

# Planning Statement

2 Lealand Road,  
Tottenham,  
London N15 6JS

13 July 2026

## 1. Introduction

This Statement accompanies a full planning application for the erection of a single-storey wrap-around rear extension at 2 Lealand Road, Tottenham, London N15 6JS.

The application follows the refusal of application HGY/2025/2988 on 5 February 2026 and takes account of the significant change to the site's lawful planning position brought about by two subsequent decisions of the Local Planning Authority: the amalgamation approval HGY/2025/1501 (14 August 2025), and the grant of a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use in HGY/2026/1362 (9 July 2026) in respect of an extensive programme of Class A permitted development at the property.

The scheme is presented on the basis that the property is, and will remain, a single-family C3 dwellinghouse. No sub-division into flats is proposed. The Statement demonstrates that each of the three grounds of refusal recorded in HGY/2025/2988 is no longer capable of arising or, insofar as it does arise, cannot rationally be maintained in light of the Council's own certification of the lawful fallback.

## 2. Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwellinghouse on the south side of Lealand Road, at its junction with the High Road (A10). The property is not located within a conservation area and is not within the curtilage of a listed building. It sits within the South Tottenham CPZ and enjoys a PTAL rating of 6a.

The rear garden of the site is bounded on three sides by neighbouring properties, all of which have themselves been substantially extended:

To the east, the immediately attached neighbour at 4 Lealand Road carries a substantial two-storey rear outrigger which projects beyond the rear building line of the application property. To the south and west, the rear gardens of the properties fronting the High Road

(including 108A High Road immediately adjoining) are occupied by a continuous run of single-storey rear extensions built up to the shared plot boundary. Aerial photography of the site and its surroundings is provided at Appendix A.

The character of the immediate context is therefore one of comprehensively extended residential curtilages. The proposal is made against that established grain of development rather than into an unencumbered or open boundary condition.

### 3. Planning History

The relevant planning history is as follows:

**HGY/2025/1501** — Amalgamation of two existing self-contained flats into one single 3-bedroom dwelling house (Class C3 Use). Approved with conditions, 14 August 2025. This decision establishes the extant lawful use of the property as a single C3 dwellinghouse.

**HGY/2025/2524** — Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed erection of a dormer extension to the rear roof and 2-storey outrigger. Certified as Permitted Development, 30 October 2025.

**HGY/2025/2988** — Erection of ground floor single storey wraparound extension. Refused, 5 February 2026. This is the decision to which the present application responds.

**HGY/2025/2989** — Erection of additional level at roof level with a pitched roof (Type 3 extension) with 4no. rooflights and erection of two-storey side extension. Approved with conditions, 23 April 2026.

**HGY/2026/1362** — Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed use: erection of single storey rear extension from rear outrigger rear wall; single storey side/rear extension from rear outrigger side wall; single storey side extension from flank wall of the main house. Certified as Permitted Development, 9 July 2026. This decision is fundamental to the assessment of the present application and is addressed in detail at Section 5 below.

### 4. Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single-storey wrap-around rear extension to the existing C3 dwellinghouse. The extension takes the form and position shown in red on the submitted drawings (drawing series E00–E09 and P01–P09, dated 11 May 2026).

The proposed ground floor GIA is 79.85 sqm. Of that footprint, **64.66 sqm** is the lawful fallback certified in HGY/2026/1362. The additional element for which planning permission is sought is therefore approximately **15.2 sqm**, occupying the flank of the property adjoining the rear gardens of the High Road properties. The additional element completes the geometry of the wrap-around so that it reads as a single coherent element rather than the three legibly-separate Class A pieces certified under the LDC.

The extension is single storey. It does not exceed the eaves height of the host dwelling and is entirely subordinate in scale. The materials will match the existing dwelling. No conversion to self-contained flats is proposed.

## 5. The Extant Lawful Fallback

The controlling context for this application is the Council's own certification of the lawful fallback. On 9 July 2026, in HGY/2026/1362, the Local Planning Authority certified as Permitted Development a three-part single-storey extension package comprising a 3m rear extension from the outrigger rear wall, a 1.96m side/infill extension from the outrigger side wall, and a single-storey side extension from the flank wall of the main house.

In arriving at that certification the Council calculated the increase in ground floor footprint as follows:

*"Existing Ground Floor = 42.07 sqm. Proposed Ground Floor = 64.66 sqm.  
64.66 – 42.07 = 22.59 sqm is the increase ... 22.59 / 90.52 x 100 = 24.95%  
increase so around 75.05% (67.93 sqm) remaining. Complies."*

The Council further confirmed that each of Class A limbs (a) to (k) is satisfied, and that the physical form of the three extensions — including the side extension from the flank wall — is lawful. That form may be implemented at any time and requires no further consent.

The relevance of that fallback to the present application is twofold. First, it fixes as lawful and implementable a substantial three-part single-storey extension whose physical envelope is materially identical to that now proposed, differing only in the completion of a corner. Second, applying the *Mansell* and *Samuel Smith Old Brewery* principles, the lawful fallback carries significant material weight in the planning balance, because it represents a genuine and realistic alternative that the applicant is entitled to build out.

The material planning question is not whether a substantial single-storey extension should be permitted at this site — that question has already been answered in the affirmative by the LPA. The narrower question is whether the completion of the geometry, adding approximately 15.2 sqm to the certified 22.59 sqm, causes any harm that the fallback does not.

## 6. Prevailing Pattern of Development

The aerial evidence at Appendix A shows that the rear gardens of properties along this section of Lealand Road, and the rear gardens of the properties fronting the High Road backing onto them, are comprehensively occupied by ground-floor rear extensions. The adjoining neighbour at 4 Lealand Road is extended at both floors. The properties on the High Road backs have built a continuous run of flat-roofed single-storey rear extensions up to the shared boundary.



In these circumstances a single-storey wrap-around extension at 2 Lealand Road is entirely characteristic of the established pattern. It does not, and cannot rationally be found to, represent development out of character with the prevailing form.

## 7. Planning Assessment

The three refusal reasons in HGY/2025/2988 are addressed in turn.

### Reason for Refusal 1 — Character and Appearance

*"The side extension by reason of its excessive depth, height and detailed design would dominate the host property and be out of character with the application site and the prevailing pattern of development. As such it is, contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM12, and London Plan Policy D6."*

The physical form now proposed is materially the same 3m single-storey extension the same Case Officer subsequently certified as lawful under Class A on 9 July 2026. The Officer having accepted, in the Council's own name, that a 3m single-storey side and rear extension package at this property is lawful in principle and complies with Class A limits including the height, eaves, boundary and highway limbs, it is not open to the Council rationally to maintain that the same 3m single-storey envelope is nonetheless excessive in depth or height for the purposes of DM1, DM12 or D6.

The consistency principle in *North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 65 P&CR 137 requires like cases to be decided alike, and requires an officer or Inspector who departs from an earlier decision on materially the same facts to give reasons for doing so. The Council cannot properly find that the same 3m single-storey extension is unacceptable in February and lawful in July.

As to the wider character point, Section 6 above and the aerial evidence at Appendix A demonstrate that comprehensive rear and side extension is the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate context. The proposal accords with that pattern and is compliant with London Plan Policy D6 and Haringey DPD Policies DM1 and DM12.

### Reason for Refusal 2 — Loss of Family Housing

*"The proposed conversion of this single-family dwelling into 2no. self-contained flats, by virtue of its insufficient original un-extended floorspace size and absence of a family-sized unit, would result in unacceptable loss of family housing without replacement for which there is an identified need. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM16 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017)."*

This ground of refusal does not arise on the present application. The extant lawful use of the property, established by HGY/2025/1501, is a single C3 dwellinghouse. The application does not propose, and the drawings do not show, any sub-division into self-contained flats. Policy DM16, which is directed at conversions to small self-contained flats within a

Family Housing Protection Zone, has no application to a proposal that leaves the property as a single family dwelling.

Reason for Refusal 2 accordingly falls away in its entirety.

## Reason for Refusal 3 — Standard of Accommodation

*"The proposed development, by reason of its poor layout in Flat 01, insufficient floorspace, lack of outlook and light in the sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to London Plan policy D6, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan and policy DM16 of the Haringey Development Management Plan."*

This ground of refusal likewise does not arise on the present application. There is no Flat 01. There are no flats. The accommodation is that of a single family dwellinghouse with a bedroom, living room, kitchen/dining/living area, hallway, playing area, bathroom, and storage at ground floor level, together with the existing bedrooms and bathroom at first floor. The London Plan Table 3.1 minimum floorspace standards for self-contained units are not engaged.

Reason for Refusal 3 accordingly falls away in its entirety.

## Neighbouring Amenity

Neighbouring amenity did not form part of the reasons for refusal in HGY/2025/2988 but is addressed here for completeness.

The additional element for which permission is sought sits along the shared boundary with the rear gardens of the properties fronting the High Road, in particular 108A High Road. As shown on the aerial photograph at Appendix A, that neighbour has itself been substantially extended along this shared boundary with a large single-storey flat-roofed rear extension already sitting hard against the plot line. The proposal does not therefore introduce built form into an unencumbered or open boundary condition; it sits alongside existing neighbouring built form of comparable footprint and equivalent single-storey height.

In these circumstances the usual concerns of overbearing effect, enclosure and boundary intrusion cannot properly arise. No habitable window of any neighbour is affected by the additional element beyond what is already the case as a result of the neighbours' own extensions. Sunlight, daylight and outlook to neighbouring rear windows are unaffected. There is no overlooking, no loss of privacy, and no material change to the boundary condition already accepted by these neighbours' own development.

As to 4 Lealand Road, the extension along that shared boundary is entirely within the lawful Class A envelope certified in HGY/2026/1362 and the amenity relationship on that boundary is already fixed by that certification.

## 8. Conclusion

The scheme now before the Council is materially different in character from that considered under HGY/2025/2988. Two of the three refusal reasons — loss of family housing and sub-standard accommodation — fall away entirely because no conversion to flats is proposed. The third — character and appearance — cannot rationally be maintained in light of the Council's own certification of essentially the same physical envelope as lawful Permitted Development in HGY/2026/1362, on 9 July 2026.

The proposal represents the completion of the geometry of a lawful three-part Class A extension into a single coherent wrap-around, adding approximately 15.2 sqm to the certified 22.59 sqm fallback. It is entirely consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate context, causes no material additional impact on neighbouring amenity beyond that already lawful under the fallback and already accepted as a matter of the neighbours' own development, and complies with London Plan Policy D6 and Haringey DPD Policies DM1 and DM12.

Planning permission should be granted.

Planning Beyond Limits