

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/2055
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	20 Bennington Road, Tottenham, London, N17 7NU
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing rear conservatory and garden shed, and the erection of a single-storey detached outbuilding measuring approximately 41 sqm, for use as a hobby room and private gym incidental to the main dwellinghouse.
Case Officer:	Neil McClellan
Valid Date:	29/07/2026
	6
Applicant:	Mrs Turkan Eren
Agent:	Murat Altinkilic

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

Demolition of the existing rear conservatory and garden shed, and the erection of a single-storey detached outbuilding measuring approximately 41 sqm, for use as a hobby room and private gym incidental to the main dwellinghouse.

Site Description

The property in question is a modest sized end of terraced house located within the Tower Gardens conservation area. It has a modest size rear garden with a small garden shed. The house has a steel framed open side covered structure attached to its rear.

The property is not listed or close to any listed buildings.

Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2010/1705 – Planning permission granted for replacement timber windows.

REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to notification and publicity of the application.

CONSIDERATIONS

Design, Character & Heritage

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.

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

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. 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 Tower Gardens Estate in Tottenham is a historically significant Cottage Estate built by the London County Council between 1904 and 1927. Built in the Arts and Crafts style, it was heavily influenced by the garden city movement. It was designated as a conservation area in 1978, with an Article 4 Direction added in 1981 to protect its unique historic character. The Article 4 effectively removes all householder permitted development rights under Part 1, of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (as amended).

The estate has benefited from a multi-million-pound council investment programs aimed at sympathetic historic restoration, roof repairs, and energy-efficiency upgrades.

The property has an existing small garden shed at the end of its rear garden, that is to be replaced by the proposed new much larger outbuilding. The property also has a steel framed single storey rear roof structure, with open sides, described on the existing plans as a conservatory. Although quite light weight in appearance this existing structure is a poorly built, unattractive and unsympathetic addition, detrimental to the character and appearance of the house and conservation area. This structure has never had the benefit of planning permission, but officers are satisfied that it has been in situ for long enough to be immune from enforcement action and is therefore lawful. The application proposes removing this structure.

The proposed outbuilding is to be built up against the property's rear boundary, taking up the full width of the plot. It is described in the application as measuring approximately 41sqm. However, this relates to its internal floor area, its actual footprint is approximately 49.25sqm or 54sqm if the proposed projecting overhang is included. The outbuilding would have a mono-pitched roof sloping up from a height of approximately 2.7 metres at its front elevation, closest to the rear of the house, rising to around 3.1 metres at the rear boundary.

Even with the removal of the existing structure to the rear of the house, the proposed outbuilding would still take up significantly more than half the area of the garden beyond the house's rear

elevation, leaving just a small less than 5-metre-deep patch of garden between the front elevation of the outbuilding and the rear elevation of the house, greatly reducing the area available for soft landscaping and planting. The proposal would therefore significantly erode the open character of the property's rear garden, leaving a small, enclosed space at odds with the generally open character of the rear gardens to this group of terraced cottage style properties, causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The removal of the existing structure described above while welcome is not considered sufficient improvement to offset this harm. As noted above, the existing structure while in a poor condition, and with an unsympathetic design and unattractive appearance, is much smaller, and relatively light weight in appearance, compared to the much more substantial outbuilding proposed in this application.

It was suggested to the applicant that a reduction in the footprint of the proposed outbuilding might be an acceptable compromise. However, the applicant has declined this suggestion. The agent has offered to lower the height of the roof by around half metre. To 2.2 metres at the front and 2.5 metres to the rear. However, it is the size of the footprint relative to the size of the garden plot, and the erosion of the area's open character that is the cause of the harm. The lowering of the roof would not mitigate this harm.

The agent has also cited examples of other outbuildings and extensions in and to neighbouring properties. However, none are as large as the one proposed in this application, and of the specific addresses mentioned by the agent, none have planning permission for the outbuildings or extensions described.

The applicant has agreed to alter the description of the outbuilding as an 'incidental' rather than 'ancillary' use. This addresses any potential concern that the outbuilding be used as additional living accommodation that might result in a material impact on neighbouring amenity through additional activity. The description has been amended accordingly.

Impact on neighbouring 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 residents.

Whilst sizeable, the position, bulk, massing and height of the proposed outbuilding would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity that would warrant refusal of the proposal.

Conclusion

In summary the proposed development by reason of its size, siting, depth and associated loss of space for soft landscaping, would be considered an overdevelopment of the site, significantly eroding the open character of the property's rear garden, leaving a small, enclosed space at odds with the generally open character of the rear gardens to this terrace of cottage style properties, causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and to local visual amenity. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management, DPD (2017) policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017, Policies G7 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and to Chapter 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026).

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

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed outbuilding by reason of its size, siting, depth and associated loss of space for soft landscaping, would be an overdevelopment of the site, significantly eroding the open character of the property's rear garden, leaving a small, enclosed space at odds with the generally open character of the rear gardens of this terrace of cottage style properties, causing harm to the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens conservation area, and detrimental to local visual amenity. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management, DPD (2017) policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017, Policies G7 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and to Chapter 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026).