

HERITAGE STATEMENT

Statement of Significance and Assessment of Impact

Erection of a single-storey rear and side extension, with changes to the first-floor rear roof and internal remodelling

68 Nightingale Road, Wood Green, London N22 8PP

Site address	68 Nightingale Road, Wood Green, London N22 8PP
Local planning authority	London Borough of Haringey
Designated heritage asset	Bowes Park Conservation Area (designated 29 November 1994)
Adopted character appraisal	None adopted for this conservation area
Listed building status	Not listed; not locally listed; not identified as a building of individual significance

1. INTRODUCTION, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

- 1.1** This Heritage Statement is submitted in support of a householder planning application at 68 Nightingale Road, Wood Green, London N22 8PP, for the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension, changes to the roof of the first-floor rear back addition, and associated internal remodelling.
- 1.2** Policy DM9(B) of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) requires applicants to submit, with a planning application affecting a designated heritage asset, a statement describing the significance of the asset concerned, including any contribution made by its setting, together with an assessment and justification of the impact of the development on that significance. Policy HE4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026) is to the same effect. This statement discharges that requirement.
- 1.3** The designated heritage asset engaged is the Bowes Park Conservation Area, designated on 29 November 1994. The application building is not statutorily listed, is not included on Haringey's local list, and is not identified as a building of individual significance. There is no adopted conservation area character appraisal or management plan for Bowes Park; the significance of the area is accordingly assessed in this statement from first principles.

Methodology

- 1.4** Significance has been assessed using the heritage values set out in Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (2008) — evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value — and applying the approach in Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 2, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment, and Historic England Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance. The contribution of setting has been considered using the staged approach in Good Practice Advice Note 3, The Setting of Heritage Assets.
- 1.5** The assessment proceeds in four stages, in accordance with GPA 2: understanding the significance of the affected asset; understanding the impact of the proposal on that significance; avoiding or minimising conflict; and looking for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance.
- 1.6** The level of detail in this statement is proportionate to the importance of the asset and to the scale of the proposal, as paragraph 2.58 of the Development Management DPD requires. The proposal is a modest, entirely rear-facing householder extension to an unlisted building that is a typical rather than an exceptional example of its type.

Sources

- 1.7** This statement draws on: a site inspection of the property and its immediate context; the existing and proposed drawings prepared by Metta Design Consultancy Ltd (drawings A-001 to A-008); the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies and Development Management DPD; the Haringey conservation areas register; the Greater London Historic Environment Record; the National Heritage List for England; and historic Ordnance Survey mapping of the area.

2. LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

Statute

- 2.1** Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, in the exercise of planning functions with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The duty is one of preservation or enhancement; preservation in this context means doing no harm, and a proposal that leaves the character and appearance of an area unharmed satisfies the duty.
- 2.2** Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National policy

- 2.3** The National Planning Policy Framework published on 17 August 2026 restructured national heritage policy. The phrase "less than substantial harm" no longer appears. Policy HE5 requires the effect of a proposal on the significance of a heritage asset to be assessed and articulated as positive, none, harm, substantial harm or total loss. Policy HE6 applies to designated heritage assets and provides that any harm to significance is a matter of considerable importance and weight, with a stricter refusal rule where substantial harm or total loss is found. Policy HE9 contains the dedicated policy for conservation areas. The Framework expressly confirms that it does not displace the statutory duties imposed by the 1990 Act.
- 2.4** The significance of the assessment sequence for this application is that no balancing exercise arises unless harm is first identified under HE5. As set out at Section 6, no harm arises here.

Development plan

- 2.5** Policy SP12 of the Strategic Policies Local Plan seeks to protect and positively manage the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, including their immediate and wider setting. Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) requires development to conserve and take account of the significance of heritage assets.
- 2.6** Policy DM9 of the Development Management DPD gives local effect to national policy. Policy DM9(A) supports development that conserves and enhances the significance of a heritage asset and its setting. Policy DM9(C) sets out the considerations to which the Council will have regard, including the preservation or reinstatement of original or historic form, fabric, function or character. Policy DM9(D) supports the sensitive redevelopment of sites and buildings which detract from the character and appearance of a conservation area. Policy DM9(E) requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings in conservation areas to complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and not to appear overbearing or intrusive.
- 2.7** The supporting text is directly relevant. Paragraph 2.64 records that the significance of a conservation area derives much more from its townscape than from its individual buildings, and that not all elements of a conservation area contribute to its significance; their replacement or alteration can represent opportunities for enhancement. It concludes that the emphasis is to guide and manage development, not to prevent it. Paragraph 2.66 records that conservation areas can be enhanced through the removal of buildings or features that detract from the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 2.60 records that the Council takes a positive view of

development and change where this is consistent with conservation objectives, consistent with Historic England's Constructive Conservation principles.

3. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1** The land now occupied by Bowes Park formed part of the rural fringe of Middlesex until the later nineteenth century, in an area historically associated with the manor of Bowes, recorded from the medieval period and shown as Bowes Farm and Bowes Manor on nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey mapping. Until then the area was farmland and market gardens serving London.
- 3.2** The character of the area was transformed by the arrival of suburban railway services in the later nineteenth century. From the 1880s onwards the fields were laid out and sold for speculative development, and the district was built out rapidly with regular grids of two-storey terraced housing served by local shopping streets, of which Myddleton Road remains the principal example within the conservation area. The pattern of development is characteristic of London's outer Victorian and Edwardian rail suburbs: narrow, deep plots at consistent frontage widths; continuous terraces on a common building line; and long rear gardens.
- 3.3** Nightingale Road belongs to this phase of development. It was laid out as part of the same speculative expansion and built up with two-storey terraced houses of consistent design, materials and plot width, following the standard London terrace plan of two principal rooms per floor to the main body of the house with a two-storey back addition and a residual side return to the rear.
- 3.4** The area was designated as the Bowes Park Conservation Area on 29 November 1994 in recognition of the coherence and completeness of this late Victorian and Edwardian suburban townscape. No character appraisal has been adopted; the most recent focused heritage work relates to Myddleton Road, which was the subject of a feasibility study undertaken as part of a Historic England partnership scheme.
- 3.5** Like the great majority of houses of its type and date, 68 Nightingale Road has been altered over more than a century of continuous domestic occupation. The most significant alteration is the addition, at an unknown but clearly later date, of a single-storey lean-to at the rear beyond the original back addition, housing a ground floor bathroom and separate shower room. This is a functional accretion, poorly constructed and without architectural pretension, of a kind found throughout the terrace and the wider area. It is a record of the twentieth-century adaptation of Victorian housing to modern sanitary expectations, but it is not itself of heritage interest.

4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BOWES PARK CONSERVATION AREA

- 4.1** The significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area is communal, historical and, principally, aesthetic. It resides in the survival of a legible and coherent late Victorian and Edwardian suburban townscape, developed within a short period to a consistent pattern, and still read as a whole.
- 4.2** The attributes that carry that significance can be identified with precision.
- Historical value. The area is direct physical evidence of the rail-driven suburbanisation of north London in the later nineteenth century, and of the speculative housebuilding economy that produced it. That value is carried by the street layout, the plot pattern and the consistency of the housing stock, all of which survive intact.

- Aesthetic value. The area’s visual quality is collective rather than individual. It comes from the repetition and rhythm of the street elevations: a consistent building line, uniform two-storey height, regular narrow plot widths, the repeated proportion and placing of window and door openings, surviving chimney stacks punctuating the roofline, and a coherent palette of brick, slate and painted joinery to the street frontage. Front boundary treatments, forecourts and the relationship of the terraces to the street contribute to this.
 - Communal value. The area retains its original residential function and remains a settled, continuously occupied residential neighbourhood, with Myddleton Road serving as its historic local centre.
 - Evidential value. This is limited. The buildings are standard speculative products, well documented as a type, and the site is not within an Archaeological Priority Area.
- 4.3** Paragraph 2.64 of the Development Management DPD states the point directly: the significance of a conservation area derives much more from its townscape than from individual buildings, and the proportion of windows, doors and chimney stacks adds to the rhythm of street frontages.
- 4.4** It follows that the significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area is concentrated overwhelmingly in what is seen from the public realm. Rear elevations and rear gardens make a very different and much more limited contribution. They are private and enclosed, screened by the buildings themselves and by boundary treatments, and are not appreciable from any public vantage point. They have also, throughout the area, absorbed more than a century of organic change: rear extensions, infilled side returns, re-roofed back additions and outbuildings are commonplace and unremarkable. The rear townscape of this block is characterised by that accumulated adaptation, not by uniformity.

5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APPLICATION BUILDING

- 5.1** 68 Nightingale Road is a two-storey terraced dwellinghouse of the standard type described above, constructed in brick beneath a double-pitched roof of approximately 30 degrees to each slope, with a ridge at 7.96 m above site datum and retained chimney stacks. The front elevation is a regular two-window-wide composition with an arched-headed entrance door.
- 5.2** The building is a positive but unexceptional contributor to the conservation area. Its value is almost entirely as one unit within a group: it contributes by conforming, not by distinction. Individually it possesses no architectural or historic interest that would justify separate designation, and it has not been locally listed.
- 5.3** The contribution made by individual elements of the building varies markedly. Table 1 grades each element, applying the approach recommended at paragraph 2.59 of the Development Management DPD, which expects applicants to identify those elements of highest, moderate and low significance and those that detract.

Table 1 — Grading of the elements of the application building

Element	Contribution to significance	Reason
Front elevation, openings and entrance door	High	Read from Nightingale Road as part of the collective terrace composition; carries the rhythm and proportion that give the area its aesthetic value
Position on the building line and plot width	High	Establishes the urban grain and continuity of the terrace
Front roof slope, ridge line and chimney stacks	High	Punctuate and define the roofline seen from the street
Front forecourt and boundary treatment	Moderate	Contributes to the setting of the terrace within the street scene
Two-storey scale and overall massing	Moderate to high	Consistency of height is a defining attribute of the area
Historic plan form of the front of the house	Moderate	Two principal rooms per floor with a side entrance hall and stair is characteristic of the type, though not publicly appreciable
Two-storey rear back addition (structure)	Low to moderate	Original to the plan type but wholly private and of no architectural quality
Shallow-pitched roof over the back addition	Low	A functional covering laid at approximately 11 degrees, of no architectural quality and entirely concealed from public view
Open side return	None	A residual strip approximately 1 m wide, permanently shaded, of no architectural or heritage interest
Single-storey rear lean-to	Detracts	A later, poorly constructed accretion of no architectural merit; the kind of feature paragraph 2.66 of the DM DPD identifies as an opportunity for enhancement through removal
Rear garden	Low	Contributes to the open character of the block interior; retained in substantial part

5.4 The setting of the asset has been considered in accordance with GPA 3. The relevant setting of the conservation area, so far as it is affected by this proposal, is the street scene of Nightingale Road and the views along and across it. The proposal makes no change of any kind to anything seen from that setting.

6. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON SIGNIFICANCE

- 6.1** The proposal comprises the demolition of the single-storey lean-to and the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension; the replacement of the shallow-pitched roof over the two-storey back addition with a flat roof at the same height; and internal remodelling. Table 2 assesses the effect of each element against the graded significance set out in Table 1.

Table 2 — Assessment of effect under Policy HE5

Element of the proposal	Element of significance affected	Assessed effect
Demolition of the single-storey rear lean-to	An element assessed as detracting	Positive. Removal of a poor-quality later accretion of no architectural merit
Single-storey rear extension, flat roof at 3.25 m	None. The extension occupies ground already built upon and the private rear of the plot	None. Not visible from the public realm; no height added; no historic fabric of significance lost
Infilling of the side return, mono-pitch roof at 16°	An element assessed as making no contribution	None. A residual strip of no heritage value is put to use
Replacement of the back addition roof with a flat roof at +5.840 m	An element assessed as of low significance	None. The new roof sits at exactly the height of the roof it replaces; no increase in height, footprint or volume; not visible from the public realm
Internal remodelling at ground floor rear	None. The historic plan form of the front of the house is untouched	None. Entrance hall, stair and both front rooms retained in position
Internal remodelling at first floor rear	None. Bedrooms 1 and 2 and their window relationships are untouched	None. Works confined to the rear room within its existing footprint
Materials and detailing	Materials palette of the host building	Positive. London stock brick matched in colour, size and texture with lime-based mortar matched to the existing joint; natural slate to the mono-pitch matched to the existing roof covering
Front elevation, roof slope, ridge, chimneys, forecourt and boundary	The elements graded High and Moderate in Table 1	None. No alteration of any kind is proposed to any of them

The four tests of GPA 2

- 6.2** Understanding significance. Sections 4 and 5 above set out the significance of the conservation area and the graded contribution of the elements of the application building.
- 6.3** Understanding the impact. The proposal affects only those elements graded as making no contribution, low contribution, or as detracting. It affects no element graded as of high or moderate significance. It removes no historic fabric of significance, alters no publicly appreciable feature, and adds no height at any point on the building.
- 6.4** Avoiding or minimising conflict. Conflict has been designed out rather than mitigated after the event. The extension is confined to the rear and to ground already occupied by built form. The first-

floor roof is set at exactly the height of the roof it replaces rather than raised, which is the least intrusive means of achieving a usable head height in that room; a pitched alternative achieving the same internal height would necessarily have added between 0.6 m and 0.9 m of additional bulk at first floor level. Daylight to the deeper part of the plan is taken through flush rooflights rather than through new openings in flank walls. The two-storey element is re-roofed but not enlarged.

- 6.5** Opportunities to enhance. Two arise and both are taken. The unsympathetic lean-to is removed and replaced with well-detailed brickwork matched to the host building, which is precisely the kind of enhancement contemplated by Policy DM9(D) and paragraph 2.66 of the Development Management DPD. Two incoherent shallow-pitched roof coverings at the rear are replaced by a simpler and quieter arrangement, rationalising a rear roofscape that has accumulated without design.

Cumulative effect

- 6.6** Paragraph 2.61 of the Development Management DPD records that the incremental loss of architectural and other design details has a cumulative negative impact on the integrity of the historic environment. That concern is not engaged here. The proposal removes no architectural detail of any kind. Every feature of the building that carries the character of the area — the front elevation and its openings, the front roof slope, the ridge, the chimney stacks, the front boundary — is retained untouched. The proposal is a rear addition of a type the block has absorbed repeatedly without erosion of its character, and it does not set a precedent for any alteration to a publicly visible feature.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1** The significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area is carried by the street-facing townscape of its terraces: the building line, the uniform two-storey height, the regular plot widths, the rhythm of window and door openings, the chimney stacks and the coherent materials palette of the street elevations. That significance is concentrated in what is seen from the public realm.
- 7.2** This proposal does not touch a single element of it. The front elevation, front roof slope, ridge, chimney stacks, forecourt and front boundary are all retained exactly as existing. No part of the proposal is visible from Nightingale Road or from any other public vantage point. There is no increase in height anywhere on the building: the main ridge remains at 7.96 m and the back addition roof remains at 5.84 m.
- 7.3** The elements of the building that are affected are those graded in Table 1 as making no contribution to significance, a low contribution, or as actively detracting. The proposal removes a poor-quality later lean-to and replaces it with a carefully detailed brick addition in matched materials, and it rationalises an incoherent rear roofscape.
- 7.4** Applying the assessment required by Policy HE5 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the effect of the proposal on the significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area is assessed as none to positive. No harm arises. It follows that the decision route at Policy HE6, under which any harm to a designated heritage asset is a matter of considerable importance and weight, is not engaged, and no balancing of harm against public benefit falls to be undertaken.
- 7.5** The requirements of Policies DM9(A), (B), (C), (D) and (E) are met in full, as are Policy SP12 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan. The statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is discharged: the character and appearance of the Bowes Park

Conservation Area are preserved in full, and are modestly enhanced by the removal of a detracting feature and the tidying of the rear roofscape.

- 7.6** The proposal is exactly the kind of sensitive, well-managed change that paragraph 2.64 of the Development Management DPD contemplates when it records that the emphasis of conservation area policy is to guide and manage development, not to prevent it.