
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/16/3158595

Flats 1-21 St. Georges Residences, 78-80 Railton Road, London SE24 0LG

- 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 Mr David Holgado against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/02036/FUL, dated 29 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is to replace existing windows with double glazing to a locally listed building. Front and flank windows are to be replaced with joinery made timber double glazed sliding sash to match existing styles, including doors. Rear windows and doors (not viewed from road) to be white double glazed UPVC to match existing styles and sizes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace existing windows with double glazing to a locally listed building. Front and flank windows are to be replaced with joinery made timber double glazed sliding sash to match existing styles, including doors. Rear windows and doors (not viewed from road) to be white double glazed UPVC to match existing styles and sizes at Flats 1-21 St. Georges Residences, 78-80 Railton Road, London SE24 0LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02036/FUL dated 29 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - (i) the development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
 - (ii) the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Window Renewal – Front & Rear Elevations, Drawing No AM-ST-01; Standard Double Glazed Box Frame Window 'Timber'; Plan Elevation Section Thru, Standard Double Glazed Box Frame Window; Side Elevation Section Thru, Standard Double Glazed Box Frame Window; Standard Double Glazed Box Frame Window with 6 over 6; and The NEW VEKA Vertical Slider Window System; and,
 - (iii) no development shall take place until detailed drawings (1:20 scale elevations and larger scale 1:5 or 1:2 detailed cross sections) showing the rear windows and doors in relation to the existing window and door reveals and cills have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
-

Procedural matter

2. The Council raised no concerns for the windows proposed to the front and side of the building; parties agree that the matter in dispute concerns the windows and doors to the rear. In light of the evidence before me I find no substantive reason to take a different view and therefore I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locally listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a large period building which is locally listed. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies locally listed buildings as heritage assets. One of the core planning principles of the Framework is to *conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance*¹.
5. The stock brick block of artisan flats retains many original features with elevations that exhibit intricate features including balconies and decorative windows which contribute to the building's status as a locally listed building. The rear elevation, largely obscured from public view, is subsidiary in character and contributes less to the building's significance as a locally listed building. Whilst parties' views on the origins of the existing powder coated aluminium sliding sash windows in the rear elevation differ, I doubt that they are original given the age of the building and the later origins of metal windows.
6. Policy Q11(a) of the Local Plan² seeks development that responds positively to the original architecture of a building and policy Q23 seeks to retain, protect and safeguard buildings on a local heritage list.
7. The UPVC windows would be sliding sash windows with decorative horns which would complement the style of the original windows evident elsewhere on the building and therefore would retain the architectural form of the building overall. The Council highlights concern for the impact the opening mechanism on the windows would have on the character and appearance of the building, although no further reasoning is given. A catchment to allow the windows to be opened and closed would be set within the window frames. I find nothing about its design or scale to consider it incongruous or harmful to the historical importance of the building overall.
8. The UPVC windows and doors would contrast with the timber materials elsewhere on the building and the frames would be more thickset. However, given the subsidiary character of the rear elevation compared with the rest of the building, the UPVC materials and thickset frames would not detract from the architectural merits of the building to be considered harmful to its historical attributes.
9. The Council's SPD³ suggests that new windows should replace the originals, particularly where the building is part of a terrace or a group to give unity of

¹ Paragraph 17 of the Framework.

² Lambeth Local Plan, Adopted September 2015

³ Building Alterations & Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document (September 2015) (SPD)

design. With the origins of the powder coated aluminium windows in question, the relevance of 'replacement' is debatable. Notwithstanding this, the building is not part of a terrace or a group and very little of the rear elevation is exposed to public view. Together with my findings for the limited harm the windows would have on the architectural and historical importance of the building overall, the replacement windows and doors would not harm the special interest of the building.

10. It is not clear to what extent the windows and doors would be set in from the facing brickwork in the way the existing units are. So that the windows and doors would sit within the existing reveals and therefore not protrude and alter the overall character of the rear elevation, it would be reasonable to secure any planning permission with a condition that requires the submission and approval of drawings to show such details.
11. In all, therefore, I find that the replacement windows and doors would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the locally listed building and as a result would not be contrary to policies Q11(a) and Q23 of the Local Plan nor the SPD.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have included a condition concerning window and door detailing to ensure that the units are set behind the face of the existing brickwork and therefore do not cause undue harm to the overall character of the rear elevation.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is allowed.

R Walmsley

Inspector