

24 June 2026

From:

Mr and Mrs Ghile
36 Crowland Road
Tottenham
London N15 6UT

To:

Planning Service
5th Floor, Alexandra House
Station Road
Wood Green
London N22 7TY

Planning Application Ref: HGY/2026/0955

34 Crowland Road
Tottenham
London N15 6UT

Further Representation Regarding Revised Drawing Packages Dated 17 June 2026 and 23 June 2026 and Response to Correspondence of 18 June 2026 and 23 June 2026

This representation is submitted in response to the revised drawing packages dated 17 June 2026 and 23 June 2026 and the subsequent correspondence received from Ms Skelli and Ms Oruwari.

It should be read alongside our Formal Objection dated 17 May 2026, which remains maintained in full.

Dear Ms Oruwari,

Chronology of Correspondence

Further to:

1. Our email sent to you at 1:19pm on 18 June 2026, on which Mr James Argles and the Planning Support Team were copied.
2. Our telephone call with Mr James Argles at approximately 2:21pm on 18 June 2026.
3. Mr Argles' acknowledgement email sent at 2:26pm on 18 June 2026 confirming receipt of our correspondence and confirming that he had spoken with you and asked you to prioritise a response.
4. Ms Skelli's email sent at 2:51pm on 18 June 2026.

5. Our reply email sent to Ms Skelli at 4:05pm on 18 June 2026.
6. Your email sent at 5:32pm on 23 June 2026.

Further Representation Attachment

For ease of reference, **the contents of this correspondence have been saved as a PDF** and attached as:

Further Representation Regarding Revised Drawing Packages Dated 17 June 2026 and 23 June 2026 – Planning Application Ref HGY/2026/0955

As the online representation facility is no longer available and the application remains under consideration, this correspondence and the attached PDF representation form part of our representations in relation to Planning Application Ref: HGY/2026/0955.

Attachments – Revised Drawing Packages

For ease of reference, **page numbers have been added** to each attached drawing package so that individual pages can be readily identified and cross-referenced when comparing the various revisions.

We attach the three drawing packages referred to within this correspondence:

Attachment 1 – Original Drawing Package Showing Level References and Dimensions – Type 3 Loft Extension – 01 April 2026

Attachment 2 – Revised Drawing Package Rev B Removing Level References and Dimensions – Type 3 Loft Extension – 17 June 2026

Attachment 3 – Further Revised Drawing Package Adding Drawings of No. 32 and No. 36 but Not Restoring Original Level References – Type 3 Loft Extension – 23 June 2026

Clarification of Our Position

Your email of 23 June 2026 states:

"You clarified in the email sent on Thursday the 18th of June that your concerns were not about any confusion of the drawings, and your objection is not based upon frustration with the proposal itself. Your concerns were regarding the procedure of being notified about the revised plans before the status of the application being changed to 'Recommendation Made'."

You are correct that our concerns were not about confusion regarding the drawings and were not based upon frustration with the proposal itself.

However, our concerns were not limited to neighbour notification.

Our concerns relate to the transparency of the revised drawing process, including the removal of level references and dimensional information from the revised drawings, the subsequent introduction of further revisions, and the fact that the revised proposals do not address the substantive residential amenity concerns raised in our formal objection dated 17 May 2026.

Review of the Drawing Revisions

Having compared Attachments 1, 2 and 3 on a **page-by-page basis**, we note the following.

Pages 1, 4 and 5 are substantially unchanged between the three drawing packages.

However, significant changes are apparent on Pages 3, 6 and 7.

Page 3

Attachment 1 (Page 3) and Attachment 2 (Page 3) show No. 34 Crowland Road only.

Attachment 3 (Page 3) introduces drawings of No. 32 and No. 36 together with an additional existing rear elevation which did not appear within Attachments 1 and 2.

However, **our objection does not concern the impact upon No. 32**. Our objection relates specifically to the **impact of the proposal upon No. 36 as the directly adjoining end-of-terrace property**.

As the end-of-terrace property, No. 36 is uniquely affected by the side-by-side relationship with the proposed development. Consequently, the scale, height, bulk and massing of the proposal are central to our concerns regarding outlook, enclosure, loss of light and neighbouring residential amenity.

Page 6

Attachment 1 (Page 6) contains level references and dimensional information including:

- Ground Level: +0.00m
- Second Level: +3.120m
- Third Level: +6.037m
- Loft Level: +9.017m
- Roof Apex: +12.154m
- Vertical measurements including 3.107m, 2.890m, 2.697m and 2.864m.

Those level references and dimensions assisted interested parties in understanding the scale, height and massing of the proposal.

The level references and dimensional information shown on Attachment 1 (Page 6) were removed from Attachment 2 (Page 6) and were not restored in Attachment 3 (Page 6).

Page 7

Attachment 1 (Page 7) contains further level references and dimensional information including:

- Ground Level: +0.00m
- Second Level: +3.120m
- Third Level: +6.037m
- Loft Level: +9.017m
- Roof Apex: +12.154m
- Vertical measurements including 3.107m, 2.890m, 2.697m, 2.864m, 2.817m, 2.365m and 1.500m.

Those level references and dimensions assisted interested parties in understanding the scale, height and massing of the proposal.

The level references and dimensional information shown on Attachment 1 (Page 7) **were removed from Attachment 2 (Page 7) and were not restored in Attachment 3 (Page 7).**

Removal of Level References and Dimensional Information

We note that Ms Skelli's email sent at 2:51pm on 18 June 2026 referred to a reduction from approximately 3.1m to 2.8m.

However, the level references and dimensional information shown on Attachment 1 (Pages 6 and 7) were removed from Attachment 2 (Pages 6 and 7) and were not restored within Attachment 3 (Pages 6 and 7).

Accordingly, the revised drawings no longer contain the level references and dimensional information previously shown on Attachment 1.

The removal of that information means that the original level-reference system demonstrating the scale, height and massing of the proposal is no longer available for comparison against the revised drawings.

This is particularly relevant where reference has been made in Ms Skelli's correspondence to a reduction from approximately 3.1m to 2.8m, as the level references and dimensional information previously shown on Attachment 1 were removed from Attachment 2 and were not restored within Attachment 3.

Substantive Planning Concerns Remain

The latest drawings **now include drawings of No. 32, No. 34 and No. 36. However, our objection relates specifically to the impact upon No. 36 as the directly adjoining end-of-terrace property.**

We have reviewed the latest revisions carefully and understand the changes that have been made. However, we disagree that those revisions address the concerns raised in our formal objection regarding outlook, enclosure, scale, height, bulk, massing, loss of light and the wider impact upon neighbouring residential amenity at No. 36.

Whilst the drawings have been amended, the proposal still appears to show the same Type 3 roof extension, the same additional storey, the same loft accommodation and the same overall scale of development.

As set out in our formal objection dated 17 May 2026, our concerns include:

- The increase in height from the existing roofline.
- The scale, bulk and massing of the proposal.
- Loss of outlook.
- Loss of daylight and sunlight.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking.
- Approximately 45 square metres of additional accommodation.
- Four additional bedrooms.
- Two additional bathrooms.
- Increased residential intensity.
- Increased activity levels and footfall.
- Wider impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity.

We also note that **Planning Application Ref: HGY/2026/0862 for 34 Crowland Road was refused** following an assessment that the proposal would have an adverse effect on neighbouring amenity, resulting in a material loss of light, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

Whilst HGY/2026/0862 concerned a different form of development, **the refusal demonstrates that neighbouring residential amenity, including loss of light, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure, are important planning considerations at this site.**

Having reviewed the latest revised drawings, we do not consider that the revisions materially alter the proposal or address the substantive concerns raised in our formal objection.

We therefore continue to maintain our formal objection in full.

Request

We note your statement that the application has been placed on hold and is now intended to be finalised on 30 June 2026.

As further revised drawings have been introduced after the original consultation period and the **online representation facility is no longer available**, this correspondence and the attached PDF representation form part of our representations in relation to Planning Application Ref: HGY/2026/0955.

This correspondence and the attached PDF representation should be placed on the planning file and published on the public planning register in the same manner as other representations submitted in relation to this application.

They should also be taken into account as part of the determination of the application.

Should any further revised plans, drawings or supporting documents be submitted prior to determination, they should be uploaded to the public planning register and made available for public inspection before the application is determined.

This would ensure that interested parties are able to review any further amendments prior to determination and make any further representations they consider necessary.

We continue to maintain our Formal Objection dated 17 May 2026 in full.

Kind regards,

Mr Ghebrenegus Ghile and Mrs Maria Ghile