



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2023

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3309205

58 Gladstone Avenue, Wood Green, Haringey, London N22 6LL

- 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 Sunitha Annamasery Appukuttan against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/0936, dated 7 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2022.
The development proposed is a retrospective development relating to the replacement of timber-framed windows for UPVC framed windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Noel Park Estate is a planned residential development within Wood Green. It was planned and developed by the Artizans, Labourers and General Dwellings Company circa 1881-1913. The houses were designed to house the families of workers and artisans in fashionable cottage style dwellings that are richly decorated and well-designed houses. The area retains its homogenous appearance and much of its attraction, and is easily distinguished from the surrounding Wood Green area.
4. Much of the Estate's charm and interesting character derives from the quality of the architecture. All around the estate, decorative details adds variety to the terraces. Consistency across the estate gives the area a distinctive character. Each property is an integral part of the design and makes its own contribution towards the character of the neighbourhood. There is great harmony in design seen here. Windows throughout are predominantly double hung wooden sash windows with narrow glazing bars and whilst some of the properties have been altered by the use of non-traditional fenestration, the homogeneity of the townscape is still retained.
5. The appellant has explained that they sought to emulate the traditional style of window seen locally, throughout their property. However, they have executed this with the use of upvc material. Whilst there are examples of non-traditional window styles and materials, these are in the main, very limited. Its flat

appearance does not reflect the design detail of the traditional fenestration of the other CA dwellings and thus harmfully jars with them.

6. Furthermore, the use of brown coloured finish is not a sympathetic or appropriate colour to the character and appearance of the area where white coloured frames are a consistent feature of the CA.
7. There is no evidence before me to agree with the appellant that the original windows that have since been removed were in a state of disrepair. With the CA, the conservation of traditional windows is very important in the context of heritage assets.
8. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The incremental loss of architectural detailing harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and does not preserve or enhance the conservation area as a whole.
9. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. That is still so, irrespective of whether the potential harm is 'less than substantial'. This harm would be 'less than substantial' and in accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, the public benefits must be balanced against any harm found.
10. A benefit may be by creating a more energy efficient home. However, this is rather a personal benefit to the appellant than a public benefit and I apply only moderate weight to it.
11. Bringing all matters together, the general appearance and character of the CA is harmfully affected, and the appearance of the immediate surroundings is not preserved. There is harm to the significance of the heritage asset as a whole.
12. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal represents an insensitive alteration to the fabric of the building. It does preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area, contrary to the design aims and heritage protection objectives of policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies DPD (2017), as well as Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021).

Conclusion

13. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR