

Dear Mercy Oruwari,

FORMAL OBJECTION – HGY/2026/2412 – 34 Crowland Road, Tottenham, London N15 6UT

We (Mr Ghebrenegus Ghile and Mrs Maria Ghile) are the owners/occupiers of 36 Crowland Road, immediately adjoining No.34, and **formally object to HGY/2026/2412**, which seeks prior approval for a single-storey rear extension extending 6 metres beyond the original rear wall, with a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres.

Our objection is straightforward. **Haringey has already considered a 6-metre rear extension of these dimensions at this property and refused it because of the unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity.**

Only months later, **No.34 is again seeking a 6-metre rear extension.** We have seen nothing demonstrating that the harm previously identified by Haringey has been removed.

Furthermore, since that refusal **Haringey has approved substantial additional-storey/Type 3 development at No.34.** The overall development position has therefore become **more extensive, not less.**

Attachments

For ease of reference and to enable a direct comparison between the previously refused proposal and the current proposal, we attach the following documents:

- **Exhibit A** – HGY/2026/0862 – Refusal Decision – 30 April 2026
- **Exhibit B** – HGY/2026/0862 – Final Officer Report
- **Exhibit C** – HGY/2026/0862 – Redacted Application Form
- **Exhibit D** – HGY/2026/0862 – Proposed 6M Rear Extension Drawing
- **Exhibit E** – HGY/2026/2412 – Newly Submitted 6M Rear Extension Drawing – 27 August 2026
- **Exhibit F** – HGY/2026/2412 – Newly Submitted Redacted Application Form – 27 August 2026

Reason for attaching these documents

The documents from **HGY/2026/0862** are attached alongside the corresponding documents newly submitted under **HGY/2026/2412** so that Haringey can directly compare the proposal it refused with the proposal now before it.

That comparison demonstrates that the proposed extension remains 6 metres in depth, with a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres. The same 6-metre rear-

extension drawing used for the refused application has also been submitted again with the current application.

We therefore ask that these documents are considered together with this objection when HGY/2026/2412 is determined.

Request for objection and exhibits to be placed on the planning file

We request that this formal objection, together with **Exhibits A–F**, is placed in full on the **electronic planning file and public register for HGY/2026/2412**, so that the objection and all documents relied upon in support of it form part of the application record and are available to the case officer when determining the application.

1. Haringey has already refused a 6-metre rear extension at No.34

The previous application, **HGY/2026/0862**, was also made under **Prior Approval Part 1 Class A.1(ea): Larger Home Extension**. It proposed a single-storey extension extending **6 metres beyond the original rear wall, with a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres**. Haringey assessed that proposal and refused it (**Exhibit A – Refusal Decision**).

The officer's conclusion was explicit (Exhibit B – Final Officer Report). The Council found that:

“by virtue of the depth and height of the extension it would have an adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents leading to a material loss of light and outlook and increased sense of enclosure”

That became the formal reason for refusal.

These are therefore **not new or speculative concerns being raised by No.36**. Haringey itself has already assessed the effect of a 6-metre rear extension at this particular property and **determined that its depth and height would cause material harm to neighbouring amenity**.

2. The refused 6-metre proposal has been resubmitted without alteration to its dimensions

The current application does not reduce or alter the dimensions of the extension which Haringey refused under HGY/2026/0862. The previous application proposed a 6-metre rear extension with a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres (**Exhibit C – Previous Application Form**). The current application again proposes a depth of 6 metres, a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres (**Exhibit F – Current Application Form**).

The depth has not been reduced. The maximum height has not been reduced. The eaves height has not been reduced.

Furthermore, **as shown by Exhibits D and E, the same 6-metre rear-extension drawing used for the refused application has been resubmitted with the current application.**

As set out in Section 1 above, Haringey refused the previous proposal because of the amenity harm arising from its depth and height. Those dimensions have not been altered.

Nothing in the current submission demonstrates how the harm which resulted in the refusal of HGY/2026/0862 has been overcome.

3. Loss of light, outlook and increased enclosure

A 6-metre rear projection immediately adjoining No.36 is substantial. No.36 shares the boundary directly with the application site, and the proposed extension would run alongside that boundary for a depth of **6 metres at a height of approximately 3 metres (Exhibit E – Current 6M Rear Extension Drawing)**. It would therefore be experienced directly from our rear living accommodation and garden.

The extension would introduce a substantial and continuous built form immediately alongside our property, significantly reducing openness along the boundary and creating a dominant and enclosing presence when viewed from our rear rooms and garden. Its depth and proximity would materially affect our outlook and would also reduce natural light to the rear of No.36, particularly to the ground-floor accommodation which relies upon light from the rear.

These are the same amenity concerns which resulted in the refusal of HGY/2026/0862 (Exhibits A and B). As set out in Sections 1 and 2, Haringey has already identified those amenity concerns, and the dimensions which resulted in that refusal have not been reduced or altered.

4. Haringey has since approved substantial additional-storey development at No.34

The development position at No.34 has become **more extensive, not less**, since Haringey refused HGY/2026/0862.

Haringey subsequently approved the additional-storey/Type 3 development under **HGY/2026/0955**. That development involves approximately **45 m² of additional internal floorspace, four additional bedrooms and two bathrooms**.

We objected to that development because of its effect upon No.36, **including its height, scale, bulk, loss of light, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. It was nevertheless approved.**

No.36 therefore now faces the prospect of **substantial additional built form above No.34 together with a further 6-metre extension projecting into the rear garden immediately alongside our property.**

Importantly, as set out in Section 1 (Exhibits A and B), Haringey had already found the 6-metre rear extension unacceptable on neighbouring amenity grounds before approving the additional storey. The subsequent approval of further substantial development at No.34 does not remove that previously identified harm.

5. Impact upon our rear garden

The impact upon our rear garden is **particularly significant**. The proposed extension would project 6 metres into the rear garden at No.34 immediately alongside **the shared boundary** with No.36. **For that full depth, substantial built form would therefore extend alongside our private outdoor space (Exhibit E – Current 6M Rear Extension Drawing).**

This would significantly reduce the existing openness along the boundary and create an overbearing and enclosing presence when experienced from our garden. **As set out in Section 4 above**, this impact must also be considered in the context of the substantial additional storey development which Haringey has subsequently approved at No.34.

6. The previous refusal cannot simply be disregarded

A new application number does not, by itself, remove the amenity harm which resulted in the previous refusal.

We recognise that HGY/2026/2412 is a new application and must be determined on its own merits. However, the relevance of HGY/2026/0862 is exceptionally clear. It concerned:

- the same property at No.34;
- the same adjoining property at No.36;
- the same Larger Home Extension prior approval procedure;
- a 6-metre rear extension with a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres; and
- the same question of neighbouring residential amenity.

As demonstrated by **Exhibits A–F**, Haringey has therefore already exercised its planning judgment on a proposal of these dimensions at this particular property and **found the resulting harm unacceptable, while the current application again proposes the same dimensions.**

The present application again seeks the same 6-metre extension and **relies upon the same drawing used for the application which Haringey refused under HGY/2026/0862 (Exhibits D and E).**

If Haringey now intends to reach the opposite conclusion only months later, the **officer report should clearly identify what has materially changed since HGY/2026/0862** and how that change removes the material loss of light, loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure previously identified by the Council.

7. Additional Floorspace – 25 m², No Proposed Floor Plan

The current application states that the proposed 6-metre rear extension would create approximately **25 m² of additional internal floorspace**, while declaring **zero additional bedrooms and zero additional bathrooms (Exhibit F – Current Application Form)**.

However, **no proposed floor plan has been provided showing the internal layout or intended use of this additional 25 m²**. Neighbouring occupiers are therefore being consulted on a substantial extension without being shown what the additional internal floorspace will actually contain, how it will be laid out or how it will be used.

This is a straightforward lack of information in the submitted documentation. The application identifies the amount of additional floorspace but does not provide the proposed floor-plan information necessary to understand what that additional accommodation actually represents.

There is also insufficient detail showing the precise width and relationship of the proposed extension to the **shared boundary with No.36 (Exhibit E – Current 6M Rear Extension Drawing)**. This is **particularly important** given that the effect upon the immediately **adjoining property** is the very issue which resulted in Haringey refusing the previous application.

7A. Further Development Following the Approved Additional Storey

Under **HGY/2026/0955**, No.34 has already obtained approval for approximately **45 m² of additional internal floorspace, including four additional bedrooms and two bathrooms**. The current application now seeks a **further 25 m² of internal floorspace at ground-floor level (Exhibit F – Current Application Form)**.

These are separate developments. The 25 m² now proposed does **not** form part of the previously approved 45 m². The significance is that substantial additional accommodation has already been approved at No.34 and a further substantial area of internal floorspace is now proposed **without a floor plan showing its intended use**.

7B. Repeated Lack of Clear and Complete Information

This adds to our wider concern regarding the **repeated lack of clear and complete information being made available to No.36 in relation to substantial works at No.34**.

In the current application, a further **25 m² of internal floorspace is proposed without a proposed floor plan showing what that space will contain (Exhibit F – Current Application Form)**.

Separately, in relation to the additional-storey works already approved, **No.34 has not formally contacted us by email or letter to confirm what is happening with the proposed works, when they are intended to commence, or to provide the information or documentation necessary for the Party Wall process to progress and for us to appoint our own surveyor**.

No.36 is therefore repeatedly being placed in the position of having to seek clarification and further information concerning substantial works immediately adjoining our property rather than being provided with clear and complete information from the outset.

7C. Proposed Floor Plan Required Before Determination

For the reasons set out in Section 7 above, the submitted documentation **does not enable neighbouring occupiers to understand or verify what the additional 25 m² is actually intended to contain**. We are not alleging that undisclosed bedrooms or bathrooms are necessarily proposed. The issue is the absence of sufficient information showing the internal layout and intended use of the additional floorspace.

A proposed floor plan showing the layout and intended use of the additional 25 m² should be provided before HGY/2026/2412 is determined.

8. Drainage, pipes, sewer infrastructure and excavation

We also formally raise concerns regarding the **excavation and foundation works** required for the proposed 6-metre extension and their potential interaction with drainage, sewer and water infrastructure affecting Nos.34 and 36.

No.36 immediately adjoins the proposed works. There must therefore be clarity regarding whether any **public sewer, public lateral drain, water main or other relevant infrastructure** lies within or close to the proposed extension and excavation area, close to the boundary between Nos.34 and 36, or serves or otherwise affects No.36.

We have contacted **Thames Water Developer Services** requesting confirmation of the relevant recorded infrastructure and whether the proposed development **requires any build-over/build-near agreement**, notification, approval or other action **before excavation** or construction commences. **At the date of this objection, we are awaiting Thames Water's response and will not delay this objection while waiting for that response.**

We recognise that Thames Water/build-over requirements and Building Regulations are separate from the neighbouring-amenity assessment under this prior-approval application. We are **not presenting this as a separate amenity ground for refusal**. However, the concern has been formally raised before excavation or construction takes place and **should be recorded on the planning file**.

9. Outstanding Party Wall position and stated September commencement of works

Information submitted in connection with the separately approved additional-storey/Type 3 development **at No.34 stated that works were expected to commence in September 2026**. It is now September and, **as set out in Section 7B, No.34 has still not formally contacted us by email or letter regarding the proposed works or provided the information or documentation necessary for the Party Wall process to progress.**

Given the stated September commencement date, sufficient notice and information must be provided to enable us to appoint our own surveyor and for the necessary Party Wall process to be completed before any relevant works commence.

If No.34 intends to commence works to which the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 applies without first completing the necessary statutory process, **we will have to obtain urgent legal advice regarding the protection of No.36**, including whether it is **necessary to seek injunctive relief to prevent relevant works proceeding until the statutory requirements have been dealt with**.

We recognise that **Party Wall matters are legally separate** from the determination of this prior-approval application and we are not relying upon the unresolved Party Wall position as a separate planning ground for refusal.

Nevertheless, **Haringey should be aware of the stated September 2026 commencement date and the unresolved Party Wall position**.

10. Conclusion and request for refusal

As set out in Section 1, Haringey has already determined that the 6-metre rear extension proposed at No.34 would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity **(Exhibits A and B)**.

The refused proposal has been resubmitted without alteration to its dimensions. It retains the same 6-metre depth, 3-metre maximum height and 3-metre eaves height **(Exhibits C and F)**, and the same drawing used for the refused application has been submitted again **(Exhibits D and E)**. Nothing in the current submission demonstrates how the previously identified amenity harm has been overcome.

The development position has since become more extensive because Haringey has subsequently approved substantial additional-storey development at No.34, as detailed in Sections 4 and 5. No.36 now faces that approved additional built form together with the proposed 6-metre rear projection immediately alongside our garden.

We therefore formally request that prior approval for HGY/2026/2412 be refused on neighbouring amenity grounds.

If Haringey nevertheless intends to reach a different conclusion from HGY/2026/0862, the officer report should **clearly identify what has materially changed** since the previous refusal and explain why the same 6-metre extension which Haringey found unacceptable only months ago is now considered acceptable.

Kind regards

Mr Ghebrenegus Ghile and Mrs Maria Ghile