



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/24/3357000

26 Tooting Bec Gardens, Lambeth, London SW16 1RB

- 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 Ms Jeremic against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/02110/FUL.
 - The development proposed is replacement PVCu wood-grain effect windows to basement flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Streatham Park and Garrad's Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings with bay pitched gable, mock timber details, hanging tiles and ornately decorated porches. The appeal site comprises the basement flat of the property. The property is set back from the main road, has off-road parking to the front and is partly enclosed by a rendered boundary wall. The surrounding area has a leafy suburban character with similar architectural style to the appeal property.
4. Because the appeal site lies in the CA, I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). The CA covers an area on the south-western edge of the borough. It is bounded by Garrad's Road to the west, Bedford Hill to the north, Ockley Road to the east and Rydal Road to the South. Its significance is derived from its development that illustrates both the expansion of Streatham and the evolution of domestic architectural tastes between 1880 and 1930.
5. The Streatham Park and Garrad's Road Conservation Area Statement (2023) (CAS) states that the CA contains a variety of fenestration detailing with a common feature being good quality materials, craftsmanship and authenticity to the style of the property. Vertical painted timber sliding sash windows and timber casement windows are the predominant window types. Nos 20-34 Tooting Bec Gardens are listed in the CAS as positive contributors to the CA. The replacement of historic timber windows in the CA is identified in the CAS as a recurrent problem where chunky and factory made uPVC windows fail to replicate the traditional

construction details and delicate glazing designs of the traditional, single glazed windows.

6. On the ground and first floor of the property there are traditional timber windows which are slightly rounded to the top. The proposal would include the replacement of existing timber windows at basement level, in addition to those on the front and rear elevations of the side lean-to. Two of the windows are located within an existing lightwell which is surrounded by black painted railings, whilst the lean to is set back from the front elevation and covered in security railings. Although these existing windows are not historic, they are timber and thereby have a traditional appearance. Therefore, the existing windows contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA, albeit to a limited extent due to their location.
7. I observed that uPVC windows have been installed at Nos 18, 22, 24 and 28 to 30 and that the windows on the second floor of the host property are not of traditional appearance. However, these windows are not part of the prevailing character of the CA.
8. The submitted drawings show that the windows would include trickle vents which are not characteristic of traditional windows. Although the appellant has confirmed that these could be removed, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans. Despite the similar openings and wood grain effect, the appearance of the proposed new windows would be different to the existing timber windows, which would diminish the traditional appearance of the building.
9. The proposal would introduce uPVC windows into a prominent building within the CA, where the existing traditional timber windows contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal for non-traditional materials fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where harm is identified to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appellant puts forward that there is extensive mould in the lower ground floor bedrooms as well as damp, due to the condition of the existing windows. Furthermore, the proposed replacement of the windows with uPVC would provide a cost-effective solution which would enhance the energy efficiency of the flat. Whilst I note the argument put forward in relation to improving energy efficiency, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the uPVC windows would provide greater energy efficiency than replacement timber windows, which would maintain the architectural integrity of the building. Although the uPVC windows would provide a cheaper alternative than replacement timber windows, this would not be a public benefit.
11. Taken overall, I attribute neutral weight to the public benefits of the proposal, which is insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA. Given this and the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the Framework, and conflicts with policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021). Taken together, these policies amongst other things seek to ensure that alterations to buildings positively respond to the original architecture, roof form, detailing, fenestration (including design, materials and means of opening) of the host

building and respects the established positive characteristics of the locality and historic character.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR