



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2819
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	52-60 High Street, Hornsey, London, N8 7NX
Proposal:	Replacement of existing wooden windows at the front and rear to UPVC double glazed
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	28/11/2023
Applicant:	BRIDGET JOHNSTON
Agent:	HB Planning Services

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

2.1 The following consultation responses were received:

1) LBH Conservation: Objects to the proposal.

52-60 High Street is part of a parade (Nos. 34-60) which is locally listed and lies within the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area.

There is no in principle objection to the appropriate replacement of existing windows, if they cannot be repaired. However, the design and materials of the proposed replacements should be to match the existing original windows. The proposed change for timber to uPVC is not supported in principle as their design and materiality are uncharacteristic of the original design of the host buildings and would detract from its architectural interest and historic character.

Additionally, there are no submitted details provided for the replacement windows and doors. Any replacement windows would need to accurately replicate the joinery details of the windows to the front elevation. The rear elevation, whilst less sensitive to change than the front would still require proposed details.

The proposal would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area and causes harm to the significance the locally listed building.

Conservation does not support this application, and it should be considered in line with paragraphs 200, 205, 208, 209 of the NPPF and local plan policy DM9(b).

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

Proposed development

3.1 The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and letters. One objection was received upon publicity of the application, outlined below:

- Impact of new windows on front façade on conservation area. Windows should be repaired or replaced with like-for-like timber windows. Failing this, any replacement with uPVC windows as proposed must ensure that the original appearance is preserved as much as possible e.g. regarding the width of the glazing bars etc. Relevant details have not been provided as such.

4. REASONS FOR REFUSING PERMISSION

4.1 The application site is part of a parade comprising ground floor shops and residential flats above. The parade is two storeys in height, with a gabled attic above, on the southern side of High Street. The site is locally listed, within the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area.

4.2 This is an application for the replacement of existing wooden windows at the front and rear to UPVC double glazed.

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

4.4 It is proposed to replace the existing timber windows on the front elevation, which are in poor condition. Despite their poor condition, the existing timber windows are consistent and have high quality detailing. The proposed replacement windows would be composed of uPVC. UPVC would be a downgrading of the materials on this locally listed building within the conservation area. The materiality of uPVC windows provide a visual character that is discordant with the original design of the host buildings. Furthermore, uPVC windows tend to be thicker and have detailing that deviates from original timber windows, impacting on the appearance of the host building.

4.5 Any replacement windows would need to accurately replicate the joinery details of the windows to the front elevation. Without these details there is insufficient information to determine whether or not the proposed joinery details would match the existing and to assess the impact of the proposed works.

4.6 The rear elevation is less sensitive to change than the front, but the replacement rear windows would still require the submission of details to demonstrate their appropriateness.

4.7 There is also an inconsistency in the plans. The submitted sections on the drawings both numbered 202303-HB05 do not match the elevations on the same drawing, nor the proposed works in the proposed elevations, application form, and design, access and

heritage statement. These details appear to be for secondary glazing, not replacement windows.

4.8 The replacement uPVC windows are not supported as their design and materiality are uncharacteristic of the original design of the host buildings and would detract from its architectural interest and historic character. The proposal would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Hornsey High Street Conservation Area and causes harm to the significance the locally listed building.

Conclusion

4.9 The proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would not materially harm the character and appearance of the listed building and Hornsey High Street Conservation Area. It does not satisfy Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and Policy SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

4.10 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

5. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The replacement windows will not reflect the form, material or appearance of the original windows and would have an incongruous design harmful to the character and appearance of the listed building and Hornsey High Street Conservation Area. As such the proposal does not accord with the design and conservation aims 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 (2017).