
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/19/3239549
24 Bury Road, Harlow CM17 0ED

- 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 Mrs Montgomery against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref HW/HSE/19/00318, dated 2 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is replace existing single glazed window sashes in front ground floor and first floor windows with double glazed sashes. Windows will be painted to match existing colours.
-

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 Old Harlow Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a terraced property, with original sliding sash windows, which is located within the Old Harlow Conservation Area. The Old Harlow Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2013 (CAA) describes the general character of Bury Road, which consists of rows of highly attractive terraced and semi-detached homes, which are of significant group value. The rows of similarly designed Victorian terraces are a dominant feature and their well-preserved sliding sash windows play a key role in defining the original character of the street. It is recognised that as a shared and unifying feature these make a significant contribution to the group value present in the area.
4. The appeal proposal would result in the replacement of the existing sash windows with double glazed timber units. A building's fenestration is an important component in defining its visual and architectural character. The proposal would result in the loss of the original windows which contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. There is insufficient evidence before me to demonstrate that the current windows could not be repaired and upgraded to improve their thermal performance and as a result I do not consider there is justification to allow the replacement of the existing windows.
5. There are no detailed plans of the original sash windows, however the replacement windows would have 10mm thick double glazing which would be thicker than the original single glazed pane. The 23mm glazing bar would also

be wider than that of a traditional sash window. Therefore the replacement windows would alter the appearance of the existing dwelling and detract from the overall uniformity of the terrace which contributes to the character of the Conservation Area.

6. It is considered that the loss of historic fabric and detailing and the resulting change in appearance, from the introduction of double glazed windows, would reduce the significance of the host building and therefore fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
7. In line with paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I afford the harm that would arise to the heritage asset great weight. Given that the proposal would be of a relatively small scale in the context of that of the Conservation Area, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be less than substantial in this instance.
8. Under such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the appellant has outlined some benefits associated with the scheme, such as the improved thermal efficiency and noise reduction provided by double glazing, I do not consider that this would be a public benefit. Therefore, there is no public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Old Harlow Conservation Area. This would be contrary to policy BE10 of the Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan 2006 which seeks to ensure that development does not harm the character of appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR