

Dear Ms Oruwari,

Planning Application Ref: HGY/2026/0955
34 Crowland Road, Tottenham, London N15 6UT

For transparency, we have copied Ms Tania Skelli, Planning Support, and Mr James Argles into this correspondence.

Attachment 7: Request for Clarification of Officer's Report, Approved Drawings and Condition 5 – Planning Application Ref. HGY/2026/0955 – 7 July 2026.pdf

As the online representation facility is no longer available following the decision issued on **7 July 2026**, **Attachment 7** is to be placed on the planning file and published on the public planning register in the same manner as our previous correspondence relating to Planning Application Ref. HGY/2026/0955.

Having carefully reviewed the Officer's Report and the Decision Notice, and compared them with our written objections, we have been unable to identify within the Officer's assessment the reasoning by which a number of the planning policy issues, evidential matters and questions raised in our objections were considered and resolved.

Before determining our legal position in relation to this decision, the following matters require clarification so that we can properly understand the basis upon which planning permission has been granted.

1. Structural Impact

Our objection **did not ask the Local Planning Authority to determine matters** arising under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 or the Building Regulations, nor did it ask the Local Planning Authority to determine the structural adequacy of the proposed development.

Rather, our objection referred to the **South East Surveys correspondence dated 8 May 2026** as evidence of the extent of the **structural intervention likely to be required** to construct the proposed Type 3 extension, including the likely insertion of multiple steel beams into the shared party wall and the significant structural intervention commonly associated with such extensions, including strengthening or underpinning works.

In addition, our objection referred to:

- the contractor's observations identifying possible signs of structural movement affecting No. 36;
- the age of the Victorian terrace;
- the end-of-terrace position of No. 36;
- the potential impact of excavation and structural works on the adjoining property; and

- the proximity of drainage infrastructure, including sewers, together with the potential for land movement.

These matters were raised **as planning considerations** relevant to the scale, structural intensity and **likely impact of the proposed development** on the adjoining Victorian terrace, and to the assessment of the proposal against the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document.

Whilst the **Officer's Report states that the applicant did not submit** structural calculations and refers to Building Regulations, the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and Condition 5, **it does not identify where the planning considerations raised within our objection were assessed**, nor does it explain how those planning considerations were taken into account when concluding that **planning permission should be granted**.

Accordingly, **please identify the section of the Officer's Report** in which the planning considerations raised within our objection **were assessed and explain** how they were taken into account when assessing the proposal against the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document.

In particular, please explain:

- how our reference to the **South East Surveys correspondence dated 8 May 2026** was taken into account when assessing the structural intensity of the proposed Type 3 extension;
- how the extent of the structural intervention described within our objection was considered as part of the planning assessment;
- what weight, if any, was given to those planning considerations; and
- how those matters contributed to the conclusion that the proposal complied with the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document.

2. South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document

Our objection referred specifically to **pages 3, 4 and 6** of the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document and explained why we considered the proposal to conflict with those provisions relating to:

- neighbouring amenity;
- terrace unity;
- architectural character;
- structural intensity; and
- the impact of larger-scale extensions.

In particular, page 4 of the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document states that each planning application will be considered **on its individual merits**, having regard to **the impact** on the appearance of the house itself, **on the adjoining houses** either side, as well as on the **architectural unity** of the terrace and overall character of the specific street.

Our objection specifically **addressed the impact** of the proposal upon **No. 36** as the immediately adjoining property, including the effects on residential amenity, outlook, enclosure, structural intervention and the established terrace context.

Whilst the **Officer's Report concludes that the proposal complies** with the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document, **it does not identify** where those specific provisions were assessed or explain **how the individual impact** upon **No. 36** was considered in accordance with the requirements of page 4 of the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document.

Accordingly, please identify:

- the section of the Officer's Report in which each of the above provisions of the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document was assessed;
- **where within the Officer's Report the individual impact of the proposal upon No. 36 was specifically assessed in accordance with page 4 of the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document;** and
- explain how each of those provisions was applied in reaching the conclusion that the proposal complied with the South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document.

3. Roof Height Revision

The Officer's Report states:

*"The increase from 2.8m to 3.1m adds additional height and bulk to a property in addition to the new floor level. This **has been revised** with the height of the roof being reduced **to 2.8m.**"*

The Officer's Report therefore concludes that the proposed roof height was reduced by **0.3 metres (300 mm)**.

Having carefully reviewed the approved Rev 04 drawing package dated **3 July 2026**, we have been unable to identify any approved drawing, drawing revision, page number or measurement demonstrating that **300 mm reduction** in roof height.

As explained within our objections, the **revised drawing packages removed the level references and dimensions previously shown** on the original drawings, which previously enabled the overall building height and roof dimensions to be verified. Consequently, we have been unable to identify where the approved drawing package demonstrates the stated reduction in roof height from **3.1 metres to 2.8 metres (300 mm)**.

Accordingly, please identify:

- the specific approved drawing relied upon;
- the relevant drawing revision;
- the page number;
- the measurement; and
- the location within the approved drawing package

which demonstrates the stated **300 mm reduction** in roof height.

If the approved drawing package does not itself demonstrate that 300 mm reduction, please explain the evidential basis upon which the Officer's Report concluded that the roof height had been reduced from 3.1 metres to 2.8 metres.

4. Condition 5

The Officer's Report states that the applicant did not submit structural calculations with the planning application and that **Condition 5** has therefore been imposed.

Please confirm:

- whether the applicant will be required to submit structural engineering drawings and calculations to the Local Planning Authority before commencing development pursuant to Condition 5;
- whether those structural engineering drawings and calculations must be approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences;
- whether those documents will be retained by the Local Planning Authority;
- whether those documents will be published on the public planning register;
- if they will not be published, how adjoining owners and members of the public may inspect the documents demonstrating compliance with Condition 5; and
- **if the applicant is not required to submit those documents to the Local Planning Authority, please explain how the Local Planning Authority will satisfy itself that Condition 5 has been complied with before development commences.**

Actions Required:

1. Acknowledge receipt of this email and Attachment 7.
2. Confirm that Attachment 7 has been placed on the planning file.
3. Confirm that Attachment 7 has been published on the public planning register.
4. Provide a substantive response addressing each of the matters raised in this correspondence.
5. Provide that substantive response within 7 days of the date of this email.

Kind regards

Mr Ghebrenegus Ghile and Mrs Maria Ghile