

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/3824
Type	Full planning permission
Location	8, The Grove, Hornsey, London, N4 4HJ
Proposal	Replacement of windows and doors with double glazed uPVC windows and doors.
Case Officer	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date	
Applicant	Mr Barnaby Havercroft
Agent	Mr Joe Marshall

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 Seven representations were received in response to notification and publicity of the application.

1.2 The following issues were raised by neighbours, local groups and Councillors:

- There were a large number of objections to this application, all of which centred around the fact that the proposed change to uPVC at the front elevation would be out of character and detrimental to the conservation area.

2. CONSULTATION

- Internal consultation was conducted for this application, where build heritage colleagues were requested to give some input on the proposal. Their comments were as follows:

'The existing single-glazed timber windows and doors are considered to make a positive contribution to the architectural interest of the building, which makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and its significance. In principle, the replacement of the existing timber windows and doors raises significant concerns as the loss of traditionally detailed windows for UPVC poses one of the greatest threats to the heritage value of historic areas¹. Furthermore, no evidence towards justification for the removal of the existing windows has been submitted to the local planning authority. Historic glazing is a finite resource and greatly contributes to our ability to appreciate historic areas and places.

To conclude, the proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. With regards to the NPPF (2021) the level of harm is less than substantial, Paragraph 202 being relevant.'

3. REASONS FOR REFUSING PERMISSION

3.1 The subject site is a three-storey residential dwellinghouse, being the second of four taller buildings in a terrace of 8 properties. Officers note that the properties in this terrace have all retained the timber-sash windows, and therefore the delicate appearance of the glazing bars and window detail is consistent across the whole terrace.

3.2 The site is located within Stroud Green conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

3.3 The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision.

3.4 The proposal seeks the replacement of all of the existing timber sash windows, with bulkier windows of a uPCV construction. Additionally, the proposal seeks to replace the existing timber doors with new timber replacements.

3.5 The character of The Grove is in part upheld by the consistency in the fenestration of all of the properties in the terrace. The current windows in place all have narrow glazing bars that appear delicate and add to the appearance of the front elevations of the terrace.

3.6 Officers note that the proposed windows would see this consistency altered through the addition of windows with significantly bulkier frames such that the character of the host dwellinghouse, terrace, and conservation area as a whole would be negatively affected contrary to DM Policy DM9 and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3.7 The changes proposed would also see the windows at the rear of the property replaced and changed materially to uPVC. This change is one that the LPA has allowed in the past, and in this instance a change to uPVC at the rear would not be visible from many other properties and therefore is deemed to have less than substantial impact on the host dwellinghouse and conservation area.

3.8 With respect to impact on neighbouring amenity, the proposal does not seek any new openings, merely the replacement of the existing windows with new examples. It is deemed then, that this would not lead to any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking.

3.9 The proposal would not comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and does not help to preserve or improve the character of Stroud Green conservation area. Therefore the proposal cannot be supported.

3.10 In conclusion, the proposal cannot be supported as a change materially from timber to uPVC would be harmful to the character of the host dwellinghouse and to Stroud Green conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, DM Policy DM9, London Plan Policies D3 and D6, and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3.11 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, due to the inappropriate design and materials if approved, would seriously detract from the important character to the detriment of the Conservation Area. The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area., as such the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, DM Policy DM9, London Plan Policies D3 and D6, and Section 72(1)

of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.