



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3361151

26 Richmond Road, Wood Green, London N11 2QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Mei Brody against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/3189.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey side infill rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
3. There is a discrepancy in terms of the plans submitted which the appellant acknowledges. Notwithstanding this, it appears from the planning officers report and representations received that the extent of the proposed works was clear.
4. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 24 Richmond Road.

Reasons

6. The site is located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal property is two storey mid-terraced with a two-storey outrigger to the rear which has been extended.
7. The development is a single storey extension which extends along the shared boundary with No. 24 Richmond Road by 4m. 1m further than a single storey extension deemed permitted development¹ which had a different roof form. Windows from a kitchen face onto the appeal proposal, a dining room window is

¹ Ref: HGY/2022/1939

located within the rear elevation of No. 24. There is limited separation distance between the development and the built form and windows of No. 24.

8. The occupants of No. 24 provided, during the consideration of the application, an assessment which considered the effect of the development on ground floor windows within their property in accordance with Building Research Establishment (BRE) "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight 2022, 3rd Edition.
9. The assessment demonstrates that combined the extensions to the appeal site have caused a reduction in light to kitchen and dining room windows below BRE daylight and sunlight recommendations. The assessment does not take into account the difference in light levels caused from the approved rear extension² and the permitted development scheme to compare them to the appeal proposal. I therefore cannot be certain that the decrease in light levels below the BRE recommendations is caused directly by the appeal proposal.
10. The extension appears to be in-line with the rear projection of the single storey extension at No. 24. Nevertheless, due to location along the shared boundary, the height and the constrained separation distance between the properties, the development is overbearing and oppressive. I find that the proposed development harms the living conditions of occupiers of No. 24 Richmond Road.
11. There is conflict with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) which, amongst other things, set out design principles for new development which seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development is required due to personal circumstances in terms of accessibility. I have had regard to the comments raised. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the development would be the only way to fulfil the needs of the appellant, I therefore give this limited weight.
13. The Party Wall Agreement and other discussions relating to the design of the extension are beyond the remit of this appeal. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

² Ref: HGY/2021/2677