially misleading:

“3.5 Proposed Roof Alterations Replacement of the Rear Roof Pitch: The existing rear roof pitch will be replaced as part of the proposed works. The replacement will replicate the existing roof form and geometry while allowing for improved thermal performance and integration of the proposed dormer structure. The replacement roof will match the existing roof in terms of profile, pitch and overall appearance, ensuring that the architectural character of the building is maintained. Section DD through new extension – As Proposed Not to scale Rear Dormer Extension: A modest dormer extension is proposed on the rear roof slope.

The dormer will:

- *be positioned entirely on the rear roof pitch*
- *be set back 615mm from the eaves*
- *be set in 500mm from the side boundary of the roof slope*
- *remain subordinate to the main roof form*
- *be set below the ridge line*

The dormer will be clad in standing seam dark grey zinc, a material commonly used in contemporary roof extensions due to its durability, subtle appearance and ability to form lightweight roof structures. The colour of the zinc will match closely the colour of the slate tiles. The use of zinc provides a clear yet discreet distinction between original and new, etc”

It is evident from the quotation above that the Architect has found Haringey's parameters for dormers with which I am familiar but the proposed combination of two rear dormers, each of quite different design and neither typical nor modest simply do not meet Haringey's requirements as claimed in the Applicant's Design, Access and Heritage Statement, quoted above. The combined effect of the proposed jumble of roof forms explicitly does not meet Haringey's Guidelines and therefore this application must be refused. It is probable the proposed roof extensions could be seen from the Highgate Conservation Area.

Addition of new conservation rooflights

This is the situation in the Highgate Conservation Area in the immediate vicinity of no. 29 Cromwell Avenue:

- No. 23: 2
- No. 25: 2
- No. 27: 1
- No. 29: 0
- No. 31: 3
- No. 33: 0
- No. 35: 2

No. 37 and the remainder are all three storey properties with different roof forms. There are few if any rooflights in that part of the Highgate Conservation Area. The application seeks four rooflights for which there is no precedent and which would harm the Highgate Conservation Area.

Replacement of existing windows with new double glazed timber ones to match existing
Full details at 1:5 of the proposed new windows should be provided or required by Condition.

Associated internal and external alterations

There is no reference to works under this heading in the Heritage, Design and Access Statement. Full details should be submitted.

In my opinion this application must be refused for all the reasons I have set out above.

Yours sincerely,

Gail Waldman