126 Nelson Road – Planning Statement

Oct 19, 2026 ·

Hark Architecture Lrd

1. Introduction

This statement supports a householder planning application to replace the existing gabled rear dormer at 126 Nelson Road, N8 9RN, with a wider flat-roofed dormer clad in standing seam metal.

The statement explains why the proposal departs in two minor respects from the council's design guidance and from permitted development. It shows that the scheme is acceptable on its merits and when compared with a realistic permitted development fallback.

2. Site and surroundings

No. 126 is a two-storey terraced house on Nelson Road, within the London Borough of Haringey. The main roof is pitched, finished in clay tiles, with an existing small gabled dormer on the rear slope.

The rear roof slope faces is not visible from the public highway. The site is not within a conservation area, and no Article 4 direction applies.

The surrounding rear roofscape already includes a number of dormers of varied form and materials.

3. The proposal

The proposal demolishes the existing gabled dormer and replaces it with a single flat-roofed rear dormer. Its key features are:

- Width of 3.48 m, and height of 2.21m, 1.05m below the main ridge.
- Front face flush with the external wall below, with no set-back from the eaves apart from a fascia board and a gutter. This matches the current dormer.
- Cheeks and face clad in brown standing seam metal to match the existing tiles, with white timber windows to match existing.
- Flat roof finished in single-ply membrane, with no roof terrace or access
- No side-facing windows

The dormer enlarges the existing loft bedroom of about 2 sq m and gives it usable headroom across its full depth.

4. Permitted development fallback

A rear dormer of essentially the same size and form could be built without planning permission. It would fall under Class B, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended). The proposal is within the Class B volume limit of 40 cu m. It does not extend beyond the plane of the principal elevation, does not rise above the ridge, and has no balcony or side windows.

The proposal differs from a permitted development dormer in only two respects:

1. Its face is not set back the 20 cm from the eaves that Class B requires where practicable.
2. Its cladding is standing seam metal rather than materials similar in appearance to the main roof.

The applicant has a real prospect of carrying out the permitted development scheme. . Following *Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling BC* [2017] EWCA Civ 1314, that fallback is a material consideration. The question for the council is therefore narrow: whether these two differences cause material harm compared with what could be built anyway.

5. Design assessment

No set-back from the eaves. The loft bedroom is only about 8 sq m. A set-back of the dormer face would remove about 0.5 sq m of usable floor, roughly 6% of the room, at the point where full headroom matters most. Bringing the face in line with the wall below keeps the room usable as a bedroom. The visual difference from a 20 cm set-back is slight on a rear elevation, and the eaves line remains legible via the retained gutter line. The existing dormer has no set back.

Standing seam cladding. Standing seam metal is a durable, high-quality material with a fine vertical rhythm. It gives the dormer a crisp, lightweight appearance. Tile-hanging a large dormer cheek often produces a bulky, poorly detailed result. A recessive brown finish will sit comfortably against the weathered clay tiled roof, and reads as a clearly contemporary addition rather than an imitation of the original.

Scale and form. The dormer stays below the ridge and inside the party walls. It replaces a small, awkwardly proportioned gabled dormer with a simpler form that tidies the rear roofscape. Its size matches what permitted development already allows.

6. Conclusion

The proposal replaces a poorly proportioned dormer with a well-detailed rear dormer of a size permitted development already allows. It departs from that fallback only in its flush face and its standing seam cladding. Both are justified: one preserves the usability of a small bedroom and repeats the existing dormer, the other uses a better-quality material. Neither causes material harm to the character of the area or to neighbours, and the application should be approved.