



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019

by Paul Jackson B Arch (Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/Y/19/3234176

79 High Street, Saffron Walden, Essex CB10 1DZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Evans against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/19/0952/LB, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is replacement windows to side and rear and replacement door to rear.
-

Preliminary matter

1. The items which are proposed to be replaced comprise the following: window and door to rear kitchen extension; small downstairs wc single casement window to side elevation; upstairs bathroom 3 casement window to side elevation. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed in part and dismissed in part. Listed building consent is refused for replacement windows to the side elevation. Listed building consent is granted for replacement window and replacement door to rear at 79 High Street, Saffron Walden, Essex CB10 1DZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref UTT/19/0952/LB, dated 24 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No works shall take place until elevations and sections showing the design and construction of the window and door, at a scale of not less than 1:10, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The replacement window and door shall be glazed with sealed double-glazed units with black spacer bars.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a late 19th century former gardeners' cottage, listed at Grade II. Its heritage significance derives mainly from its architectural design and detailing which reflect its former importance on the Gibson Estate. The primary windows on the front and side elevations which contribute a great deal to its architectural quality and the character and appearance of the Saffron Walden Conservation Area are distinctive cast iron casements with lozenge 'lattice' glazing, painted black and white.

4. The kitchen window which is proposed to be replaced is a modern timber unit in an extension which itself is a later addition to the building. Its replacement with an up to date contemporary unit would not compromise the architectural or historic interest of the building, providing that the double-glazed units are not conspicuous. The door and frame are of some age but not unusual or of particularly special interest. The door is very difficult to see from any public viewpoint. Providing that the replacement door and frame are constructed of solid timber and the glazing has black spacer bars, then the special interest of the building would not be compromised. In considering this matter I have taken account of the Council's objection to timber glazing beads, but given the limited visibility, and as the existing window may well have been installed prior to listing in 1994, no unacceptable harm to heritage significance would occur. I conclude that these elements of the proposed works would not conflict with the heritage protection objectives of policy ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan of 2005 or the National Planning Policy Framework. The drawings submitted are inaccurate insofar as the appearance of the window is concerned. For this reason, a condition is imposed requiring new details to be approved.
5. The existing windows on the north east flank wall are simple wood casements typical of the later Victorian period. The larger first floor bathroom window is visible from the High Street and contributes to appreciation of the heritage significance of the building as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area. It currently has 3 top opening casements secured with iron 'monkey tail' type sash fasteners. The ground floor wc window is hard to see from the street but is similar in construction to the window above.
6. The proposed flank wall windows would be of unashamedly modern construction. The first-floor window would appear anachronistic and out of character seen in the same context as the original iron window at ground floor which illuminates the stairwell. The side hung central casement of the first-floor window would not replicate the appearance or the mode of operation of the existing window and the generic industrial ironmongery proposed would appear out of keeping seen from the inside, in the original part of the house. The proposed frame would be of very different proportions to the existing. Moreover, it is unclear why the existing simple windows are incapable of repair or reproduction, possibly including upgrading with draught sealing and new 'slimline' double glazed units (if required) as well as stripping and repainting, or replacement with facsimiles, of the fasteners.
7. The erosion of special interest that would be caused by the replacement of the first-floor window with a modern unit would not be justified by any public benefit. The improvements in energy efficiency and damp penetration that might occur do not outweigh the harm to heritage significance. For reasons of consistency, the wc window should match the first-floor window in appearance. For these reasons, the side elevation windows would be unacceptably harmful and would conflict with the heritage protection objectives of policy ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan of 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. For all the above reasons, the appeal should succeed only in part.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR