



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0812
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	73 Great Cambridge Road, Tottenham, London, N17 7LN
Proposal:	Erection of a 2-storey side and single storey rear extension, and conversion of the loft including a rear dormer extension and front rooflights.
Case Officer:	Neil McClellan
Valid Date:	23/03/2026
Applicant:	Mr Dersim Orhan
Agent:	Murat Altinkilic

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

Erection of a 2-storey side and single storey rear extension, and conversion of the loft including a rear dormer extension and front rooflights.

Site Description

The subject site is a 2-storey end of terrace house located on the corner of the junction of Grate Cambridge Road with Devonshire Hill Lane. The property occupies a wedged shaped plot tapering towards its rear boundary. It has a wedged shape area of garden to the side on which the proposed 2-storey side extension would be built.

The property has an existing significant depth of single storey rear extension and a long tapering single storey outbuilding/garage occupying the rear 2/3rds of its back garden. Neither the existing extension or outbuilding have planning permission but based on historic street view images both have been in place since at least 2008, and likely longer than that.

The site is not located within a Conservation Area and is not listed or close to any listed buildings or structures.

Planning and Enforcement History

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received on this application.

CONSIDERATIONS

Design & Appearance

DM Policy (2017) DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, and this is supported by London Plan (2021) Policies D3 and D6.

The supporting text to the above policies stresses that improving the quality of housing in Haringey is a key priority for the Council. The above policies aim to ensure delivery of high-quality housing which provides a good quality of life for occupants and is compatible with and contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of an area, whilst also delivering upon the Council's aim to optimise housing delivery on individual sites.

The Council expects that residential extensions and alterations are well designed to create a good quality living environment, whilst protecting the amenity of adjoining neighbours and the integrity of the local residential character.

Extensions to residential buildings should therefore be subordinate in scale to the original building, as well as respect the architectural unity of a block or terrace of houses and the urban grain and character of the surrounding area. New development should not undermine existing uniformity of the building or terrace and should not over balance or dominate existing features important to the building.

Full width rear extensions are not normally considered acceptable, and they should be lower than the ridge height of the host building. Depth of the rear extension should be such that the resulting footprint is subordinate to the main house and does not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, ensuring no overlooking or inappropriate loss of daylight and sunlight.

Extensions to the roof, such as dormer windows, should be restricted to the rear and their size, location and design should be such that they appear subordinate on the roof.

The existing property has a wedged shape area of garden to the side on which the proposed 2-storey side extension would be built. At the front the extension would be approximately 5.25 metres wide, almost doubling the width of its existing front elevation. It would be built at both floors to be level with its existing 2-storey projection front projection, which at ground floor incorporates the house's porch. These projections are repeated along the terrace. Originally these would have been open fronted porches, but like the application property most of these have now been internalised.

The small window proportions of the proposed front elevation and solid to void ratio of the front elevation would fail to replicate the design of the original dwelling and others within the streetscene and would create a discordant appearance. Overall the front elevation would appear mis-proportioned and out of keeping.

The proposed side extension narrows towards its rear, creating a wedge-shaped extension with a gabled roof to its side which due to its size shape and form would appear a disproportionately large and incongruous addition, appearing jarringly out of character with the existing house, and upsetting the pleasing rhythm and symmetry of the wider terrace.

The proposed dormer would have a small set in from both sides but given that it would take up most of the extended rear roof slope, it would have width of approximately 8.6 metres. The dormer, by reason of its excessive size, would therefore exacerbate the disproportionate and incongruous appearance of the proposed side extension.

The property has an existing 4.9-metre-deep existing single storey, flat-roofed rear extension which would be extended across the full width of the plot, behind the proposed 2-storey side extension. On its own the proposed addition to the existing single storey extension would be considered suitably subordinate, however in conjunction with the other proposed extensions and existing development within the site adds to the cumulative sense of overdevelopment.

Occupying a prominent corner site, increases the concerns raised above. The proposed extensions by reason of their scale, massing and design, are therefore considered likely to appear as uncharacteristic and incongruous features within the streetscene, to the detriment of local visual amenity,

The agent was advised at validation stage that in order to achieve an appropriate level of subordination and a complimentary appearance they should consider reducing the width of the side extension, removing the angled flank elevation, and setting the first floor back from the front elevation by one metre, and to reduce the width of the rear dormer. No response was received to this request.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

The proposed side extension is located far enough away from adjoining neighbours at 75 Great Cambridge Road and 36 Devonshire Hill Lane, and from neighbouring properties on the opposite side of the road junction, for it not to have any materially harmful impact on their residential amenity. The proposed dormer although large, is not considered likely to have any materially significant impact on neighbouring amenity. While windows in the proposed dormer would overlook neighbouring gardens. However, in established urban/sub-urban areas such as this, there is already a significant degree of mutual overlooking of properties by their neighbours from existing first and second floor windows, and the proposed additional overlooking would not be to a degree that would be considered materially worse than the existing situation.

The proposal is therefore acceptable with regards to neighbouring amenity considerations.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions by reason of their scale, massing and design, would appear an uncharacteristic and incongruous feature within the streetscene, to the detriment of local visual amenity,

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The increase in internal floor area would be approximately 124.3 sqm. and therefore, the proposal would be liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge. If

If the application were to be approved, based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge would be £9,040.34 (124.3 sqm x £72.73) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £7,487.83 (124.3 sqm x £60.24 (Indexation included)). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

As this is a house extension it is likely that the proposal would qualify for the relevant CIL exemption. This would be applied for following the issuing of the initial CIL liability Notice in the event of permission being granted.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by reason of its scale, massing and design, would appear a disproportionately large, uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the existing property, and upsetting the rhythm and symmetry of the wider terrace, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and local visual amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021).