



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: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3361289

38 Lordsmead Road, Tottenham, London N17 6EY

- 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 Mr. Asif Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/3299.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 36 Lordsmead Road.

Reasons

3. 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 historically extended to include a wrap around single storey rear extension with flat roof.
4. The proposed development would infill the existing passage leading from the original property towards the wrap around extension and rear garden beyond. The proposed development would be built up to the boundary, similar to the existing wrap around extension, however, would have a mono pitched roof rather than flat roof.
5. The separation distance between the proposed development and No. 36 Lordsmead Road is approximately 1.8m, however the bay window facing the appeal site boundary is approximately 1m from the proposed development. There is also a window at ground floor in the rear elevation of No. 36.
6. I observed on my site visit that the shared boundary close boarded fence is approximately 2.2m in height, the proposed development would have a height of 2.5m on the boundary projecting up to 3m to the top of the proposed mono pitched roof.

7. I understand that an infill proposal was previously dismissed at appeal¹, the proposed before me has been revised in an attempt to address the previous refusal. Notwithstanding the change to the roof of the proposed infill due to the separation distance between No. 36 and the appeal site the bulk of the proposed development would exacerbate the sense of enclosure by creating a tunnelling effect. The proposed development would be overbearing and oppressive to the occupiers of No. 36.
8. Whilst the amount of light is already limited to No. 36 due to the two storey outrigger and existing extension the proposed development would reduce the amount of light further.
9. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 36 Lordsmead Road.
10. There is conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, set out design principles for new development which, in combination, seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other similar developments within the area. I have not been provided with substantive details to compare these to the proposal before me. 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.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Y5420/D/24/3350300