The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/D/17/3176354
24 Roman Road, Derby DE1 3RX

- 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 Miss Deaon Garwandoe against the decision of Derby City Council.
- The application Ref DER/10/16/01275, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2017.
- The development proposed is replacement windows and door to the front elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description given by the Council as this is more concise and accurate than that given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Little Chester Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. Sited on a residential road, the property is a Victorian two storey mid-terrace dwelling house located within the CA. It is constructed from red brick with a slate roof and stone detailing. The significance of the CA derives largely from the evolutionary nature of development, from early Roman occupation to later 19th Century industrial growth; together making a contribution to the architectural and historic quality and character of the area surrounding Chester Green. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

5. The proposal is to replace the existing windows and doors to the front elevation of the dwelling. Based on the information submitted, the windows would have UPVC frames in a 'rosewood' finish and the door would be in a composite material. However, I do not have any detailed plans of the proposals, save for a photo of a door and a manufacturer's window leaflet.

6. The site is located in a sensitive area, being a conservation area, and one which is subject to an Article 4 Direction which restricts permitted development

rights for alterations to doors, windows and roof materials, or the rendering or painting of any elevations fronting a highway. It is important to have detailed information regarding the design of the proposal, including plans drawn to scale in order to be able to make an informed decision about the effect of the development upon the CA, a designated heritage asset.

7. The street features a variety of windows and door styles, some of which are modern and do not reflect the age and character of the properties here. However, the Council has clear aims of improving the character and appearance of the CA by the introduction of the Article 4 Direction and the subsequent approved applications for replacement windows and doors at 14, 18 and 20 Roman Road. To allow this proposal for what appears to be modern style windows and doors, constructed from modern materials with double glazed units, especially based on such brief information, would fail to achieve those aims. Modern style UPVC windows and composite doors can commonly appear unsympathetic, artificial and incongruous in a heritage setting.

8. The National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Although it is likely that the harm to the CA would be less than substantial in this case, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm.

9. Whilst I appreciate that the appellant may wish to ensure her home is safe and energy efficient; in the absence of any detailed plans and on the basis of the limited information I do have, I find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy E18 of the City of Derby Local Plan Review (January 2006) and Policy CP20 of the Derby City Local Plan - Part 1, Core Strategy (January 2017), which seek to preserve or enhance the special character of conservation areas.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR