



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1184
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	81 Wellington Avenue, Tottenham, London, N15 6AX
Proposal:	Erection of a Type 3 extension and first-floor rear extension
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	30/04/2026
Applicant:	6
Agent:	Mendy Rozner

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is an application for the erection of a type-3 upward extension and the erection of a full width first floor rear extension.

The application site has permission for a large ground floor rear extension under reference HGY/2024/1801, as well as joint first floor extensions to with both Nos. 78 and 83 Wellington Avenue under references HGY/2025/2842 and HGY/2026/0547.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site contains a two-storey residential dwellinghouse and is located on the north side of Wellington Avenue

The site is not within a conservation area, nor does it affect the setting of any listed building. However, it is located within the area covered by the House extensions in south Tottenham SPD. The neighbouring property, 79 Wellington Avenue has a Type-3 upward extension that was built differently from approved plans and deemed immune from enforcement action.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows.

HGY/2024/1801 | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.30m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m.

Prior approval not required

HGY/2025/2842 | Erection of joint first floor rear extension to Nos. 79 – 81
Approve w/ conditions

HGY/2026/0547 | A first floor joint extension to Nos. 81 - 83 Wellington Avenue - Ground Floor extension for 81 already approved under app ref: HGY/2024/1801
Approve w/ conditions

Relevant enforcement history is as follows:

ENF/2025/1176 | 79 Wellington Avenue | Departure from Approved Drawings/Plan
Case closed – immune from enforcement action

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

None required.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of neighbour letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No responses received.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
4. Other considerations.

Principle of the development

The application site is located within the designated area identified in Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013). The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of house extensions being built to meet the need for providing additional habitable accommodation for large families in this part of the borough. The SPD sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extension defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level. This proposal is for a Type 3 second floor extension and given its location, the principle of this type of extension is acceptable subject to the design detailing and other consideration as outlined below.

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.

Also, relevant here is design guidance relating to facing materials, fenestration and detailing for 'Type 3' roof extensions as set out in Haringey SPD 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' (2013). This is a design led document which seeks to readdress concerns regarding the inappropriate roof extensions within the area. This guidance ensures that the design and scale of any roof extension is appropriate for the building and for the character of the area.

The original SPD precipitated an increase in the number of applications for roof extension in the area, although not all extensions followed the guidance correctly. The revised SPD (October 2013) sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extensions; defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level. This proposal is for a 'Type 3' second floor extension. Type 3 is a full second floor extension with loft accommodation at third floor level, in material to match.

The relevant criteria for the purposes of complying with the SPD in respect of a Type 3 extension is outlined and discussed below.

Type 3 extension

1. Should the Council grants permission for this planning application, **Permitted Development Rights** to change the materials and details of windows will be removed. This is to ensure that the appearances of windows in extensions are in accordance with the planning permission [SPD para 3.29]. **Comment:** Proposal not complaint with policy, hence no condition needed

2. Do all proposed **materials match the original house**? Bricks need to match in colour, pattern and texture. If the original bricks are discoloured, then new brickwork can be artificially aged or the original brickwork can be cleaned. Render should match in colour and texture [SPD para 2.18 + 3.30] **Comment:** Proposed materials would match that of the existing, with render to upper floors

3. Do all **proposed windows match those on the floor below** and roughly same distance from window cill to the head of the window below as found in the existing house? [SPD para 3.10]. **Comment:** Proposed windows would approximately match in terms of height from cill to head

4. Do the proposed **roof eaves match the existing eaves, with the height of the eaves above the heads of windows** immediately below the same as existing? In other words, the distance from the head of the new 2nd floor windows to the new eaves should be the same as the distance from the head of the existing 2nd floor windows to the old eaves [SPD para 3.129]. **Comment:** No, proposal follows that of the Type-3 extension built differing from approved plans at No. 79 where the eaves sits significantly above the head of the 2nd floor windows creating an elongated appearance to the building.

4a, It is acknowledged that the extension at 79 Wellington Road has not been built in accordance with the approved plans, with the height of the eaves set significantly above the heads of the upper floor windows, giving the building an incongruous elongated appearance, that the SPD guidance seeks to avoid. The current proposal seeks to match this unauthorised development. It is acknowledged that the extension at 79 Wellington Avenue is immune from enforcement. Notwithstanding this, officers do not believe it should taken as a precedent for further such development. The majority of extended and un-extended houses have a front eaves height just above the heads of their upper floor windows, avoiding the incongruous elongated appearance of No. 79. The proposed extension to No. 81 should following this prevailing pattern of development within the locality. Further such incongruous development should not be encouraged.

5. Do the proposed **facing materials match the existing front elevations** in South Tottenham include brickwork, render and to first floors, hanging tiles? [SPD para 3.13]. **Comment:** Yes
6. Are the **size and pattern of the proposed windows reproduced from the floor below?** The line of the window cills and heads will set the line of fenestration which must be maintained. When the existing house windows on the 1st floor are not as high as windows on the ground floor, then the new windows on the 2nd floor should reduce in height by the same proportion [SPD para 3.15 + 3.33]. **Comment:** 2nd floor windows are positioned significantly higher than 1st floor windows, projecting above the where the ridge line of the roof was previously.
7. Where the existing building has **two-storey bay windows and/or pointed gable front elevation**, does the proposed extension **replicate this at the new floor?** [SPD para 3.17-18]. **Comment:** Detail is replicated into the upper floors.
8. Does the new **roof pitched roof follow the original roof** in materials and detailing? **Comment:** New pitched roof follows the materials and details of the original roof
9. Where the original house has **parapets at party walls**, between houses, has a parapet been provided in the extended roofs both between the pair of extended roofs and at either end? If original terrace did not have party walls in the roof, there should not be parapets between or at either end [SPD para 3.20]. **Comment:** N/A.
10. Where the original house is **end of terraces**, does the proposal **replicate the hipped pitched roof** (where that is original)? Gable end extension may acceptable if the proposal is not overbearing [SPD para 3.21]. **Comment:** N/A.
11. For **semi-detached/paired** houses, are the properties **jointly extended?** [SPD para 3.25]. **Comment:** N/A.
12. Where the extension joins the original house, are there any **horizontal joint, line**, change in materials or projecting horizontal feature? [SPD para 3.30]. **Comment:** No horizontal joint line is shown on the drawings
13. Applications for Type 1/2/3 extensions will not be approved for houses already converted to flats or HMOs unless the property is being converted back into a single-family dwelling [SPD para 3.51] **Comment:** The LPA have no record that the site is in use as an HMO or being divided into flats

The relevant criteria for the purposes of complying with the SPD in respect of a rear extension is outlined and discussed below.

Given the details provided in the plan submitted and associated annotations, and the assessment above, it is considered that this Type 3 extension would be unacceptable and fails to comply with the policies and guidance discussed above.

Ground floor rear extension

The ground floor rear extension in this instance has approval via a previous application, ref: HGY/2024/1801 and therefore is not being considered as part of this application.

First floor rear extension

The first-floor rear extension seeks to use an existing two approvals (Nos. 78 and 83 Wellington Avenue under references HGY) for joint rear extensions as a form of fall-back position for the

erection of a full width rear extension at first floor level. While the South Tottenham SPD does not have any specific wording on first floor rear extensions, it is generally considered that full width extensions present an over development of the site that adversely affect neighbouring amenity and struggle to appear subordinate to the host building.

In this instance the applicants have sought permission for a joint first floor rear extension with both Nos. 79 and 83, which have been granted. Recent appeal decisions have shown that the principle of a full width first floor rear extension can be acceptable where the adjoining properties also have half width first floor rear extensions, such as at Nos. 12, 14, and 16 Clifton Gardens (Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3306428).

As such, it is considered that the formation of a full width first floor rear extension would be acceptable, provided that the applicants were to build out the aforementioned approved permissions concurrently such that No. 81 has a full width rear extension, and Nos. 79 and 83 have half width rear extensions.

Impact on amenity

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.

Type-3 Extension

The proposed type-3 extension would be similar in scale to other approved and built type-3 extensions within South Tottenham, and this form of upward extension is well established in the area. It is considered that this element of the proposal would not result in any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

First-floor rear extension

The proposed first floor rear extension would be full width and adjoin with approved first floor rear extensions approved at Nos. 79 and 83 Wellington Avenue. In reference to the appeal allowed at 12 – 16 Clifton Gardens, the inspector made no reference to any issues in relation to neighbouring amenity. Additionally, the proposed first floor rear extension would be modest in depth and when built concurrently with other approved developments would not impact a line drawn 45 degrees outward from windows serving habitable rooms to Nos. 77 or 85 Wellington Avenue.

It is therefore considered that the first floor rear extension would not have any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

Additional matters

Paragraph 3.36 of the South Tottenham SPD states that the "all proposals for Type 2 and Type 3 provide structural calculations to demonstrate that the additional loading on the ground by the foundations does not exceed the accepted maximum bearing capacity of the ground."

No calculations have been formally submitted to the LPA with this application, however structural calculations are an integral part of building regulations submission and as such will need to be assessed at the detailed design and construction phases of such a project. If this proposal were for approval steps would be required to be taken by a qualified professional to demonstrate that the additional

loading on the ground by the foundations would not exceed the accepted maximum bearing capacity of the ground.

Conclusion

Taking account of the matters discussed above the proposal is considered unacceptable in design terms, however will have no material impact on neighbouring amenity. The proposal Type-3 extension fails to comply with the requirements of the House extensions in South Tottenham SPD.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be REFUSED for the reasons set out above.

7. CIL Applicable

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m (94.14sqm) and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. Recommendation

Proposal should be REFUSED for the following reason(s):

The proposed development, by reason of the roof eaves not matching the proportions and guidelines set out in adopted guidance, with the height of the eaves significantly above the heads of the property's upper floor windows , would appear an incongruous form of development out of character with the majority of extended, and un-extended properties in the street, to the detriment of local visual amenity, contrary to paragraph 3.129 of the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013, and thereby contrary to policy DM1 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Strategic Policy SP11 of Strategic Local Plan 2017.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of the roof eaves not matching the proportions and guidelines set out in adopted guidance, with the height of the eaves significantly above the heads of the property's upper floor windows , would appear an incongruous form of development out of character with the majority of extended, and un-extended properties in the street, to the detriment of local visual amenity, contrary to paragraph 3.129 of the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013, and thereby contrary to policy DM1 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Strategic Policy SP11 of Strategic Local Plan 2017.