



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0180
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	First Floor Flat, 133 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London, N15 4JR
Proposal:	Loft conversion with erection of a half-mansard roof extension with 1no. skylight.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	31/01/2026
Applicant:	Mr Aidan Pearson
Agent:	

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is a first floor and second floor level self-contained flat in a three storey mid-terraced residential property on the south side of Philip Lane. The roof is a shallow hipped roof with a parapet wall to the front. It is within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area and is a locally listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a loft conversion with erection of a half-mansard roof extension with 1no. skylight.

The half mansard dormer has been setback from the façade of the front projection by 3.42m. It would be 1.24m above the ridge with the front part of the existing roof being retained. Following the pre-application advice, the pitch on the rear wall of the mansard dormer has been changed from 80 degrees to 70 degrees. The dormer would be full width within the parapets on either side of the roof, with a flat roof and 1no. skylight above the staircase.

The proposed development would provide a fourth bedroom. However, this might be an error because it appears that there would be three bedrooms in total in the proposed development.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

OLD/1971/0974
Address: 133, Philip Lane, N15
Proposal: Conversion into 2 self-contained flats.
Decision Date: 25 August 1971
Decision: Approve with Conditions

PRE/2025/0278

Address: First Floor Flat, 133 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London, N15 4JR

Proposal: loft conversion project

Received Date: 25 September 2025

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

LBH Conservation Officer: The proposed upwards extension is an inappropriate addition. It is a bulky addition, visible from the surrounds which and has no relationship to the building below. It would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the building which would detract from the C19 design of the terrace, with its carefully proportioned floors and openings. The extension would also disrupt the definition of the chimney stacks and the pitched roof element and would be visually subsumed into the bulk of the new floor behind. Whilst the extension has been set back from the front it would still be a visible and incongruous addition and this does not mitigate the identified harm.

The proposed additional storey would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area as it would be a prominent and incongruous addition which would be eroding the design and form of the distinctive locally listed C19 terrace, and its contribution as part of the distinctive streetscape. As the Clyde Circus Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits, in line with S72 of the L(PLBCA)A, local plan policy DM(9) and paragraphs 212,213, 215 of the NPPF. The proposal would also be considered to cause some harm to the significance of the adjacent locally listed building, and this harm would need to be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme in accordance with DM(9) and NPPF paragraph 216.

Accordingly, Conservation would object to this application.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations:

Clyde Circus Area RA: Objection – There are no other roof extensions of this type in the row so there is no planning precedent. It also creates planning precedent across the area. Note all the other roofs have velux type windows set into them. Or have the space extending to the lower rear of the property so do not impact the visuals.

Neighbour Consultation

No representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application.

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design, appearance, and impact on conservation area

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, the policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

Following pre-application advice, the angle of the rear wall has changed from 80 degrees to 70 degrees but this only to rear. So the from the front it would appear as a box dormer due to the 90 degrees angles on the side walls and front wall of the dormer.

As stated by the Conservation Officer, the proposed upwards extension is an inappropriate addition. It is a bulky addition, visible from the surroundings, which has no relationship to the building below. It would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the building which would detract from the C19 design of the terrace, with its carefully proportioned floors and openings. The extension would also disrupt the definition of the chimney stacks and the pitched roof element and would be visually subsumed into the bulk of the new floor behind. Whilst the extension has been set back from the front it would still be a visible and incongruous addition, and this does not mitigate the identified harm.

The proposed additional storey would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area as it would be a prominent and incongruous addition which would be eroding the design and form of the distinctive locally listed C19 terrace, and its contribution as part of the distinctive streetscape. The proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Overall, the proposal would be unacceptable in heritage terms.

The proposed roof extension, by reason of the unnecessary introduction of an incongruous feature, would introduce a discordant feature to the elevations of the building and would detract from the visual continuity of the street scene and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area. The proposed development, if approved, would seriously detract from the important character to the detriment of the vicinity contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The proposed roof extension would not lead to overlooking and loss of privacy, therefore it would not have an impact on neighbouring amenity.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DM1, DM9, and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character and appearance of the site and surrounding street scene and conservation area. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for refusal subject to the following reasons.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of the introduction of an incongruous feature, would introduce a discordant feature to the elevations of the building and would detract from the visual continuity of the street scene and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area. The proposed development would be a bulky, discordant, and incongruous addition that would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area to its detriment and would be contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.