

PLANNING OBJECTION
76 Muswell Road, London N10 2BE
LB Haringey Ref: HGY/2026/0584 | Planning Portal Ref: PP-14746864

22 April 2026

27 APR 2026

Head of Development Management
Planning Service, London Borough of Haringey
6th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road, Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: HGY/2026/0584 – Erection of a Single Storey Rear Extension at 76 Muswell Road, London N10 2BE – OBJECTION

I write from **31 Donovan Avenue, London N10**, as a local resident within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area, to register a formal objection to the above application. I also raise a number of procedural and validation concerns that I believe require resolution before the application can properly be determined.

I have reviewed the submitted plans (drawing series AS-1073), the Design, Access & Heritage Statement (Ref: 1073-100), the application form (PP-14746864), the block plan and all supporting material published on the Council's website. My objection is set out under the following headings.

1. Application Validity – Request for Invalidation or Suspension Pending Correction

Before addressing the planning merits, I wish to draw the Council's attention to **material errors in the application as submitted** which, in my view, render it incapable of proper determination in its current form. I respectfully request that the Council either **invalidates the application** pending correction, or suspends determination and requires the applicant to submit amended documentation, triggering a fresh consultation period.

1.1 Drawing Number Discrepancy

The application form (PP-14746864, page 6) lists the supporting drawings with the project reference prefix **"1076"** (e.g. 1076-110, 1076-111, 1076-112, etc.). However, every drawing actually submitted and published on the Council's website carries the reference prefix **"1073"** (e.g. AS-1073/110, AS-1073/111, AS-1073/211, etc.).

This is not a trivial typographical error. The application form constitutes a formal statutory document and the drawings listed on it define the scheme for which permission is sought. A mismatch between the form and the submitted plans means there is no certainty that the Council is assessing the correct scheme. If drawings bearing the reference "1076" exist for a different project, there is a risk of confusion in the Council's records and in any future enforcement proceedings.

I request that the Council requires the applicant to submit either a **corrected application form or re-issued drawings** with consistent references, and that a **full 21-day re-consultation** is carried out once the corrected documents are available.

1.2 Inaccurate Design, Access & Heritage Statement

Figure 2.2 of the DAS is captioned "*Street elevation of north side of Parham Way.*" The photograph shown is clearly of Muswell Road, not Parham Way. This is evidently a copy-and-paste error from a different application prepared by the same agent (AS Design). This error raises legitimate concerns about whether the site-specific analysis presented in the DAS has been prepared with sufficient care and attention to this particular property and conservation area, or whether it is a generic template adapted from another scheme.

I request that the Council requires a corrected DAS to be submitted and, again, that re-consultation takes place.

1.3 Incomplete Description of Development

The application is described simply as a "proposed ground floor rear extension." However, the proposed drawings clearly show additional works beyond the rear extension, including a terrace at first floor above the proposed extension.

Where the scope of works extends beyond the description of development, the Council should satisfy itself that the description is adequate and, if not, require an amended description. An amended description would constitute a material change to the application and should trigger re-consultation.

2. Missing Supporting Information – Request for Further Information Before Determination

The application is deficient in a number of respects. I request that the Council **does not determine the application** until the following assessments and information have been submitted by the applicant and made available for public consultation:

2.1 Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

No daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted, despite the extension's proximity to the shared boundaries with both No. 74 and No. 78 Muswell Road. The BRE Guide to Good Practice (Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, BR 209) provides established methodologies for assessing whether an extension will cause unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties. In the absence of a BRE-compliant assessment, the Council has no technical basis on which to conclude that the extension will not cause material harm.

The Council's own validation checklist for householder applications in sensitive locations should require this information, and I request that it be sought from the applicant before determination.

2.2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment

The application form confirms at Section 7 (Trees and Hedges) that there are trees within falling distance of the proposed development and that trees or hedges will need to be removed or pruned. Despite this, no arboricultural impact assessment, tree survey, or tree protection plan has been submitted.

The site lies within a conservation area where **all trees with a trunk diameter of 75mm or more are protected under Section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990**. The applicant is required to give the Council six weeks' notice before carrying out works to any such tree. Without an arboricultural assessment, the Council cannot properly assess the impact of the development on protected trees, nor can it impose appropriate conditions.

I request that a BS 5837:2012 compliant tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment be submitted and consulted upon before determination.

2.3 Ecological Survey – Bats

The property is a Victorian building within a conservation area with mature trees in the rear garden. Victorian roof voids and mature trees are known to provide roosting habitat for bats, which are a European Protected Species. The proposed works involve alterations to the ground floor rear structure in close proximity to the garden and existing trees.

Natural England's standing advice and the CIEEM guidelines recommend that where there is a reasonable likelihood of bats being present, a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) should be undertaken **before** planning permission is granted, not conditioned for later. I request that the Council requires a preliminary roost assessment before determining the application.

2.4 Surface Water Drainage Strategy

The proposed extension will increase the impermeable area at ground floor level, replacing what is currently a mix of garden and paving with a built structure and hard standing. No information has been provided on how surface water from the new roof and surrounding areas will be managed.

Policy DM29 of the Haringey Development Management DPD and Policy SI 13 of the London Plan require developments to incorporate sustainable drainage measures. I request that a surface water drainage strategy, demonstrating compliance with the drainage hierarchy, be submitted before determination.

3. Excessive Depth and Scale – The Extension Exceeds the Approved Scheme at No. 78

The applicant's DAS relies extensively on the approved planning permission at No. 78 Muswell Road (Ref: HGY/2021/1539) as a precedent. However, careful analysis of the submitted block plan (Figure 4.1) and dimensions reveals that **the proposed extension at**

No. 76 is deeper than the approved extension at No. 78. The DAS is misleading in its presentation of this relationship.

The DAS states at Section 4.0 that the extension “aligns on the right-hand side with the neighbouring projection, resulting in an approximate 600mm projection beyond their flank wall.” Put plainly, this means the extension at No. 76 projects **600mm further to the rear than the already-built extension at No. 78.** On the No. 78 side of the building, the proposed extension is therefore approximately **40% deeper** than the approved precedent the applicant relies upon.

The DAS then attempts to deflect from this by drawing a comparison with projection beyond the boundary wall on the No. 74 side (1,200mm proposed vs 1,500mm approved at No. 78). This is a selective and misleading comparison. The relevant measure for assessing scale, massing, and amenity impact is the overall depth from the original rear building line, not the relationship to an intervening side boundary wall. On this proper measure, the proposed extension at No. 76 is demonstrably larger than the approved scheme the applicant cites as justification.

The Council should not accept at face value the DAS’s characterisation of the proposal as “more modest” than the approved scheme at No. 78. It is not. It is deeper, and the applicant has obscured this through selective presentation of dimensions.

4. Harm to Residential Amenity

Notwithstanding that I am not the immediately adjoining neighbour, the impact of the proposed extension on residential amenity – particularly on No. 74 Muswell Road – is a material planning consideration that any member of the public is entitled to raise, and that the Council is required to assess.

4.1 Impact on No. 74 Muswell Road

No. 74 sits approximately 600mm higher than the application site. Despite this level difference, the proposed extension will:

- **Cause Loss of Daylight and Sunlight:** The extension projects 1,200mm beyond the boundary wall on the No. 74 side, at a height of approximately 2,650mm above No. 74’s finished ground level. No technical assessment has been provided to demonstrate that the 25-degree line, 45-degree line, or BRE vertical sky component tests are satisfied. Without this evidence, the Council cannot conclude that the impact is acceptable.
- **Create an Overbearing Sense of Enclosure:** The proposed brick wall of the extension, finished in London yellow brick, will be visible from No. 74’s rear ground floor habitable rooms and immediate garden. The combined effect of depth, height, and proximity to the boundary will materially alter the outlook from these rooms.
- **Set an Unacceptable Precedent:** If approved, the extension at No. 76 – deeper than the already-approved scheme at No. 78 – will establish a pattern of incremental deepening of rear extensions along this terrace. No. 74 could then face pressure from a further extension on their other side, resulting in a “canyoning” effect that progressively degrades the amenity of properties that have not extended.

4.2 Wider Neighbourhood Amenity

The rear gardens of properties on Muswell Road back onto gardens serving properties on Donovan Avenue and neighbouring streets. The progressive loss of rear garden depth and openness caused by ever-deeper extensions along Muswell Road has a cumulative effect on the wider neighbourhood character. While a single extension may appear modest in isolation, the Council should consider the cumulative impact of approving extensions that exceed established precedents.

5. Harm to the Muswell Hill Conservation Area

The Council has a statutory duty under **Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990** to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The following concerns arise:

5.1 Material Mismatch

The existing property at No. 76 is constructed in red brick, consistent with the prevailing character of this terrace group on Muswell Road. The proposed extension specifies London yellow reclaimed brick. While yellow stock brick is found elsewhere in the conservation area, introducing a contrasting material to the rear of a red brick terrace property creates a discordant visual relationship with the host building. The Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal emphasises the importance of material consistency within terrace groups.

5.2 Incremental Erosion of Rear Garden Character

The NPPF (Paragraph 200) and the Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal both recognise the importance of the pattern of development, including rear garden depths and building lines, to the significance of the conservation area. Each successive rear extension along this terrace erodes this pattern. The proposed extension at No. 76, being deeper than the approved scheme at No. 78, represents a further incremental deepening that the Council should resist.

5.3 Less Than Substantial Harm and Public Benefits

The DAS concedes at Section 5.0 that the proposal results in *“less than substantial harm”* to the designated heritage asset. Under **Paragraph 208 of the NPPF**, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The claimed benefits – improved internal layout, increased natural light, and continued residential use – are entirely private benefits to the applicant’s household. They do not constitute public benefits of the kind envisaged by the NPPF. The harm to the conservation area, however modest, is therefore not outweighed and the application should be refused on heritage grounds alone.

6. Construction Impact

No Construction Management Plan or Construction Logistics Plan has been submitted. Given the site’s location on a residential street with on-street parking only, and within a conservation area, the Council should require details of construction traffic management,

working hours, dust and noise mitigation, and temporary storage of materials before granting permission. This is particularly important given the proximity to neighbouring properties on both Muswell Road and the streets to the rear.

If the Council is minded to approve the scheme, I request that a pre-commencement condition requiring a Construction Management Plan be imposed, with the plan to be submitted and approved before any works begin on site.

7. Relevant Policy Framework

The proposal is considered contrary to the following policies:

- **NPPF (December 2024):** Paragraphs 135, 139 (design quality); 200–208 (heritage assets); Paragraph 208 (public benefits must outweigh less than substantial harm).
- **London Plan (2021):** Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach); Policy D14 (Noise); Policy G5 (Urban greening); Policy SI 13 (Sustainable drainage).
- **Haringey Local Plan:** Policy SP11 (Design); Policy SP12 (Conservation).
- **Haringey Development Management DPD:** Policy DM1 (Delivering high quality design); Policy DM9 (Management of the Historic Environment); Policy DM29 (Managing and reducing flood risk).
- **Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal.**
- **BRE Guide BR 209:** Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (as a material technical reference).

8. Summary of Requests

For the reasons set out above, I **object** to this application and make the following specific requests of the Council:

1. **Invalidation or Suspension:** The application should be invalidated or suspended pending correction of the drawing number discrepancy between the application form and the submitted plans. Once corrected, a full 21-day re-consultation should take place.
2. **Further Information:** The applicant should be required to submit a daylight and sunlight assessment, an arboricultural impact assessment (BS 5837:2012), a preliminary ecological appraisal (bats), and a surface water drainage strategy before the application is determined. Each submission should trigger a further consultation period.
3. **Corrected DAS:** The Design, Access & Heritage Statement should be corrected to remove the erroneous reference to Parham Way and to accurately describe the depth of the extension relative to No. 78. A corrected DAS should be re-consulted upon.
4. **Refusal:** If the Council proceeds to determine the application in its current form, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused on grounds of harm to residential amenity, harm to the conservation area, and the failure to demonstrate that public benefits outweigh the identified heritage harm.

5. **Committee Determination:** In the alternative, should officers be minded to recommend approval, I request that the application be referred to the Planning Sub-Committee for determination rather than dealt with under delegated authority. I wish to be notified of any committee date.
6. **Re-consultation:** I request that I am re-consulted on any amended plans, additional information, or revised documents submitted by the applicant at any stage, and that a full 21-day consultation period is provided for each re-consultation.

I reserve the right to submit further representations at any stage, including in response to any amended or additional information submitted by the applicant, any officer report, or any committee agenda.

Yours faithfully,



31 Donovan Avenue

London N10

cc: Councillors for Muswell Hill Ward, Haringey Council

cc: Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association