

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3150940

170 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London N15 4JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms S Forbes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/0851, dated 15 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "Replacement of Windows on Flat. No change of use."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to the first floor of a two-storey, terraced property located on Philip Lane. The property is located within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area, the significance of which derives from the quality of Victorian and Edwardian buildings that define the evolution of the area from the 19th century onwards. The streets of the conservation area are principally lined with long terraces of such properties. Despite some later buildings, the properties are generally consistent in scale, layout, the use of materials and architectural detailing.
 4. The Clyde Circus Conservation Area Character Appraisal makes reference to 128 to 174 Philip Lane, noting that most of the properties retain timber sash windows. The appraisal also notes that the unity of the terrace has been damaged at the eastern end by a series of unsympathetic alterations carried out at No 128. The appellant indicates that around 29% of the properties in this part of Philip Lane retain timber sash windows on both floors, with several properties having fitted replacements in other styles and materials.
 5. My own observations indicate that there is a significant variation in the quality of replacement windows in the area, with some examples having incorporated traditional designs. There are also several properties, such as the appeal site, which retain timber sash windows on either ground or first floor. As a result, the overall unity of the terrace is generally preserved.
-

6. Nevertheless, it is clear that the use of non-traditional designs and materials has adversely affected the appearance of these buildings and has diminished the contribution they make to the conservation area. Indeed, whilst the retention of timber sash windows in the first floor of the appeal property is a positive characteristic, the windows are currently painted black and in a poor state of repair. This reduces their overall contribution to the significance of the conservation area.
7. However, the windows would be constructed of white UPVC. The use of such material would have a glossier finish and would appear in stark contrast to the prevailing use of traditional, timber sash windows in the area. Moreover, the proposed windows would have the lower frame set-back from the window frame above, resulting in a significant recess between the two. As such, the proposed windows would lack finesse in their detailing, and would be a poor approximation of the original windows.
8. I note that there is large variety of non-traditional window materials which have been used close to the appeal site. However, to allow this appeal would increasingly diminish the contribution traditional windows make to the significance of the conservation area and would compound the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area through the use of unsympathetic replacements.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area. It would, consequently, conflict with the high quality design and historic environment aims of Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan 2013 Strategic Policies 2013-2026. It would also conflict with saved Policy CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 which states that alterations to buildings in Conservation Areas will be required to preserve or enhance the character of the area.
10. In addition, the proposal would conflict with Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the emerging Haringey Development Management DPD Pre-Submission Version 2016 which seek to achieve a high standard of design, development that sustains and enhances the significance of a heritage asset and its setting, and that alterations to residential buildings will be required to be of a high design quality and respect or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, and detailing of the original buildings. It would also conflict with the guidance set out in the Council's SPG 1a Design Guidance SPG 2006 and SPG2 Conservation and Archaeology SPG 2003.
11. For the reasons above, I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the conservation area. That harm would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, it should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. I have, however, no evidence to suggest that the proposal would result in any public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR