The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/17/3174280
16 Chaddock Street, Preston PR1 3TL

- 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 Mohammed Laly against the decision of Preston City Council.
- The application Ref 06/2016/1272, dated 17 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2017.
- The development proposed is replacement windows to front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. As part of the appeal, I sought the parties' views on whether the proposed development would result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets, and if so, to what extent, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and whether, there are any public benefits that would outweigh this harm. The appellant replied that they have no comments in respect of these matters. I have also had regard to the Council's response in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Avenham Conservation Area (ACA) and the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey red brick mid-terrace dwelling in the ACA that is subject of an Article 4 direction which controls the insertion of replacement windows. While the property is not listed, 17 and 18 Chaddock Street are Grade II listed buildings. The property has three windows, one at ground floor with two at first floor with raised sills and wedge lintels. This is a consistent pattern along the street, including at Nos 17 and 18. Each of the appeal site's windows is a timber-framed sliding sash window with timber glazing bars in an eight-over-eight form. Elsewhere in Chaddock Street, including at Nos 17 and 18, there is an extensive use of timber-framed sliding sash windows, even if there are variations to those used in the appeal site which are not original.

5. Chaddock Street is in tandem with neighbouring streets laid out in a grid which has resulted in terraced rows of similar designed properties which use a limited

palette of traditional building materials and widely use of timber sliding sash windows. This creates positive visual harmony in the street and the wider ACA.

6. The proposed double glazed heritage grade uPVC windows would replace the existing single glazed windows with a like for like design. I understand the Council is not opposed to the principle of replacement windows being installed and that recommendations[1] were made to *allow the use of heritage grade replica sash windows (as appropriate) as they maintain the desired look for longer and cost significantly less*. Yet, this is only a recommendation and I am not certain if this reflects the Council's current approach. However, any development must preserve or enhance any heritage assets.

7. Notably, the proposed windows would have a slim profile and a colour which would not be dissimilar to the existing windows. However, significantly there are no examples of uPVC or other synthetic materials in the windows of properties in the immediate vicinity of No 16. The proposed windows would introduce a modern material which does not reflect the traditional use of timber for the sash windows in Chaddock Street. While the proposed specification is of a higher grade than typical uPVC windows, they would still have a very different appearance to painted timber frames, in that they would appear duller and would not reflect the use of natural, traditional materials which positively contributes to the visual harmony in Chaddock Street. The proposal would be a significant departure, even though the window style is compatible with the host property.

8. I noted the examples of uPVC windows in properties in Frenchwood Street which is also in the ACA, even if they do not benefit from planning permission. Despite this, aesthetically, they do have a different appearance to the use of timber and properties in Frenchwood Street do use a wider variety of materials which includes timber, uPVC and metal. Thus, the proposed windows would result in a significant harm to the character and appearance of the ACA and the adjacent listed buildings. The windows would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the ACA and the listed buildings.

9. With regard to paragraph 134 of the Framework the harm to the ACA and the listed buildings would be less than substantial. This is still a harmful impact which adversely affects the significance of the ACA and the listed buildings as heritage assets. Public benefit would arise from increased security due to the windows modern design. It is also suggested that environmental benefit would arise, but I am unclear what the specific benefit would be, especially given the Council's evidence regarding the thermal performance of uPVC windows compared to timber replacements. Still, the harm to the ACA and the listed buildings would, to which I attach considerable importance and weight, in my view, clearly outweigh this modest public benefit.

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the ACA and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. The proposal would not accord with Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy Local Development Framework, Policies EN8 and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and paragraph 134 of the Framework. Together these seek, among other things, development to preserve or where

[1] Residential Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, A Work Plan Study by the Communities Scrutiny Panel, February 2015 – June 2015

appropriate enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset through high quality new design that responds to its context.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR