

Heritage, Planning, Design & Access Statement

Erection of a rear dormer extension.

8 Gladstone Avenue, London, N22 6LS

1. Introduction

1.1 This statement has been prepared in support of a planning application for a modest rear dormer roof extension at 8 Gladstone Avenue, London N22 6LS. The proposal relates to an existing residential property on Gladstone Avenue within the Noel Park Conservation Area. The submitted drawings show a modest rear dormer set in from both sides and the ridge by 500mm and raised 800mm above the eaves, finished in matching slate with a timber-framed window.

1.2 The purpose of this statement is to explain the site context, identify the significance of the heritage asset, describe the design rationale, and demonstrate that the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area while providing a proportionate and carefully integrated form of residential improvement. The assessment has been prepared having regard to the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

2. Site and Surroundings

2.1 Gladstone Avenue forms one of the principal streets within the Noel Park Estate. The Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal identifies Gladstone Avenue as the widest and most important street in the estate hierarchy, containing the largest house type, with strong architectural presence, double-height bay windows and a distinctive roofscape. The appraisal notes that the largest type of house is found on Gladstone Avenue and that the scale, detailing and width of the road set it apart from other streets within the estate.

2.2 The significance of the conservation area derives not simply from individual buildings but from the collective value of the estate as a coherent and planned historic townscape. The appraisal records that houses across the estate are unified by consistent materials and details, including slate roofs, wooden sash windows, terracotta sills and decorative brickwork. It also makes clear that rooflines, chimneys, window proportions and the rhythm of terraces are important contributors to character.

2.3 At the same time, the appraisal recognises that appropriately designed alterations and repairs have been, and will continue to be, necessary to keep the

housing stock in viable modern use. That is an important point here: the issue is not whether change can occur, but whether the change is modest, subservient and sympathetic enough to preserve the area's special interest.



3. The Proposal

3.1 The proposal is for a single rear dormer positioned on the rear roof slope only. As shown on the submitted proposed drawings, the dormer is deliberately modest in form and is set in from both party boundaries and the ridge by 500mm, while also being lifted 800mm above the eaves. This creates a clearly subordinate addition which remains visually contained within the rear roof slope. The dormer is to be clad in matching slate and fitted with a timber-framed window so that the extension sits comfortably within the material language of the host building. Access to the new accommodation is taken internally from the existing stair, with no change to the established residential use of the property.

3.2 The proposal is therefore not an expansive roof enlargement. It is a restrained and conventional rear roof addition, intentionally designed to avoid full-width, full-height or boundary-to-boundary treatment. The principal public-facing form of the house remains dominant, and the intervention is focused to the rear.

3.3 In addition to the rear dormer, the proposal also includes 2 Velux conservation style rooflights installed to the front roof slope. These are modest

in scale, sit flush within the plane of the roof, and are designed as subordinate rooflights rather than prominent features. Their conservation style detailing ensures that they read as discreet additions within the roofscape.

4. Planning Policy Context

4.1 At national level, the National Planning Policy Framework states that good design is fundamental to the planning process. Paragraph 135 requires development to function well, be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character and history, and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. Paragraph 139 also states that development which is not well designed should be refused. In heritage terms, paragraph 207 requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including the contribution of setting; paragraph 210 requires decision-makers to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing significance and of new development making a positive contribution to local character; paragraph 212 requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets; paragraph 215 requires any less than substantial harm to be weighed against public benefits; and paragraph 219 encourages proposals within conservation areas that enhance or better reveal significance.

4.2 At London level, London Plan Policy D3 requires development to follow a design-led approach that responds to site context and identifies the most appropriate form of development for the site. Policy D4 requires design and access statements to demonstrate compliance with London Plan design requirements. Policy HC1 requires a clear understanding of the historic environment and expects planning and design to integrate conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with contextual architectural responses that contribute to significance and sense of place.

4.3 At borough level, Haringey's adopted Development Management DPD is directly relevant. Policy DM1 requires all development to achieve a high standard of design, contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area, relate positively to neighbouring structures, and respond to prevailing form, scale, massing, rhythm, architectural style, detailing and materials. Policy DM9 supports development that conserves and enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting, and requires applicants to explain significance and justify impact. The supporting text to DM9 also stresses that conservation area significance is often derived from townscape, including plot boundaries, street

pattern, building and roof lines, windows, doors and chimneys, and that extensions and alterations should preserve and enhance those qualities. The council's conservation webpage also identifies SP12 of the Strategic Policies Local Plan as requiring conservation of the historic significance of heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment.

4.4 As local guidance, Haringey's own loft-conversions advice states that dormers should generally be located at the back of the property and should be in keeping with the character of the area. The Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan is particularly material here. It emphasises the importance of original slate roofs and advises that replacement slates should match the colour, size, texture and thickness of the originals. It also states that replacement windows should be timber and should carefully match the original design, while accepting there may be more flexibility for rear elevations that are not visible from the street. The council's adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD is also material as borough guidance supporting the Local Plan, although it is not dormer-specific.

5. Heritage Assessment

5.1 The starting point is that this is a designated heritage asset and that great weight must be given to its conservation. That does not mean a blanket prohibition on change. The statutory and policy question is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area, taking proper account of the contribution made by the host building, the terrace, and the wider townscape.

5.2 In this case, the key heritage sensitivities are the established terrace rhythm, the prominence of the principal roof form, the retention of the characteristic roofline, and the use of appropriate materials. The proposal has been designed expressly around those points. The dormer is confined to the rear roof slope, set well in from the sides and ridge, and held above the eaves so that it does not dominate the roof plane or appear as a crude box fixed across the full width of the building. That set-back treatment is precisely what allows it to read as a secondary and recessive intervention rather than a competing roof form.

5.3 That matters particularly in Noel Park because the appraisal identifies building and roof lines as contributors to significance and warns against cumulative erosion of historic detail. This proposal avoids that problem. It does

not alter the principal frontage composition or undermine the defining front roof profile in public views. The roof addition is located to the rear, where it is inherently less sensitive than the front elevation, and it remains subordinate to the main roof. In short, it preserves the legibility of the original building as the dominant element.

5.4 The 2 Velux conservation style rooflights proposed to the front roof slope are similarly modest in scale and flush in profile. Unlike a projecting dormer, they sit within the plane of the existing roof and remain subordinate to the principal roof form. By reason of their limited number, conservation style detailing and discreet appearance, they do not compete with the architectural composition of the host building and do not result in harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

5.5 The material treatment is also right. The use of matching slate directly reflects the Noel Park guidance that roof repairs or replacements should use natural slates that match the originals in colour, size, texture and thickness. Likewise, the use of a timber-framed window aligns with the appraisal's clear preference for wooden replacement windows and with the general conservation principle that new work in sensitive contexts should respect the material and visual language of the host building. Even where rear elevations allow some flexibility, the choice here is to take the more sympathetic route.

5.6 The appraisal also notes that, in some locations, glimpses of rear elevations and rear additions can be visible from the street and can affect character where poorly handled. That is a fair point and it strengthens rather than weakens the case for the submitted design. Because rear alterations can sometimes be perceived obliquely, this dormer has intentionally been designed to be modest, tucked in and materially recessive. It is not a full-width or bulky structure. As a result, even if glimpsed in oblique or longer views, it would read as a limited and sympathetic addition rather than an overbearing or discordant element.

5.7 The applicant's own townscape assessment also identifies at least one larger rear dormer in the wider visual vicinity to the rear at 136 High Road. That does not create an automatic precedent, and it is not relied on as one. But it does indicate that rear roof additions are not alien to the wider rear townscape and that a carefully controlled rear dormer can be accommodated without causing harm to the special interest of the area. Here, the submitted scheme is notably restrained.

5.8 Overall, the proposal results in no harm to the significance of the Noel Park Conservation Area. The extension is modest, subservient, materially sympathetic and located on the rear roof slope. It preserves the host building's primary architectural composition and the wider conservation area's important townscape attributes. The proposal therefore satisfies the section 72 duty and accords with the NPPF heritage tests, London Plan Policy HC1, and Haringey Policies SP12, DM1 and DM9.

6. Design Assessment

6.1 From a pure design perspective, the proposal is straightforward and proportionate. The amount of development is limited to what is reasonably necessary to improve the roof space. The scale has been carefully moderated by the side set-ins, ridge set-in and raised eaves line. The form is simple and secondary. The materials are chosen to blend with the existing building rather than announce themselves as an unrelated insert. The proposal therefore responds positively to the host building and terrace and complies with the design-led principles of the NPPF, London Plan Policies D3 and D4, and Haringey Policy DM1.

6.2 It is also important that the proposal reflects how good conservation design works in practice. The objective is not pastiche, nor is it aggressive contrast for its own sake. The objective is a contemporary but quiet intervention that respects the proportions, materials and established hierarchy of the original building. This proposal does exactly that. It is legible as a later addition, but one that is deferential to the original form and character of the house.

7. Residential Amenity

7.1 The proposal is modest in scale and positioned wholly within the roof form. By its nature, it will not generate any meaningful increase in bulk at lower levels, and it does not introduce the sort of projection associated with larger rear extensions. Given its rear position and contained scale, it is not considered to give rise to material overshadowing, loss of outlook or overbearing effects to neighbouring properties. Rear-facing loft windows of this kind are also a conventional residential arrangement and would not create an unusual or unacceptable overlooking relationship in this urban context.

8. Design and Access

8.1 The proposal does not alter the use of the property, which remains residential. The amount of development is modest and limited to the roof. The layout change is internal, achieved through continuation of the existing circulation pattern via an internal stair to the loft level. There is no change to the established means of access to the property at street level. The proposal therefore has no adverse effect on access arrangements and preserves the existing access characteristics of the dwelling.

9. Conclusion

9.1 The proposed rear dormer at 8 Gladstone Avenue is a carefully judged and modest form of development. It has been deliberately designed to sit comfortably within the rear roof slope, with appropriate set-ins from the sides, ridge and eaves, and with matching slate cladding and a timber-framed window. The proposal respects the architectural character of the host building, preserves the terrace's roof composition, and safeguards the special character and appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area.

9.2 For those reasons, the proposal complies with the statutory duty in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, with the design and heritage provisions of the NPPF, with London Plan Policies D3, D4 and HC1, and with Haringey's local heritage and design policies, in particular SP12, DM1 and DM9. Planning permission should therefore be granted.