
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021 by Max Webb

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3279842

4 Woodlands Avenue, Wanstead, London E11 3QZ

- 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 Geoff Elton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1670/21, dated 18 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is to replace metal casement window frames with Edwardian style window frames. Refresh of existing white paint on front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace metal casement window frames with Edwardian style window frames. Refresh of existing white paint on front of house at 4 Woodlands Avenue, Wanstead, London E11 3QZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1670/21, dated 18 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: the site location plan, the block plan and drawing reference PLA001.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council has raised no objection to the repainting of the existing render, and I see no reason to disagree. The focus of this appeal will therefore be on the effects of the replacement of the window frames.
4. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

5. The description of development in the header has been taken from the appeal form as it is more concise than that included on the application form.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed replacement of the window frames preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal dwelling is located in the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate (CA), which, in the vicinity of the appeal site, derives its significance from the presence of two storey semi-detached Edwardian dwellings with bay windows at ground and first floor with a projecting gable above. The window design and materials are varied along Woodlands Avenue, including timber sash windows, timber casement, uPVC top opening windows, uPVC casement and in the case of the appeal property, metal casement. This variation is noted in the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design Guide (2020) (Design Guide) which makes note of the large number of timber framed windows that have been replaced by less traditional alternatives.
8. Although the proposed materials for the replacement windows would not accord with the advice relating to windows set out in the Design Guide, their design with a multi-pane pattern over single pane would reflect the design of windows found elsewhere in the CA, more so than the existing.
9. Furthermore, whilst uPVC windows generally have a more regular finish than timber windows, I find in the context of the appeal site, with a variety of window design and materials nearby, that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. There is no evidence to suggest the uPVC windows would be more difficult to maintain or less sustainable than the existing, metal framed windows.
10. Accordingly, the new windows would better reflect the appearance of the area. They would improve the appearance of the dwelling and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the area. In terms of the CA as a whole, the proposal would preserve its character and appearance.
11. The proposal would therefore be in compliance with Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018), which together aim to ensure development respects local character and appearance, with particular regard to ensuring development preserves or enhances the character of conservation areas. It would also conform with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which suggests development should be sympathetic to a heritage asset's significance. It would likewise fulfil the aims of the Design Guide, which, although opposed to uPVC windows, seeks the reinstatement of traditional window patterns. Moreover, the proposal would comply with the statutory test set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the conserving of the historic environment aims of the Framework.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have recommended a condition ensuring the development accords with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and I agree that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR