



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2020

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/20/3251030

85 Stockwell Park Road, Stockwell, London, SW9 0DB

- 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 Mrs Yvonne Clarke against the decision of Lambeth Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03605/FUL, dated 14 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing single glazed timber windows with UPVC Heritage windows at the third and fourth floor to front and rear elevations. One UPVC window (kitchen) front elevation at lower ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The descriptions of development on the planning application form, the Council's decision notice and the appeal form all vary. The appellant states on the appeal form that the description of development on the Council's decision notice is incorrect and she clarifies which windows she would like to replace. The drawings submitted in support of the appeal reflect this. Therefore, in the banner heading above, I have taken the description of development included in the appeal form as it is more accurate than the original.
3. The scheme proposes the replacement of windows on both the front and rear elevations of the property. At my appeal site visit I viewed only the front elevation of the dwelling. However, detailed drawings were submitted with the appeal documents and I am therefore satisfied this has not affected my ability to determine this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, including the Stockwell Park Conservation Area (SPCA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the SPCA. Taken together, Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and Paragraph 2.7 of the Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015), require proposals to positively respond to original architectural features. Replacement windows must be authentic

reproductions of the originals, in order to preserve or enhance the historic character or appearance of the property and the SPCA.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 195-196 state that, when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. Any harm should require clear and convincing justification. Where a proposal would lead to less than significant harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
7. The proposed UPVC sash windows would not replicate the existing historic wooden sash windows which they would replace, in terms of both material and fine detail. The proposed windows would be a poor replica of the existing traditional timber sash windows and therefore would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling. The windows would also be at odds with the various forms of traditional timber sash window which prevail in the SPCA.
8. The proposed windows would unacceptably harm both the host building and the streetscene. They would therefore fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. This harm would be 'less than substantial'. However, the limited benefits associated with installing replacement UPVC sash windows into the property, as set out below, would not outweigh the harm in this case. The proposals would therefore conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015), Paragraph 2.7 of the Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015) and the NPPF.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant requires replacement windows in order to improve the energy efficiency of the property. I am satisfied that there are more sympathetic design solutions available which would address this concern.

Conclusion

10. I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan, the NPPF and Conservation Area legislation and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR