

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI

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

Decision date: 6 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/17/3175749

Flat A, 19 Coleridge Road, Islington, London N4 3NY

- 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 Emin Ozturk against the decision of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2017/0675/FUL, which was dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is 'replacing timber sash windows to uPVC box'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to replacing the timber sash windows in the front elevation with uPVC double glazed windows. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to replacing the timber sash bedroom window, kitchen window and door in the rear elevation with uPVC double glazed units at Flat A, 19 Coleridge Road, Islington, London N4 3NY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2017/0675/FUL dated 17 February 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Product Specification plans for kitchen window, kitchen door and rear bedroom window dated 17 February 2017.

Procedural Matter

2. Whilst the Council's refusal notice refers to the proposed windows in the front elevation only, the replacement windows and door in the rear elevation form part of the appeal scheme before me and I have assessed the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area, having particular regard to the Coleridge Road/Isledon Road street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located within a mixed commercial/residential area between the Seven Sisters Road and the A503 Isledon Road. Development in
-

the immediate vicinity of the appeal property is characterised by traditional three storey terraced houses with a basement level, of similar design and proportions. Whilst some features including fenestration have been altered, this has not undermined the sense of unity and cohesiveness in the Coleridge Road/Isledon Road street scene created by the similar architectural form and traditional detailing of the buildings including bay windows at basement/ground floor levels, vertical sliding sash windows and panelled front doors. The appeal property is a lower ground floor apartment at the southern end of a terraced row, adjoining commercial premises at No 21 Coleridge Road.

5. Policy CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011) (CS) seeks to conserve and enhance the historic significance of heritage assets and the historic environment whether designated or not. Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2013) (LPDMP) requires development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, based on an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.
6. Whilst not referred to in the Council's decision notice, the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (January 2017) (SPD) advises that window replacements should normally be in the style and materials of the original windows. The SPD also indicates that replacement windows should be applied universally across the elevation to ensure consistency, particularly where windows are visible from the public realm and form part of an historic townscape that retains the majority of its original windows.
7. Public views of the rear elevation of the appeal property and its host building are limited due to the position of the surrounding terraced rows. Alterations to the rear elevations of other properties in the row have resulted in a wide variety in the design, age and materials of doors and windows including the use of uPVC. As such, the replacement of the kitchen door and window and bedroom window with uPVC units would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. This aspect of the proposal would not conflict with CS Policy CS9, LPDMP Policy DM2.1 nor with the advice in the SPD.
8. However the original timber sash windows are still in place in the front elevation of the host building. The three part timber sash windows in the bay to the front of the appeal property are slightly recessed from the window opening. The proposed uPVC replacements would have a heavier and more prominent appearance due to the width of the frames, the material used, and their position flush with the window openings. They would not reflect the style and detail of the originals, including the absence of horns to the upper sashes and the top opening arrangement.
9. Replacement windows in the front elevations of adjoining properties in the row have generally been installed in all the units in the host building as at Nos 9 and 11 Coleridge Road. The exception at No 2 Coleridge Road where only the basement and ground floor windows have been replaced serves to illustrate the somewhat disjointed appearance that can result.
10. Double glazed units would be easier to maintain and would offer better thermal and noise insulation, particularly given the location of the property near a busy road. However, the wider frames, lack of traditional detailing, top opening arrangement and position flush with the opening would result in a noticeably

different style and design compared with the traditional vertical sliding timber windows in the properties above. The windows would be visible above the fence on the road frontage and their different appearance would undermine the unity that contributes to the character of the host building and the wider Coleridge Road/Isledon Road street scene. The harm to character and appearance would not be outweighed by the maintenance, thermal and acoustic benefits outlined above.

11. For these reasons, the replacement of the windows in the front elevation with uPVC units of the style proposed would conflict with CS Policy CS9, LPDMP Policy DM2.1 and with the advice in the SPD.
12. I have considered whether a condition could be used to require further details of the proposed replacement windows in the front elevation to be submitted to the local planning authority. However, it appears to me that significant changes would be necessary and these are matters that should be properly considered by the appellant and local planning authority in the first instance. In these circumstances, a condition would not meet the test of reasonableness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed replacement door, kitchen and bedroom windows in the rear elevation and dismissed in so far as it relates to the replacement windows in the front elevation.
14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Whilst I have not been supplied with detailed drawings, the product specifications provide sufficient details of the windows that are allowed as part of this appeal.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR