



HIGHGATE SOCIETY

10A South Grove, Highgate London N6 6BS

Planning Department
London Borough of Haringey
River Park House
225 High Road,
London , N22 8HQ.

For the attention of Ben Coffie

By email

Dear Sir/Madam,

HGY/2024/1237 Rear and side extensions to 62 North Hill, London N6 4RH

We note this is a new application after the previous one HGY/2023/3142 was issued without the mention of a Listed Building Consent in their proposal header text. We note that nothing in the application has varied from the aforementioned one and all drawings are the same revision as they were.

Therefore, the Highgate Society is writing again to strongly object to the above applications, and as per our previous letter, the reasons for objection are listed below:

1. This Grade 2 listed, early 18th Century, 2 storey house forms half of a semi-detached pair with no 64. It is adjacent to no 60, and all three houses are listed Grade II in the statutory register as being "Included for group value". Therefore, any proposals need to ensure there is no harm to this group heritage asset.
2. Part of the proposal is to infill the side extension to within approximately 600mm of the face of no 60. In an earlier proposal (HGY 2007/0125) Haringey expressed concern about any infilling, although a small extension to the rear of the house was permitted. What is now proposed is a considerable increase in this and it will effectively result in the currently detached house of number 60 being joined onto no 62 which will destroy the group value of these three houses by effectively turning them into a terrace.
3. Although not original, the current rear extension of no 62 is a mirror image of no. 64 thus forming a matching pair. The roof view given in Page 11 of the Design and Access Statement clearly indicates that this proposal will cause a breakdown of the formal structure of the main houses and subsidiary single storey extensions in these three houses and thus the "group value".
4. In item 6.2.2 of the Heritage Statement it is stated "The 2023 advice supported the siting the bulk of the extension to the rear of the garden with a lightweight, glazed link connecting the main house and extension but was concernedthe loss of the landscaped character of the back garden". Although there is no confirmation of this statement by the planners, which appears to support the intervention in the garden, we find this surprising and would be grateful if you can confirm whether any such binding commitment was given at the pre-application stage.

5. In terms of the new bedroom extension, this sits uneasily with the boundaries, with a narrow inaccessible gap to the rear which will gather debris and a 900mm gap to the north which appears to serve no purpose.

6. There appears to be some inconsistency in the description of the proposed usage of the new rear extension, where it is variously described as a garden room, accommodation or replacement bedroom. The submission states "The proposed extension providing a much needed ground floor bedroom suite with an ensuite bathroom that will futureproof the house for the owner."

7. Although garden rooms fall under Permitted Developments, overnight sleeping in these is specifically excluded. This would indicate that this form of usage is considered inappropriate for a garden room. It is recognised that PD Rights are used as a base point as to the suitability of a development even when, as in this case, they are Listed and thus not covered by PD Right.

8. The statement in item 6.2.4 in the Heritage Statement purports to justify the demolition of the existing rear extension on the grounds that the "current extension provides a bathroom and a garden room that is too narrow for conversion to a bedroom." This statement is factually incorrect. The width of the existing bedroom is approx. 2.65m which is more than adequate to accommodate a double bed, and although the applicant may want a more generous bedroom, the alternative garden room is not much wider. There is also an existing ensuite with a full size bath. The existing arrangement is perfectly adequate and small rooms are a constraint which should be accepted with historic cottages.

9. The glazed link will cause considerable light pollution affecting not just this garden but spilling over into the gardens of the immediate neighbours. As this is sleeping accommodation, unlike a home office, this is likely to be lit at night, thus negatively impacting on wildlife and thus biodiversity in this area, as well as causing nuisance for the neighbours.

10. As this new extension is to provide sleeping accommodation in the form of an additional bedroom, then it will need to be viewed as an integral part of the house including the glazed link and this, should Haringey be minded to approve the application, will need to comply with energy requirements in terms of heat loss, solar gain etc. It is very doubtful a single glazed extension will ever meet these levels as set down in Part E of the building regulations, let alone the enhanced levels normally required by planning authorities (35% over Part E). It would therefore appear that the glazed link is simply not feasible in its current form and if it is to be built, it will not result in a transparent structure as envisioned by the architects.

11. Should Haringey be minded to approve this scheme, the Society feels that more details should be required to show buildability and compliance with statutory requirements. This information should be provided at submission stage and not conditioned.

12. However, we consider that the proposals would cause substantial harm to the value and character of these three Listed properties, and hence to the Conservation Area.

For the above reasons the Society confirms its objection to this application and urges Haringey to refuse it.

Yours faithfully,

Maria Sanchez

for and on behalf of the Highgate Society Planning Group

Disclaimer: The Highgate Society is an unincorporated association established for the public benefit. It endeavours to ensure that the information it provides as a free service is correct, but does not warrant that it is accurate or complete. Nothing in its correspondence, or discussed verbally at any time with representatives of its Planning Group, constitutes professional or legal advice and may not be relied on as such.