

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2016

**by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 23 September 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G0908/D/16/3152419**

**8 Nook Street, Workington, Cumbria CA14 4EG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Terrance Bowness against the decision of Allerdale Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2/2016/0153, dated 23 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as "to replace front timber windows with white uPVC sliding sash windows with horns and astragal Georgian bar same design as existing. To replace front timber door with composite door in white same design as existing."
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the replacement of the front timber windows with white uPVC sliding sash windows with horns and astragal Georgian bar same design as existing. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the replacement of the front timber door with composite door in white same design as existing and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the front timber door with composite door in white same design as existing at 8 Nook Street, Workington, Cumbria CA14 4EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2/2016/0153, dated 23 February 2016, and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: Site Location Plan; Block/Site Plan; Scale Drawing Scale 1:20; and Door Design "Radiant".

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Workington Conservation Area and the host property.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of buildings that are in a mix of commercial and residential use. The properties in the terrace vary in style and design but the majority of them retain their timber sash windows. Like the buildings themselves, these windows vary in their detailing, but as prominent
-

visual features on the buildings they are an important element in the conservation area's significance as a heritage asset. Within the wider terrace, Nos 8 – 16 have a similar design both in terms of the building, the front doors and their fenestration, with the latter being multi-paned Georgian style sliding sash windows. The consistency in the design of these properties, and their windows, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4. Whilst the majority of buildings on the street retain their timber sash windows, some have been fitted with replacements in other styles and materials. This has adversely affected the appearance of these buildings, has diminished their historic and architectural importance, and the contribution they make to the conservation area. I note that in order to protect the character of the conservation area from further erosion an Article 4 Direction now covers the area.
5. At present the windows and door on the front elevation of the appeal property are in a poor state of repair, and this has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is proposed to replace these with specialist sash windows that would be designed to replicate much of the detailing of the current windows. Thus the frames would be "slimline" and the windows would incorporate run-through sash horns.
6. Whilst the proposed windows would demonstrate some of the finesse found in traditional sash windows, it is unclear whether the windows would utilise traditional brass catches on the windows, and there is no evidence to indicate that the windows would not have glossy finish that results from the use of uPVC. Moreover, although the description of the development indicates that the windows would have astragal Georgian bars, these are not shown on any of the plans which indicate that the windows would only have 2 panes of glass. As such, the proposed windows would lack finesse in their detailing, and would be a poor approximation of the original windows. Therefore they would be out of keeping with the character and detailing of the host property and the conservation area.
7. The Council has not raised any objection to the proposed new door which they consider to be sympathetic to both the host property and the conservation area. The door would be a 6 panel door of very similar design to the existing one. In the light of this, and from my own observations, I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. As this part of the proposal is clearly severable from the replacement of the windows, I consider it can be allowed on its own.
8. Overall, I consider that the replacement of the front timber door with a composite door would preserve the character and appearance of the host property and Workington Conservation Area, but that the replacement of the front timber windows with white uPVC sash windows would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of either the host property or the conservation area. Accordingly proposed new windows would conflict with Policy S27 of the *Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1) (adopted July 2014)* which seeks the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Having regard to paragraph 134 of the Framework, whilst the harm caused to the conservation area would be less than substantial, there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused.

9. The appellant has set out reasons why the windows need to be replaced, including improving the thermal efficiency and security of the dwelling and reducing maintenance. Whilst these are fully understood much the same advantages could be achieved in other ways through the use of more sensitively designed replacement windows.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alison Partington*

INSPECTOR