

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		20/03/2007	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		27.2.07	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Charles Thuairé				2006/4453/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
103 Broadhurst Gardens London NW6 3BJ				See decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Replacement of all existing timber sash and casement windows on front, rear and side elevations with UPVC double-glazed sash and casement windows.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	35	No. of responses	12	No. of objections	12
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		uPVC “ugly, unsightly, cheap and nasty”; timber sash windows add to character of building; CA policy is to maintain original features and materials; uPVC is unsustainable material, inappropriate for house of this age nor CA and detracts from its value and that of its neighbours; degrades quality of building.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		CRASH object- uPVC detracts from appearance and character of house, whatever quality of design is used; beauty of front right ground floor window with leaded fanlight would be lost; CA Statement requires architectural features to be maintained and replaced on like for like basis. No CAAC for this conservation area.					

Site Description

Large detached 3-storey plus basement and attic property on south side of road, used as HMO with numerous bedsits. It has unfortunately been painted and rendered white in the past and not had its windows adequately maintained. It has an unusual decorated Dutch gable on the front plus projecting ground floor element with railings above, and an original 2-storey bay at the rear. The windows are a mixture of sash and casement timber ones; the front ground right hand window has an attractive stained glass fanlight. Neighbouring properties are terraced red brick Victorian houses of a similar gabled form and with virtually all original timber sash windows intact. Located within Swiss Cottage conservation area. The property backs onto a communal open space at the rear.

Relevant History

21.11.88- pp granted for retention of windows on both flank elevations
27.9.89- pp for use as hostel and retention of rear extension

Relevant policies

Replacement UDP 2006 - S1,2,7; SD9; B1,3,7
Camden Planning Guidance 2006
Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal is to replace all the windows on all elevations by uPVC double glazed ones in a variety of styles, in order to match the existing glazing patterns and window types wherever possible. Essentially on the front elevation, the 6 sash windows will be replaced by new sash types, the 2 casements by new casements and the main ground floor casement windows replaced by a plain casement one of different glazing pattern losing its stained fanlight. On the rear elevation, the sashes and 1 casement on the top 2 storeys will be replaced by all new sashes, while the remaining casements will be replaced by similar casements. The 2 side elevations will have a variety of sash and casement types with some casements being replaced by sashes. The intention is to use the Rehau Heritage system of uPVC windows which have the thinnest profile of joinery possible for this type of material and which have sashes of a traditional vertical-sliding style with replica features such as projecting horns on the upper panes.

The applicant has clearly tried to use the best possible solution of uPVC glazing which replicates, as far as possible within the constraints of this synthetic material, the existing window types. However the Council is concerned that uPVC can never replicate exactly the existing windows in terms of their profile and glazing style: this is particularly true for sash windows where the narrow and elegant profile and proportions of the timber will be replaced by a plastic material which will still be bulkier and wider in section and profile. The replica features are not convincing and their plastic material will not truly give the impression of white-painted wood. Even with the casements, their proportions do not replicate the existing ones. Also the decorative fanlight of the front casement window will be lost: this is regrettable as it is an interesting feature of the elevation and matches other similar original windows such as at no.101 next door.

The existing timber windows on the front and rear elevations, although in a dilapidated state, are capable of repair or reinstatement; although some of the sashes have in the distant past been replaced by casements, these are not harmful to the appearance of the property. The original windows contribute to the appearance and quality of the property and indeed to the setting of neighbouring properties, which have retained nearly all their original sashes, and to the character of the conservation area. Moreover some of the original windows, such as the decorative casement at the front, contribute to the character of this streetscene. Although the sash uPVC replacements have been designed to minimise their bulky proportions and it could be argued that the differences between some of the existing and proposed windows would be perceived as marginal, nevertheless it is considered that the individual and cumulative impact of all the replacement windows, in terms of their proportions, glazing design and natural finish, would harm the overall appearance of the property and would set an unwelcome precedent for future replacements along this road and thus would not preserve the character of the conservation area. It should be noted that the property is visible from the public realm at both front and rear. However it is considered that no objection could be raised in

design terms to the proposed side windows as these are barely visible from the road or communal garden and as the differences in glazing type or profile would not be readily ascertained.

UDP policy B3 states that the insensitive replacement of windows and doors can spoil the appearance of buildings and can be particularly damaging if the building forms part of a group. CPG states that new windows should match the originals in type, proportion, materials and size of opening and that replacement windows in timber are preferable to uPVC framed ones. The CAS states that Broadhurst Gardens is noted for buildings which have many interesting details such as their fanlights, doors and windows. Guideline 9.33 states that existing and original features should be retained and protected and that original detailing such as timber framed sash windows add to the visual interest of properties. Guideline 9.35 further states that use of original and natural materials will be required and use of UPVC windows are likely to be unacceptable.

It should also be noted that the Council generally discourages uPVC plastic materials as they are made from unsustainable sources, contrary to policies SD9 and B1 and design advice in CPG.

A very recent appeal decision is supportive of this stance against PVC window design. Planning permission was refused on 11.10.06 for replacement of timber sash windows by PVC sash windows in Drury Lane Covent Garden, for the reason of inappropriate design and materials harmful to the building and conservation area. This was dismissed on appeal on 15.3.07. The Inspector in her decision commented that the replacement would be out of character with the design and integrity of the original building and that PVC windows would be an inappropriate replacement for them. She opined that the difference between PVC and traditional timber types is quite noticeable (despite that both involved sliding sashes) and that the box frame would appear thicker and the glazing bars, although similar in width, would be stuck on and not an integral part of the frame design. She concluded that the overall effect was to change the proportions and detailing of the windows which would be harmful to the building and conservation area.

It is recommended that the scheme be refused on grounds of inappropriate design and materials harming the appearance and character of the building, its neighbours and conservation area.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613