
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/16/3163632

5 Medina Road, Islington, London N7 7JU

- 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 KDN Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/3198/FUL, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the replacement of existing windows with new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a terrace of similarly designed two storey houses with basement accommodation. The property contains a double height bay window built from basement level with the main roof descending to a parapet at first floor. Steps leads from the pavement edge behind which are attractive wrought iron railings. The street scene generally is of elegantly designed terraced housing within a verdant setting.
 4. Despite the area not having any heritage designation, the sash timber windows are an important and integral feature of this terraced street. Indeed the presence of front elevations that have not been altered through unsympathetically designed additions or changes to the original materials gives this street added elegance and contributes significantly to its character and appearance.
 5. With relatively few exceptions, properties within Medina Street in particular have consistent features, most notably windows. These consist of pine vertical sash windows recessed into the wall openings and finished with paint that show a strong vertical emphasis. The meeting rails and glazing bars of the sash windows are typically slender and with the box set into the wall. From the road outside the appeal site and at closer distances, the glazing appears held by an elegant narrow frame.
-

6. I saw at my site visit that the windows are in good order and capable of either repair or refurbishment. In the context of the appeal building, the introduction of uPVC material would give a quite different appearance. Although the appeal drawings fail to provide detailed sections, the use of this material almost always make the window frames appear bulky. Moreover, due to their construction, such windows are often sited flush with the outer wall. The frames in this instance and, despite all good intentions, would appear inappropriately crude, heavy and overly prominent, particularly when viewed from Medina Street.
7. Although I appreciate that the appellant is keen to improve thermal efficiency and safety, there are other strategies available to achieve this without harming the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. I conclude that the development fails to complement the host building and in turn would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to policy CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy and policy DM2.1 of the Council's Development Management Policies. Amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that developments do not harm the historic significance of Islington's heritage assets whether designated or not and by reinforcing and complementing local distinctiveness. These policies are consistent with the Framework's core principle of securing high quality design quality in new developments.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR