



BRYAN CONNOR ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Planning Officer
Eunice Huang
Planning Environment and Residential Experience.
Level 5 Alexandra House
10 Station Road
London N22 8ZW

2nd June 2026

Dear Eunice Huang,

Proposed Glass Conservatory at 2 Tregaron Avenue London N8 9EY
- HGY/2026/0783

I refer to the application HGY/2026/0783 'Glass conservatory extension at the first floor level'.

There were thirty one consultation letters sent out locally to our immediate neighbours and only one comment has been received that being from 4 Tregaron Avenue.

I understand the context of the apparent objections to this application although the detail and design of this new application, which addresses in full the previous comments have not been considered.

The design of the glass conservatory as stated in the Design and Access Statement has been modified to mitigate any such objections for the following reasons:

Height – The height of the glass structure has been reduced and the proposal would not present a solid structure. The structural glass conservatory will appear minimus in height relative to the existing eaves of the host roof due the frameless construction of the glass.

Bulk – The proposal would not present additional bulk to the building or detract from the distinction of the rear elevation juxtaposed with the existing outrigger. It would be contemporary and have a minimum affect and appear to soften the appearance of bulk from the existing host building.

Amenity – The proposal would not present an amenity issue to the north as neighbouring property in this location exceed 36.0m to the rear of the property.

The proposal would not present an amenity issue to the east as there is no overshadowing or loss of daylighting in this location. The windows are facing to the north. The two nearest windows on the first floor serve one bedroom and neither window would be restricted of light or daylighting from this proposal. There would be no sunlight issues as this elevation faces to the north. (refer to appendix A, B & C)

Fully detailed plans and CGI images have been provided with this application to prove that there would in fact be no effect of overshadowing or loss of daylight/sunlight as a result of this application.

The objectors comment is factually incorrect as the proposal does not in any way overshadow or encroach on the light amenity of this property.

Number 4 Tregaron Avenue is situated due north of the application site and therefore the proposal cannot possibly impinge upon the daylighting or sunlight to the rear windows of this property.

From a day light, sunlight model of the site, the morning sun rises at the front of the property on Tregaron Avenue and would not appear to the rear of the application property until late in the afternoon. That being the case there is no right to direct sunlight, however the natural light of the day would not be affected by this proposal.

The building at the application site as originally built circa 1918 has a rear outrigger formally with a pitched roof. This pitched roof was clearly more prominent than the more recently built roof terrace with glass screening.

The original tiled and pitched roof would have perhaps interrupted direct sunlight to a certain extent the introduction of glass balustrading at this level now has somewhat improved the situation from whence historically it was extant.

The windows of 4 Tregaron Avenue are relatively small and of the Crittall style metal frame design with glazing bars which restrict light with smaller panes. The CGI model shows that there would be no restriction from the north, from the glass conservatory extension at 2 Tregaron Avenue and that this proposed glass extension would have no detrimental effect on the daylighting to the bedroom windows closest to the boundary.

Clearly the design proposes a contemporary glass frameless structure and this in turn would be an architecturally pleasing aspect to the rear of the neighbouring building. The proposed glass conservatory has also been set away from both rear and side elevations to make a clear distinction between the elevations and materials.

There are also two windows in the bedroom of note (assuming it is the bedroom closest to 2 Tregaron Avenue referred to in the comment). The room area is 14.54 m² and to apply the 1/10 floor area rule would give a minimum window area of 1.45m². Each of the two windows is in fact 1.48m² giving a total window area of 2.96 m² or 1/5 floor area ratio double the requirement of day lighting for a habitable room.

The orientation of the building at 4 Tregaron Avenue is such that daylighting is therefore not affected by the proposal and with regard to direct sunlight there is no existing enjoyment of this provision historically. The sun at dusk will have dropped below the horizon and below the intersection of the existing glass roof balustrade.

Taking into consideration a 45 degree rule there would also be no effect to the principal window of this room and there would be maintained a daylighting factor of 1/8 floor area.

Overlooking – The proposal would not present any additional overlooking to the north and the proposal would ask for obscure glazing to 1700 FFL on the east side glazing so as not to present any overlooking from this elevation.

The proposed development would be a minor and appropriate addition to provide a reading room at this location at the rear elevation. The proposal would be a lightweight and non-intrusive and in design a meritorious addition, minor in nature and would be subordinate in scale particularly as the materials used, being glass, will not affect the architectural aspect in fact contrary to this it would no less enhance the rear elevation resulting in an improvement to the rear elevation without detracting from the architectural merit of the building.

The proposed glass conservatory extension would set inside of the existing façade alignments of the lower levels and not detract from the legibility of the existing outrigger resulting in the visible and existing delineations being maintained and is considered not to harm the character of the existing building or its surroundings.

CONCLUSION

The proposal would not contribute to any additional loss of daylighting or overshadowing of the rear gardens or ground floor windows.

The impact on daylight access to the upper level windows would be deemed acceptable. (refer to the previous application HGY/2025/1393 Officers Report)

Thus, the proposed development would have no adverse impact on neighbouring properties in respect to overbearing impact, daylight and or sunlight access.

The proposed glass extension would have a lightweight appearance and is considered to be suitable and non-intrusive.

The proposal is considered to not result in harm to the character of the existing or neighbouring buildings.

The proposed glass extension would not result in additional overlooking and as such would not result in material harm to neighbouring amenity.

The proposal is considered to comply with Haringey Policy and the London Plan in terms of residential amenity.

It is therefore considered that any objections to this glass conservatory extension have been dismissed and permission should be granted.

I thank you for your assistance in this matter and I would trust that you would accept my support to this application and deem to dismiss the one objection to this proposal.

Please also refer to the Design Statement and the plans for any further information about this application.

Yours sincerely,

BrConnor.

Bryan R. Connor MRICS

2 TREGARON AVENUE LONDON N8 9EY

020 8340 9294

07958 738247

bryan.connor@outlook.com

bca-design.net



Reg. In England No. 2921268.

VAT No. 645 9354 08