

Planning & Heritage Statement

Replacement Windows,
Bifold Doors and Balustrade
AT
22b Talbot Road,
London N6 4QR

Reference:
22TR-3235

Date:
6 October 2026

1. Introduction

a. This Planning and Heritage Statement has been prepared by Just Planning on behalf of Ms Sally Carver in support of an application for the retention of replacement windows to the front and rear dormers at 22B Talbot Road, together with an enlarged rear dormer opening, bifold doors and glass balustrade. The application also proposes the re-routing of the rear rainwater pipe.

b. The property is a second-floor flat in a mid-terrace house on the western side of Talbot Road. It lies within the Highgate Conservation Area and is not listed.

c. The works were carried out as part of a wider refurbishment of the flat, in the belief that they were permitted development. On discovering that they were not, the applicant immediately submitted a retrospective application (reference: HGY/2026/0972), which the council refused on 28 May 2026.

d. Since the refusal, the applicant has sought pre-application advice from the council, and the front dormer window has been painted white. The current application seeks to retain the windows in their present finishes and proposes the re-routing of the rear rainwater pipe to improve the appearance of the rear elevation.

e. This statement considers the significance of the conservation area and the contribution made by the application building, addresses the concerns raised in the refusal and subsequent pre-application advice, and demonstrates that the development preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area and accords with the development plan read as a whole.

2. Site and Background

a. The application property is a second-floor flat within number 22 Talbot Road, a three-storey mid-terrace house on the western side of the road, which has been converted into self-contained flats. The flat has one dormer window to the front and two to the rear.

b. Number 22 is one of a group of houses on the western side of Talbot Road that were rebuilt in 1948 following bomb damage during the Second World War. The houses in this group are of red brick with tiled roofs and are plainer in form and detail than the surviving Edwardian houses on the street.

c. On the front elevation, the ground and first floors have a mixture of original single-glazed steel Crittall windows and white uPVC replacement windows dating from the 1980s. The second-floor dormer window was not original: it was also a white uPVC unit installed in the 1980s. The difference in design and appearance between the dormer window and the steel windows below is shown in figure 1, taken before the recent works.



Figure 1: Photograph of the front of the building, taken prior to recent works.

d. The front dormer window has been replaced with a powder-coated aluminium casement in a three-part arrangement. As installed, it was finished in Slate Grey RAL 7015, as shown in figure 2. This was its appearance when the previous application was determined.



Figure 2: Replacement front dormer window as installed and considered in the previous application.

e. The window has since been finished in white, as shown in figure 3, on the next page.



Figure 3: Front dormer window following painting of the frame in white.

f. On the rear elevation, the lower floors contain larger openings, including doors serving a first-floor balcony. Before the recent works, both second-floor dormer openings contained non-original white uPVC windows dating from the 1980s. Viewed from the garden, the right-hand opening has been enlarged by lowering the cill and fitted with grey aluminium bifold doors and a clear glass balustrade. The balustrade guards the opening; there is no external platform or terrace. The left-hand window has been replaced with a grey aluminium casement. The rear elevation as altered is shown in figure 4, on the next page.

g. The rear elevation is not visible from Talbot Road. It faces neighbouring gardens containing mature trees and planting. The nearest property opposite the rear elevation, on North Hill, is approximately 45 metres away across the intervening gardens.



Figure 4: Rear elevation following the alterations, from a photograph submitted by a neighbour in response to the previous application.

h. Talbot Road contains a mixture of surviving Edwardian houses and post-war replacement buildings. Window designs vary along the street, including decorative timber sash windows, steel casements and later replacement units. The variety in architectural treatments and finishes across the street, as shown in figure 5, below, is part of its established character.



Figure 5: There is considerable variation in the front elevations of the buildings along the street.

i. As the satellite image in figure 6, below, shows, there is even greater variation in windows, doors and balcony features to the rear of the row.



Figure 6: There is even greater variety in the rear elevation treatments.

3. Planning History

a. Planning permission was granted on 8 January 1979 for the conversion of the maisonette occupying the first and second floors of number 22 into two self-contained flats (reference: OLD/1979/1342). Permission was granted on 14 October 2003 for a single-storey rear conservatory extension with new stairs into the garden (reference: HGY/2003/1393).

b. On 28 May 2026, the council refused retrospective planning application HGY/2026/0972 for replacement windows, an enlarged rear dormer opening, bifold doors and a glass balustrade, together with internal alterations to provide a second bedroom. The two reasons for refusal concerned the design, proportions, colour and materials of the front dormer window and the enlarged rear dormer opening, and their effect on the house and the Highgate Conservation Area. Details of this refusal are provided in the appendices.

c. The conservation officer considered that the front window's colour and design contrasted with the rest of the building and related poorly to the other windows. The officer advised reinstating the previous window or replacing it with one that better matched the original Crittall windows or the previous window in its design, materials and colour.

d. To the rear, the conservation officer raised no objection in principle to enlarging the dormer window. The concerns related to the lowered cill, the resulting proportions of the opening and its relationship with the floor below, and the design and materials of the doors and balustrade. The planning officer also objected to the loss of part of the roof eaves and the dark grey finish.

e. The council did not object to the internal alterations to the flat and raised no concerns in respect of any impact on neighbours.

f. Following the refusal, the applicant sought pre-application advice (reference: PRE/2026/0175). The statement accompanying that application proposed painting the front window white while retaining its three-part arrangement. It also sought advice on retaining the rear bifold doors and glass balustrade, with a possible alteration to the rainwater pipe.

g. The statement explained that the windows removed were non-original uPVC units and that the house formed part of the post-war rebuilding of the street. It included photographs of differing window designs and similar rear alterations nearby. A site meeting took place on 8 July 2026, by which time the front window had been painted white.

h. The council issued its written advice on 9 September 2026. To the front, officers acknowledged the white finish but remained concerned about the grey trickle vents and the possibility of the paint peeling to expose the grey finish beneath. They recommended replacing the window with a white timber-framed unit, although the building's original windows were steel rather than timber, and the other windows on the building are not timber.

i. At the rear, officers maintained their objection to the grey aluminium bifold doors and clear glass balustrade. They advised removing the balustrade, reinstating the brickwork below the former window and replacing the doors with white timber-framed windows. They also recommended replacing the other rear dormer window with a white timber-framed unit and returning the rainwater goods to their original arrangement.

j. The council considered the examples supplied at numbers 30, 34 and 55C Talbot Road but did not accept that they justified retaining the works. The response referred to the use of timber at number 30, the history and materials of the balcony at number 34, and uncertainty about the approved window materials at number 55C. These examples and the relevant permissions are considered in the assessment below.

k. The current application seeks permission to retain the front dormer window with its white-painted finish, the grey aluminium rear window and the enlarged rear dormer opening with bifold doors and a clear glass balustrade. The drawings also show the internal alterations to provide a second bedroom.

l. The application also proposes rerouting the rear rainwater pipe vertically on the right-hand side of the elevation, viewed from the garden. This would remove the diagonal pipe from the brickwork between the first- and second-floor openings.

4. Planning Policies

a. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

b. The relevant development plan policies are contained in the London Plan 2021, Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017, the Development Management DPD 2017 and the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017.

c. Policy SP11 of the Strategic Policies requires high-quality design that respects local context, character and historic significance. Policy SP12 seeks to conserve the significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their settings and the wider historic environment. London Plan Policy HC1 requires development affecting heritage assets to conserve their significance through a sympathetic response to the assets and their surroundings.

d. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies requires development to relate positively to its locality, having regard to the form, scale, architectural styles, detailing and materials of surrounding buildings. Policy DM12(E) requires residential alterations to respect or complement the form, period and architectural characteristics of the original building, using high-quality matching or complementary materials appropriate to the context.

e. Policy DM9 requires proposals affecting heritage assets to be assessed against their significance and the effect of the development on that significance. Part C requires regard to be had to conservation area appraisals and management plans. Part E states that alterations to buildings in conservation areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.

f. Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan requires alterations to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Its supporting text states that original windows and doors should be retained and repaired wherever possible, and that replacements should match the originals in materials, design and detail. Policy DH5 requires dormers and other roof alterations to respect the existing roof form in their design, scale, materials and detail.

g. The Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, December 2013, provides more detailed guidance. Paragraph 12.3.17 requires

new windows to reflect the character of the main building and relate appropriately to its existing windows and detailing. It also states that bespoke, high-quality metal-framed windows may be acceptable depending on their design.

h. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in August 2026, after the refusal of the previous application. The current application therefore falls to be considered against the revised Framework, whose national decision-making policies are material considerations. Policy DP3 requires development to respond to the history, character and features of its site and surroundings. Policy DM3 requires a positive and proportionate approach to determining applications, including consideration of whether concerns can be addressed through planning conditions.

i. Policy HE4 requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Proposals should avoid harm or, where that is not possible, minimise it. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification.

j. Policy HE5 requires a proportionate assessment of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the effect of the proposal on that significance. The assessment should identify whether the effect would be positive, neutral or harmful and, where harm would occur, its degree. The policy makes clear that the relevant consideration is the effect on significance rather than the scale of the development.

k. Policy HE6 requires substantial weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Where harm would arise, the effect on the asset and its significance must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, with additional requirements applying where substantial harm or total loss would occur.

l. Policy HE9 requires development in conservation areas to consider their special architectural or historic interest and retain features making a positive contribution where possible. It recognises that not all elements contribute to a conservation area's significance. Where a contributing element would be lost, the assessment should consider its relative significance and its contribution to the conservation area as a whole. Proposals conserving positively contributing elements, or better revealing the area's significance, should be supported.

5. Assessment

a. The main issue is whether the development preserves the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

b. The Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal describes Talbot Road as an attractive, Edwardian street of red-brick houses with white window and door surrounds, developed between 1905 and 1908. It notes that the styles are not uniform and that the variety adds to the interest of the street.

c. The appraisal records that bomb damage caused a number of houses on the western side to be rebuilt in 1948. It describes their design as more utilitarian but notes that the use of similar red brick allows them to fit into their surroundings. Number 22 forms part of this rebuilt group. Its contribution to the conservation area lies principally in its relationship with the terrace, its scale, red-brick frontage and roof form. Its simpler architectural treatment is distinct from the decorative detailing of the surviving Edwardian houses.

d. These differences are apparent in the windows. The surviving Edwardian houses at numbers 16 and 18 retain decorative timber sash windows of a distinctive design, while the lower floors of number 22 have steel windows understood to be original Crittall units, alongside later uPVC replacements. The appropriate assessment of alterations to number 22 must take account of its own architectural history and the features that contribute to its character.

e. The conservation area appraisal places particular value on original windows and their distinctive glazing patterns. The windows removed at number 22 were low-grade, first-generation white uPVC units dating from the 1980s. They neither matched the original steel windows retained on the lower floors nor reproduced the timber sash windows of the neighbouring Edwardian houses. No original windows or historic glazing details were lost. Reproducing the former uPVC units would reinstate a later replacement design, not restore the building's original appearance.

The front dormer window

f. The external frame of the front window has now been painted white, as shown in figure 3 on page 5 of this report. This responds to the council's concern that its dark grey colour contrasted harshly with the building and brings the frame into line with the white windows below and the prevailing finish along Talbot Road.

g. The new window has a simpler and more ordered design than the previous uPVC unit. The former window (shown in figure 1 on page 3 of this report) combined

a large central pane with smaller side casements and separate upper lights, all set within bulky frames. The replacement has a simple three-part vertical subdivision, giving it a clearer rhythm and more balanced proportions. That vertical emphasis relates more closely to the steel windows below.

h. There is a mix of window designs along Talbot Road. Numbers 20 and 20A, next door, have uPVC replacement windows, as shown in figure 7, below. Number 24 is of a markedly different design, with three flat-roofed front dormers and sash windows (figure 8). Number 26 is different again and has uPVC windows (figure 9). By contrast, the surviving Edwardian houses at numbers 16 and 18 retain distinctive decorative timber sash windows (figure 10). This variety of window materials, profiles and glazing arrangements is part of Talbot Road's established character, and the new front window at the application site does not look out of place in this context.



Figure 7: Replacement uPVC windows at numbers 20 and 20A Talbot Road.



Figure 8: Timber sash windows at number 24 Talbot Road.



Figure 9: A differing design at number 26 Talbot Road.



Figure 10: Decorative timber sash windows at numbers 16 and 18

i. A few doors along from the application property, number 30 has a similar second-floor dormer with an equal casement arrangement and no transom glazing bars, comparable to the window installed at the application property, as shown in figure 11, below.



Figure 11: Second-floor dormer window at number 30, with equal casements and no transom glazing bars.

j. Number 32 has a variety of window profiles across the front elevation, with different designs on all three floors, as shown in the photograph in figure 12, below. The building also has a second-floor dormer window without transom glazing bars, giving a much more varied appearance than suggested by the council's assessment.



Figure 12: Differing window designs on all three floors at number 32 Talbot Road.

k. The council's pre-application response considered the comparison with the dormer window at number 30 but distinguished it on the basis that the approved replacement windows were timber. The important point about this example is the detailed design of the windows, not their material. Their three-part casement arrangement without transom bars shows that this simplified glazing pattern is already a feature of the street.

l. The pre-application response describes replacing the windows with white timber units as a return to the building's original state. However, this building has never had timber windows: number 22 was rebuilt after the war with steel windows, most of which remain on the lower floors. The dormer windows removed were later uPVC replacements. The recommendation for timber therefore rests on a mistaken understanding of the building's history.

m. The council has also accepted replacements in materials other than timber where the windows being replaced were not original. At number 9E Talbot Road, it granted permission in November 2025 for white uPVC to replace a timber window and door on the rear elevation (reference: HGY/2025/1565). The officer accepted that replacing timber with uPVC would not normally be supported in a conservation area, but found it acceptable because the units being replaced were not original, and took account of the gains in thermal efficiency and sound insulation in the light of the council's Climate Change Action Plan and its aim of net zero carbon by 2041. The front dormer window at number 22 likewise replaced a non-original unit, and its double-glazed aluminium frame improves the thermal performance of the flat.

n. Paragraph 12.3.17 of the Conservation Area Management plan states that bespoke, high-quality metal-framed windows may be acceptable depending on their design. Policy DM12(E) of the Development Management Policies allows matching or complementary materials. In this case, the new front window is a high-quality powder-coated aluminium unit, a more durable material than the uPVC it replaced, and its design suits the simpler architecture of this post-war building, with a colour consistent with the other windows on the building and on neighbouring buildings.

o. The pre-application response raises the possibility that the white paint on the new front window might flake off and expose the grey finish beneath. The frame was professionally painted using a primer and paint system advised by Dulux Technical Services. The council has given no reason to think that this paint system will fail. Painted timber also requires maintenance, and a condition could require the frame to be kept in good condition with a white finish.

p. The pre-application response also raises concern about the appearance of the trickle vents. Trickle vents are required under the Building Regulations to provide

background ventilation to the flat. They occupy only a small part of the frame and are barely noticeable from the street. They do not draw attention to themselves or alter the overall appearance of the window, which reads as white.

The rear windows, bifold doors and balustrade

q. The conservation officer raised no objection in principle to enlarging the rear dormer opening. The objection concerned the proportions created by lowering the cill, the relationship with the opening below, and the design and materials of the doors and balustrade. The pre-application response maintains those objections and recommends reinstating the brickwork and replacing the doors with a white timber window.

r. The bifold doors have a simple three-part arrangement with vertical proportions that relate to the doors below, as shown in figure 4 on page 6 of this report. The opening retains its former width, and neither the dormer roof nor the eaves has been altered. The only change at that level was the removal of a short length of non-original uPVC gutter that ran across the opening. The taller opening follows the arrangement of doors and larger openings on the lower floors, without increasing the size of the dormer roof.

s. The council has permitted the same change on a more sensitive building nearby. At 1 Church Road, an Edwardian house on the corner of Talbot Road, the approved scheme extended the existing second-floor rear dormer window down to floor level and replaced it with full-height glazed doors behind a painted metal balustrade, with the same treatment to the two first-floor windows below (reference: HGY/2016/3651). The council granted permission without raising any concern about the enlarged openings.

t. The brickwork beneath the bifold doors separates them from the first-floor opening below. The revised arrangement shown on drawing AM-TR-02 Rev C takes the rainwater pipe vertically down the right-hand side of the elevation, leaving this band of brickwork unobstructed and the separation between the openings clearer.

u. The glass balustrade provides a safety barrier across the doors without adding a solid parapet or an external platform. Clear glass was chosen so that the balustrade allows the doors and their vertical divisions to remain visible and does not compete with the metal railings of the first-floor balcony below. It is a restrained addition to an elevation that already has a projecting balcony at first-floor level.

v. The pre-application response notes that the existing first-floor balcony at number 34 was lawful through the passage of time. The relevant comparison, however, is with the new white-framed bifold doors and glass balustrade expressly

approved under HGY/2021/2365. The council accepted the glass balustrade because neighbouring properties had similar arrangements and found the alterations sensitive to the building, with very limited effects on the conservation area. Folding doors and glass balustrading have therefore already been accepted together on the rear of a house on Talbot Road.

w. The permission at number 30, another of the post-war rebuilt houses, also approved a single-storey rear extension with a distinctly modern rear elevation (HGY/2013/0410). The scheme included powder-coated aluminium sliding doors at ground-floor level and a glass balustrade to the first-floor balcony. The council accepted the modern design and materials, taking account of their quality and the absence of views of the ground-floor alterations from Talbot Road. The same permission that introduced timber windows at the front accepted aluminium doors and glass balustrading at the rear, recognising the different settings of the two elevations.

x. The pre-application response says that neighbouring balconies are at first-floor level and that balconies at roof level are rare along the terrace. It also questions whether the permission at number 55C included aluminium frames. In fact, there were two separate permissions at number 55C, covering different floors. The application documents, approved drawings and decisions for both are included in the appendices.

y. The application referred to in the response, HGY/2012/1235, covered enlarged openings at ground- and first-floor levels and a glass Juliet balustrade at first-floor level. The application form specified grey aluminium, and the drawings showed aluminium-framed folding doors. In granting permission, the council found that the openings and fittings were in proportion with the building and neighbouring properties, would not be seen from public viewpoints and would not detract from the conservation area.

z. The roof-level works were approved separately under HGY/2012/1239. That permission allowed a second-floor rear dormer with aluminium folding doors opening onto a small terrace enclosed by an opaque glass balustrade. The council accepted its position, limited size, glazing arrangement and materials, finding no harm to the building or the Highgate Conservation Area. This provides a direct example of aluminium folding doors and glass balustrading approved together at second-floor roof level on Talbot Road. At number 22B, the balustrade guards the opening without creating an external terrace.



Figure 13: Similar bifold doors and balustrades to the rear of number 55 Talbot Road.

aa. The council also granted permission in March 2017 for a roof extension to 3-5 Church Road, a 1950s block of flats a short distance from the application site (reference: HGY/2015/1667). The scheme includes dark grey aluminium windows on a brick building with white windows, and a frameless glass balustrade with a dark grey metal handrail to the rear terraces. The committee report described the building as being of limited architectural quality, recorded that the conservation officer raised no objection, and found no harm to the conservation area, on the basis that the materials should complement, not necessarily replicate, the local architectural character.

bb. The council has also accepted contemporary aluminium windows and doors at a Grade II listed house at 92 North Road, within the Highgate Conservation Area (HGY/2025/0065). In supporting the rear extensions, the Principal Conservation Officer explained that policy DM9 does not require alterations to copy a building's original materials or design: they should acknowledge and complement it. The council found no harm to the listed building or conservation area and subsequently approved anthracite grey aluminium frames under

HGY/2026/2144. Its assessment was based on how the design related to the building, rather than a general requirement for timber.

cc. Grey aluminium is also present in the immediate setting of number 22B. The adjoining, matching postwar property at number 20A has two sets of grey aluminium bifold doors at first-floor level. The finish at number 22B therefore relates to an established feature of the neighbouring rear elevation. The rear casement and bifold doors at number 22B also share the same colour and three-part glazing arrangement, giving the two openings a consistent appearance.

dd. Paragraph 12.3.13 of the conservation area appraisal allows Juliet balconies where they are characteristic of the area and do not harm the overall appearance of the building. Glazed doors and glass balustrades are already established features of rear elevations along Talbot Road, with a roof-level example approved at number 55C. At number 22B, the vertical divisions relate to the doors below, the brickwork separates the openings, and the transparent balustrade adds no external platform. The alterations respect the building's rear elevation and preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Neighbouring amenity

ee. The council considered overlooking when determining the previous application and found that the effect on neighbours' privacy would be neutral. The existing rear balconies already overlook one another and the ground-floor garden. The council concluded that the rear alteration would not cause additional harm to neighbouring balconies or gardens, and neither reason for refusal concerned residential amenity.

ff. The bifold doors replace a window that already provided views over the neighbouring gardens. The glass balustrade guards the opening without creating an external terrace from which occupants could look further out or to either side.

6. Conclusions

a. The front dormer window retains the existing opening and now has a white external frame that matches the prevailing finish along Talbot Road. Its simple three-part design relates to the steel windows below and the varied window arrangements elsewhere in the street. Replacing it with timber would not restore an original feature of this postwar building.

b. The rear alterations, which cannot be seen from any public place, fit an elevation already characterised by doors, balconies and varied openings. The approved works at number 55C and at 3-5 Church Road demonstrate that aluminium doors and windows and glass balustrades can be acceptable at roof level within the conservation area. At number 22B, the balustrade adds no external terrace, and rerouting the rainwater pipe will leave the brickwork between the openings unobstructed.

c. The development preserves the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area and causes no harm to neighbouring amenity, and the applicant respectfully requests that the application be recommended for approval.



Just Planning Limited
Email: info@just-planning.co.uk

Just Planning HQ
42 Hampstead House
176 Finchley Road
London NW3 6BT

www.just-planning.co.uk
justplanning
@JustPlanning

© Just Planning 2026