



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Mrs Zoë Hill BA(Hons) Dip Bldg Cons(RICS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 1 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/Y/17/3166801

77 Albert Road, Saltaire, Shipley BD18 4NS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against the grant of listed building consent subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Larham against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - Listed building consent Ref: 16/08258/LBC was granted on 1 December 2016 subject to conditions.
 - The works proposed are described as the refurbishment of property including structural repairs, refurbishment of rainwater goods and openings, demolition of outbuilding and services installations.
 - The condition in dispute is No 6 which states that: Notwithstanding any submitted details, the windows shall be none other than single glazed timber framed sash 2 over 4 and 1 over 2 sashes and 1 over 2 sashes to the arched first floor windows. The front and rear doors shall be four panelled timber doors as detailed on Saltaire Townscheme Drawings D13 and D15. All external joinery shall have a painted finish.
 - The reason for the condition is: In the interests of visual amenity, local character and historical accuracy, in accordance with saved Policies BH4, BH7 and BH14 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the condition is reasonable and necessary.
3. In this respect I am mindful of the statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, as 77 Albert Road is a grade II Listed Building, and the statutory duty to consider whether or not the proposed works preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Saltaire Conservation Area. I am also mindful of the location of the appeal property within a World Heritage Site (WHS) and of the benefits the appellants put forward in respect of their case.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of two-storey, handed, executive houses. Built by Lockwood and Mawson for Sir Titus Salt, they are of hammer-dressed stone under a Welsh slate roof. The roof structure is in the form of paired gables facing Albert Road. The windows are a feature of these dwellings. The ground floor windows facing Albert Road are of two lights with a hoodmold. At ground floor the sashes are one-over-two. At first floor there are two light

Venetian Gothic windows which have a central colonnette, with a blind (unglazed) circle tympanum. Further detail exists by way of the alternately coloured voussoirs. The houses which form this pair each have side bays which contain their doors, with a simple fanlight. The windows facing Albert Terrace are less ornate being one-over-two sashes in the gable projection (with a hoodmold at ground floor) and in the flank wall nearest that projection and with pairs of two light one-over-two sashes. The rear elevation has windows of two-over-four sashes. This description is not exhaustive.

5. These houses form part of the Saltaire model village.
6. Thus, the architectural detailing, the age of the building, construction, historic fabric, relationship to the rest of the model village and its associated social history including that related to the philanthropist Sir Titus Salt all contribute to the special architectural and historic interest of the appeal property and this forms much of its significance.
7. The site is situated within the Saltaire Conservation Area. This covers the model village and includes, amongst other things, tight-knit workers housing, bigger houses for managers, small shops, the mill buildings (Salt's Mill), Dining Building, the Congregational Church, School, hospital, areas of recreational space, Hall, a station and a section of railway line and part of the Leeds Liverpool Canal. The completeness of the model village, architectural quality and its planned design aesthetic all contribute to the character and appearance and significance of this heritage asset and are important to its WHS status.
8. The appeal relates to one condition only and within that condition one key factor. That is the use of either single glazing as per the original windows or double glazing. The proposed double glazing would be of a slim profile which the plans identify as being 11mm glazing depth. The appellants explain that all timber sections would be as existing, with the glazing depth resulting in a change to the putty angle. This would have the consequence of creating a less elegant, less slender appearance, to the window frame. This would be added to by the uncharacteristic appearance of the depth of the double glazing which would be seen within the frame. As such, it would not be either historically accurate or visually unaltered. Notwithstanding the later alterations to some of the windows and their poor condition, this amounts to harm to the listed building, albeit less than substantial harm.
9. Against that harm there is the benefit of better thermal and acoustic insulation and, in this case, I am mindful that the Albert Terrace elevation directly faces the railway line which is an active line. However, whilst anecdotal evidence is provided that the proposed glazing would result in significant benefits in this respect there is no substantiated evidence to demonstrate the benefits that might accrue or, indeed, whether there might be a difference in benefits between elevations. Nor is there consideration of the needs of the use of the rooms which the windows serve. As such these benefits do not outweigh the harm to the listed building.
10. I do, however, accept that there would be likely benefits arising from a reduction in condensation and this would have benefits in terms of the longevity of the replacement windows improving their sustainability.
11. Having in mind the evidence before me I am not satisfied that it has been demonstrated that condition 6 is unreasonable or unnecessary insofar as it

seeks to preserve the special architectural and historic interests of this grade II listed building.

12. I must also assess the effect of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the whole Conservation Area, wherein I saw that there is a variation in window material and design. In these circumstances and as the matter is one which relates to precise details observed at close proximity, I consider that the limited harm would be outweighed by relatively modest benefits to thermal and acoustic properties. As such I am satisfied that the character and appearance of the Saltaire Conservation Area would be preserved. For this reason it seems to me there would be negligible harm to the WHS also.

Other Matters

13. I have noted the appellants' reference to two other properties where they explain similar windows have been used. These are 17 Dove Street and 43 Mary Street. I looked at both properties however there is nothing before me regarding the precise circumstances of those cases and it was apparent, even from outside, that such works had been undertaken at Mary Street, but less so at Dove Street where the ground floor window appeared unaltered. As such, I am not satisfied that those cases provide a compelling precedent to justify removing condition 6.
14. I note that there are no accurate 'existing' drawings for the windows at the appeal property. Moreover, the 'proposed' drawings have been computer generated and do not provide for clarity in terms of the glazing bar profiles, or indeed, other details. Nor are there any details of the insert to be used in the void between panes of the double glazing which can make a difference to the final appearance of the window. However, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that the only change would relate to the putty angle and glass depth as this is what has been put before me. Further details could have been secured by condition had I come to a different conclusion.

Conclusions

15. Thus, for the reasons set out above whilst I having differing conclusions in respect of the effect on the Conservation Area to that of the Listed Building, I conclude that the appeal, on the basis of the evidence before me, should not succeed.

Zoë Hill

Inspector