
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3180303

10 Hargrave Mansions, 44 Hargrave Road, London N19 5SR

- 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 E Thorndon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2017/0823/FUL, dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is replacement of windows in the living room, kitchen, bathroom and bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the windows in the front elevation. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the windows in the other elevations and planning permission is granted for replacement windows at 10 Hargrave Mansions, 44 Hargrave Road, London N19 5SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2017/0823/FUL, dated 27 February 2017, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character of the building and the area.

Preliminary Matter

3. The development has already been carried out and I had the benefit of seeing the windows at my site visit.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this first floor flat which is contained within a 3 storey mansion block. Hargrave Mansions consist of a series of Edwardian 3 storey blocks of an identical design. They present an attractive formal front elevation to the street, of red brick with white painted render features around windows and doors, repeated along the street. The rear elevations are far more utilitarian, face over modest rear gardens towards a more modern development, in the case of the subject property.
5. The development has resulted in timber double glazed units being provided in the front elevation and UPVC double glazed units elsewhere. The details submitted by the appellant indicate the width of the glazing, including the gap

between the glass. The Council indicates that it has approved replacement double glazing in other flats within Hargrave Mansions but has specified the maximum width of the glazing by conditions. From the details before me I can see that the appeal scheme exceeds what has been specified elsewhere.

6. From my consideration of the effects on the street-scene, I consider that an important characteristic of this area is the close uniformity of the elevations of Hargrave Mansions. From my own observations, the additional width of the units on the front elevation is discernible. The frames appear deep and the reveal has been reduced due to the additional depth of the units. In my judgement this is noticeable and contrasts with the more slender profiles of the other windows that I saw. There is clear disagreement between the appellant and the Council regarding how obvious this is. My view is that it is clear and that it upsets the uniformity that otherwise exists here. The appellant has drawn my attention to replacement windows at No 20 Hargrave Mansions, but the Council confirms that planning permission does not exist for this; accordingly I find that it does not influence my findings. Therefore, in relation to the front elevation, I consider that the dimensions of the windows have disrupted the important uniformity to an unacceptable degree.
7. In relation to the other windows, I accept that the replacement with UPVC double glazed units has altered the appearance of the windows here. However, I am also mindful that there are very few vantage points from which these windows could be seen. Whilst they represent an obvious change to the building, I do not consider that the rear elevations involved contribute to the street-scene or the value of the building to the wider area. The value of the building to the area seems to derive from the contribution of the consistent street elevation to the overall street-scene and not in any way to its rear. Therefore, I find no harm arising from the replacement windows within the rear parts of the flat.
8. I have taken account of the Council's SPD 'Urban Design Guide' and I consider that my conclusions are consistent with it, having regard to the street frontage where windows are visible from the public realm. I have also had regard to the advice in the NPPF. In this respect the appeal site does not fall within a conservation area, is not listed or within the setting of any identified listed buildings, nor is it locally designated. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF relates to non-designated heritage assets, and even if one includes the appeal property within that category, the NPPF requires a balanced judgement in relation to the scale of any harm and any loss of significance. My judgement is that there is harm arising from the front windows and the rear windows involve very little harm, if any, and none which involves a loss of significance.

Conclusions

9. In the light of my findings I shall issue a split decision which refuses permission for the front windows but grants permission for the others. I see no need for any conditions as the development has already been carried out and, as far as it relates to the approved windows, has been done in a satisfactory manner.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR