

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/19/3240738

7 Squires Court, South Clifton Street, Lytham, Lancashire FY8 5HN

- 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 Gillian Clarkson against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0526, dated 22 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective planning permission for UPVC double glazed windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the development for UPVC double glazed windows at 7 Squires Court, South Clifton Street, Lytham, Lancashire FY8 5HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0526, dated 22 June 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The development has already taken place. As 'retrospective' is not an act of development I have amended the description of development given by the appellant in my decision above in order to reflect the particulars of the development to which this appeal relates. Furthermore, the submitted plans reflect the development that has been carried out and I have assessed the appeal based on the development that now exists.
3. Throughout the evidence reference is made to both the 'Lytham Town Centre Conservation Area' and the 'Lytham Conservation Area'. The Council has provided me with the definitive map of the conservation area and it is referred to as 'Lytham Town Centre Conservation Area' on the decision notice. For clarity I will refer to it as such throughout my decision.
4. There is no date given on the decision notice to indicate when the planning application was refused. I have instead used the date of refusal given by the appellant on the appeal form in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Lytham Town Centre Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal relates to a dwelling which fronts South Clifton Street and forms one of a small group of properties known as Squires Court which are of a similar age and design. The windows which are the subject of this appeal front both South Clifton Street and Shepherd Street. One of the adjacent lying properties, 8 Squires Court, is the subject of a separate appeal for a similar form of development¹.
7. The appeal site lies within the Lytham Town Centre Conservation Area (CA). A conservation area appraisal for the CA has not been submitted to me but from my site visit and the evidence before me, I consider that the significance of the CA derives, in part, from the varied design, scale, layout and architectural quality of the built form within the street. Due to the diverse appearance and types of buildings and structures close to the appeal site, the contribution each one makes to the character and appearance of the CA is similarly varied. However, there is consistency running through the CA in terms of the closeness of the built form to the street which exacerbates its narrowness. The presence of several period properties imparts a historic character to a street otherwise noted for its variety.
8. Whilst the appeal dwelling hosts several elements of architectural detailing and an overall fenestration design which is reflective of the historic characteristics of the street, the brickwork type and pattern, and the presence of plastic rainwater gutters and downpipes give the dwelling a more modern appearance than many of the other buildings that exist outside Squires Court, reflective of its more recent construction². Moreover, despite the presence of several good examples of period properties within the street, this stretch of South Clifton Street is fronted by a number of relatively featureless boundary walls, buildings and garage doors and overall lacks a unifying architectural and historical richness.
9. Notwithstanding the separate appeal at No 8, the windows associated with the dwellings within Squires Court are supported by traditional designed timber frames. The difference between the timber framed windows and those within the appeal dwelling is not immediately noticeable when walking along the street. However, the difference principally concerns the bulkier form of the central cross pieces, casements and general lack of depth in the overall frame composition.
10. The use of UPVC is not objectionable in itself, and I saw several examples of UPVC window frames further along the street. However, these are features of modern design which make it obvious on closer inspection that the windows are not framed with traditional materials. Nevertheless, despite their bulkier form and synthetic composition, the window frames appear authentic in style, reflecting the age, design and overall fenestration composition of the existing dwellings in Squires Court. To my mind the replacement windows do not harm the defining characteristics of the CA and do not appear out of step with the varied appearance and layout of the existing built form in the street.
11. In conclusion, the development is consistent with the preservation of the character and appearance of the CA. It does not conflict with Policies ENV5 or

¹ Appeal reference – APP/M2325/D/19/3240807

² The Council confirms 'Squires Court' was approved under application reference - 88/0293

GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 which require, amongst other matters, that developments do not have an unacceptable impact on historic street patterns and ensure preservation of the historic environment. In accordance with paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the development sustains the significance of the CA.

12. In reaching my decision I have taken into account the duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

Conditions

13. As the development has already taken place, I do not consider it necessary to impose a standard 'time-limit' condition or an approved plans condition, nor are any other conditions necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR