



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

**by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> December 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3363233**

**77 Lealand Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6JT**

- 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 Abraham Ost against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application ref is HGY/2025/0107.
  - The development proposed is described as: A ground floor wrap-around extension to the flat and a type 3 loft extension to the upper flat.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor wrap-around extension to the flat and a type 3 loft extension to the upper flat at 77 Lealand Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6JT in accordance with the terms of the application, ref HGY/2025/0107, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: E00; P01; P02; P03; P04; and P05.
  - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### Applications for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Abraham Ost against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Main Issue

3. The Council's decision notice refers to the proposal involving the extension to a former single dwelling that has been converted into self-contained flats and that this would be in conflict with the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD). The section of the SPD relevant to this appeal clearly relates to the preservation of the character of the area. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a two-storey terraced property that has been divided into two-flats. This section of Lealand Road primarily comprises two-storey properties with traditional design features such as bay windows and mouldings, this is reflected in the character of the appeal property. A number of properties along this section of Lealand Road have undergone roof alterations such as 53, 63, 74, and 81. There is nothing before me to indicate these are unlawful and the Council have not suggested this is the case. As such, the roofscape of the street scene has a distinctly varied character.
5. The SPD supports extensions at third floor level for single family dwellings acknowledging the benefits of additional accommodation for large families, thus justifying any impact on the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it states that extensions to houses that have been converted to flats will not be permitted, it also says that each application will be considered on its individual merits, having regard to the overall character of the specific street.
6. The proposed third floor extension would project above the ridge line of the neighbouring dwellings. However, this would be reflective of the existing variety in the roof scape of the area with the proposal viewed in the context of other nearby vertically extended properties. It would maintain the existing roof pitch in addition to incorporating traditional features such as lintels, achieving a visual connection to the surrounding built environment and maintaining the existing character of the property. Therefore, in this instance it is acceptable to depart from the guidance within the SPD and for the third floor extension to a dwelling that has been converted into flats.
7. The Council make reference to an appeal for a 'type three' loft extension at 109-111 Craven Park Road<sup>1</sup>. The proposal provided a new flat and the inspector found that it would cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the area. Given the proposal is for the extension to an existing flat and in the specific circumstances of this case I have not found harm to the character and appearance of the area, I do not consider the appeal before me analogous to that raised by the council.
8. The proposal would additionally involve a single storey rear extension. The Council raises no objection to this element of the proposal, and I have no reason to take an alternative view.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

## Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/Y5420/W/22/3294872

## **Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*N Unwin*

INSPECTOR