



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/W/17/3181637

Flat 6, 21 Eversley Park, Folkestone. Kent CT20 3FE

- 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 John Morrison against the decision of Shepway District Council.
 - The application Ref Y17/0466/SH, dated 11 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Replacing 11 single glazed wooden framed sash windows and 1 wooden framed non-sash window for 11 double glazed sash windows and 1 non-sash double glazed window. All will be the traditional and period style in wood effect uPVC, with the same period fixings (catches, handles, etc) and horns. The frames will be manufactured to the same size and design as the originals'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The host building provides accommodation on up to five floors and Flat 6 is a maisonette spread over the third and fourth floors. The host building was originally built for educational purposes and has recently been converted into 23 flats.
4. The development would involve all of Flat 6's timber framed, single glazed windows being replaced by PVC-U double glazed windows. Flat 6's sash windows have horns. Of the sash windows all but one appeared to be originals, with their timber joinery (ie frames and glazing bars) matching the original sash windows present throughout the rest of the host building. The other sash window forming part of a recent extension to the building.
5. The uniformity of the multiple original timber sash windows contributes strongly to the host building's appearance and their horned and slender form is typical of the time when this building was originally built. The replacement wood effect sash windows by contrast would be of a much heavier form, being typical of many non-timber, double glazed replacement windows. I consider that the bulky form of the new windows would give them the appearance of

being obvious replacements, which would look out of place when compared with the host building's many original sash windows.

6. I am mindful of the fact that new French windows were installed as part of the conversion scheme, however, while they are recent installations they are of a consistent type throughout the building. I recognise that the appellant wishes to improve the thermal efficiency of Flat 6. However, I am not persuaded that the installation of the chosen window units would be the only means by which the thermal efficiency of Flat 6 could be improved.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building, which the Council has referred to as being a non-designated heritage asset. I therefore consider that the development would be contrary to saved Policies SD1, BE1 and BE8 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review of 2006, Policy DSD of the Shepway Core Strategy of 2013 and Section 7 (Requiring good design) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). That is because the development would not be of a high standard of design, with the materials and detailing of the windows not reflecting the appearance of the host building's many other sash windows. I further consider that for the purposes of paragraph 135 of the Framework that the harm to the appearance of the host building, as a non-designated heritage asset, would outweigh the benefits of the development in terms of the improved thermal efficiency of Flat 6.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR