



Officer Report

Application Number: HGY/2026/1055
Application Type: Householder planning permission
Address: Kerry, 4 Clyde Circus, Tottenham, London, N15 4LF
Proposal: Erection of a ground floor rear extension
Case Officer: Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date: 14/04/2026
Applicant: Joe and Zara Howard/Coe
Agent: Mr Conor O'Keefe

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The proposal follows the grant of a Certificate of Lawfulness for a rear extension under reference HGY/2026/0647 and seeks approval for a revised scheme involving the infilling of the gap between the approved extension and the existing rear outrigger.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey terraced house located on the southern side of Clyde Circus near its intersection with Nelson Road. It is in Clyde Circus conservation area and is a locally listed building.

Many houses on the circus, can be seen to have rear extensions.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The planning history of the site is as follows:

HGY/2026/0647

Address: Kerry, 4 Clyde Circus, Tottenham, London, N15 4LF

Proposal: Lawful development Proposed use for the erection of a single-story ground floor extension

Decision Date: 31 March 2026

Decision: Permitted Development

HGY/2025/3013

Address: Kerry, 4 Clyde Circus, Tottenham, London, N15 4LF

Proposal: Erection of a rear dormer extension

Decision Date: 3 February 2026

Decision: Refuse

HGY/2025/3012

Address: Kerry, 4 Clyde Circus, Tottenham, London, N15 4LF

Proposal: Erection of a ground floor rear extension

Decision Date: 3 February 2026

Decision: Refuse

HGY/2024/0271

Address: Kerry, 4 Clyde Circus, Tottenham, London, N15 4LF

Proposal: Removal of robinia to rear of garden. Small v shaped garden with a mature birch already in situ. Robinia poorly positioned.

Decision Date: 10 May 2024

Decision: No Objection

HGY/2017/1883

Address: Kerry, 4, Clyde Circus, London, N15 4LF, London

Proposal: Non-material amendment to application reference HGY/2017/0147 comprising of a change to the roof design from a pitched roof to a flat roof with a lantern rooflight.

Decision Date: 6 July 2017

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2017/0147

Address: Kerry Villa, 4, Clyde Circus, London, N15 4LF, London

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey rear projection. Replacement of 2 No. existing roof windows to rear with 3 No, roof windows and additional 1 No. roof window to front.

Decision Date: 16 February 2017

Decision: Approve with Conditions

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The following consultees were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH: Heritage

No responses were received following consultation on the application.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters to neighbouring properties, a notice placed in the local press, and a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site. The representations received are as follows:

Supporting: 0

Objecting: 5

The objection received are summarised as follows:

- Detrimental effect on status of Clyde Circus conservation area
- Proposal would set negative precedent for unsympathetic development in the area
- Ground floor extension will create visually dominant effect in comparison with other houses on Clyde Circus

- Impact on outlook
- Removal of historic bay windows which constitute key architectural feature of the rear elevation
- Proposal bigger than PD fallback scheme
- External material would be render which would not match approved brick material under PD
- Out of character with locally listed architecture of Clyde Circus

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance, and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, &
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity

Design and appearance

DPD Policy 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 building, 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. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The property benefits from a fallback position established through the grant of a certificate of lawfulness for a 3m deep rear extension under reference HGY/2026/0647. In order to comply with permitted development requirements, the approved extension included a gap of 500mm between the existing outrigger and the proposed addition. The current application seeks to infill this gap, resulting in a continuous rear projection.

As the principle, depth, height and overall form of the extension have already been established through the lawful development certificate, it is not considered that the narrow infill element to link the existing and proposed extension would materially alter the visual impact of the approved scheme. Whilst the proposal would remove the separation between the extension and the existing extension, the resulting change would be limited in scale and would not give rise to a materially different character and appearance or heritage impact when compared to the lawful fallback position.

The objections received are noted and the concerns identified in the refusal of planning application ref. HGY/2025/3013, relating to the impact of a comparable extension on the conservation area, remain relevant. However, significant weight must be afforded to the extant fallback position, which establishes the ability to construct a rear extension of broadly the same scale and appearance

without the need for planning permission. In this instance, the fallback position is a material consideration which weighs heavily in favour of the proposal.

In terms of materials, given that the existing rear extension is finished in render, the proposed material would create a more cohesive and unified appearance. The use of render is therefore considered acceptable and would not result in a material harm to the character and appearance of either the host property or the conservation area. Similarly, the additional glazed door panel at the rear would not result in a material impact on appearance.

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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

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 current proposal differs from the fallback position only in that it would infill the approximately 500mm gap between the approved extension and the existing outrigger, creating a full width rear projection.

The lawful extension could be implemented without planning permission and would already establish the principal depth, height and massing of the rear addition. Given that the gap is positioned between the approved extension and the existing outrigger, rather than adjacent to either shared boundary, the infill would not materially alter the relationship between the development and the neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposal would not give rise to any material increase in overshadowing, loss of daylight, loss of sunlight, outlook or sense of enclosure beyond that which could already arise from the implementation of the lawful development scheme. Furthermore, the additional glazed door panel would remain within the rear elevation and therefore, would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

The concerns raised by neighbouring residents have carefully been considered. However, having regard to the extant fallback position and the limited nature of the proposed infill, the development is not considered to result in any additional harm to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers.

As such, in terms of impact on amenity, the proposal is in line with the above policies.

Conclusion

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a degree of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area, significant weight must be afforded to the fallback position, which establishes the ability to construct a rear extension of broadly the same scale without the need for planning permission.

In this context, the proposed infill would not result in any material additional harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers beyond that which could already arise from implementation of the lawful development scheme. On balance

therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in design and heritage considerations, as well as amenity terms.

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

CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Approved drawings list:

4CLC-(EX)001-P01: Location plan
4CLC-(PL)010-P01: Proposed site plan
4CLC-(PL)100-P01: Ground floor plan – proposed
4CLC-(PL)103-P01: Roof plan proposed
4CLC-(PL)301-P01: Side elevation proposed
4CLC-(PL)302-P01: Rear elevation proposed
Heritage Statement by CJOK Architects 14 April 2026

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.