



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 January 2025

by **O S Woodward MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2025

Appeal A - Ref: APP/Y5420/W/24/3352987

Princess Elizabeth House (aka Princess Elizabeth Court), 18 Winchester Place, Hornsey, London N6 5BQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by JMS Estates (IOM) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/2067.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing Crittall windows to building.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/Y5420/Y/24/3352988

Princess Elizabeth House (aka Princess Elizabeth Court), 18 Winchester Place, Hornsey, London N6 5BQ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by JMS Estates (IOM) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1334.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of existing Crittall windows to building.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have adopted the descriptions of development from the decision notices over those used on the application forms because they more accurately describe the proposal.
4. Because the appeals relate to works to a Grade II listed building, 'Elizabeth House'¹, including refusal to grant a listed building consent, and the appeal site lies within the Highgate Conservation Area (the CA), I have had special regard to Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

5. The main issues for both appeals are whether or not the proposal would:
 - i. preserve the Grade II listed building or any features of special architectural or

¹ List entry number 1391376.

historic interest which it possesses; and, ii. preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

Significance

Listed building

6. The building is relatively large and from the inter-war period. It is in the Neo-Georgian style. As is pertinent to the appeals, it is largely the same scale and layout as when built, although there has been a lower ground floor downwards extension to the rear. The fully above ground, historic parts comprise the majority of the building. In those areas, all the windows are original, metal framed Crittal casements, with leaded panes. They are single glazed. The glazing bars are integral to the structure with individual small window panes. They are intrinsically attractive items of historic fabric. In addition, when viewed in their totality on the building, the amount of glazing is fairly extensive, contemporaneous with the building, and forms part of a cohesive architectural composition.
7. A condition survey has not been provided nor has any other substantiated information been submitted which demonstrates that the windows are in a particularly poor state of repair. From my site visit, I could see that the windows are showing some signs of wear and tear in places, for example some bowing, broken handles and rust. However, they appear to be in relatively good condition for their age. A particularly striking feature of the building is the remaining consistency and extent of original glazing in relatively good condition.
8. Overall, the existing windows above the new lower ground floor level are important positive contributors to the significance of the building, both in architectural and historic terms, and both considered as individual units and as a whole. The windows and doors to the lower ground floor extension are double glazed, plastic units. However, this part of the building has been carved out of the rear garden area and is not particularly visible from the surroundings, and is clearly a modern addition to the original building at above ground levels. Those windows and doors, therefore, are neutral contributors to the significance of the building.

Conservation area

9. The building is slightly tucked behind existing buildings but its highly elevated position coupled with it being a relatively tall building for the area mean that it is visible in places, for example from along Cholmeley Park, and from several surrounding buildings. The building, as a fine example of inter-war architecture, including the prominent and important fenestration, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole, and therefore to its significance.

Assessment

10. It is proposed to replace all original Crittal windows. As set out above, the windows are of high architectural and historic value. This would, therefore, result in the loss of important historic fabric. The loss would cause further harm due to the importance of the windows to the overall architectural composition and aesthetics of the building.

11. Full details have not been provided of the replacement windows. However, it has been confirmed that they would be double glazed units and with metal frames. The submitted proposed elevations suggest that there would be no, or very minimal, changes to the external appearance of the windows. However, the submitted sections² and photographs tell a different story. Despite being made by the Crittal company, the replacements would have white glazing bars which are thicker, particularly to the outer edges of each window, where they meet the frame. At the same time, there would be a lesser chamfer from the glazing bars to the window panes than as existing. The glazing bars would be cosmetic, so the window panes behind would be one large sheet rather than several small panes each inset into a glazing bar.
12. I have given thought as to whether a condition could be applied to try and overcome at least some of the above concerns. However, the issues with the windows are integral to the change to double glazing. It is unlikely to be possible, and it certainly has not been demonstrated that, double glazing could be achieved without resulting in the design harms set out above.
13. The Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency Historic England Advice Note 18 is referenced by the appellant. However, this Note specifically states that draught proofing, repair and secondary glazing can usually be achieved with only a negligible effect on a building's special interest. It also states that double-glazing is unlikely to be acceptable where, as is the case with the appeal building, the existing windows retain historic glass of interest and are of historic or architectural interest. This Note does not, therefore, provide guidance to support the appellant's approach.
14. Insofar as the external appearance of the building would be harmed, so would the character and appearance of the CA, because of the prominence of the building and its fenestration, including from public views, and the positive contribution the building makes to the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

15. Due to the loss of important historic fabric and the unacceptable appearance of the proposed replacement windows, the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, and the character and appearance of the CA. I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and is contrary to Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021), Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management Plan DPD (2017), and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017). These policies seek high quality design and the protection of the significance of heritage assets.

Heritage Balance

16. In accordance with Paragraph 212 of the Framework, I place great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets. Although less than substantial, I place considerable importance and weight on the harm that I have identified. As set out at Paragraph 215 of the Framework, where there is less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, this harm should be weighed against the public

² Window Details – Existing & Proposed Ref 15104-03-15-201 Rev P2

benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

17. The public benefits of the proposal are the increased energy efficiency that would result from the installation of modern windows, in particular the change from single to double glazing. However, the level of any potential energy efficiency improvements and/or energy savings have not been evidenced or demonstrated. Therefore, a meaningful assessment of the extent of any environmental and thus public benefits of the proposal cannot be made.
18. Furthermore, there are alternative ways to improve the energy efficiency of a building of this age. The windows could be repaired and refurbished, particularly given that they appear to be in relatively good condition. Alternatively, or additionally, secondary glazing could be installed, and I particularly note that the windows are set in relatively deep internal reveals with ample space for such glazing to be introduced. No substantiated evidence has been submitted with regard to these options, for example regarding the costs or any technical limitations. Neither has any detailed information been submitted to compare these strategies in terms of energy efficiency improvements to the proposed replacement window approach.
19. A wider energy strategy for the building has been mentioned by the appellant. However, no details are provided beyond very high level statements regarding, for example, the use of solar panels or water saving measures. Certainly, no other works are before me and I must, in any event, consider the appeals on their own merits.
20. Overall, there would likely be some benefit with regard to increased energy efficiency. However, the degree of efficiency gain is unquantified, both in absolute terms against existing and also relative to alternative strategies. I therefore place limited weight on this factor. In addition, no substantiated evidence has been provided that the continued viable use of the building, which is currently being used for student accommodation, is contingent on the replacement windows. Therefore, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets that I have identified clearly outweighs the limited public benefits.

Conclusions

21. For the reasons above, Appeal A is dismissed.
22. For the reasons above, Appeal B is dismissed.

O S Woodward
INSPECTOR