



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 October 2021

by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/21/3275303

5 St. Georges Place, NORTHAMPTON NN2 6EP

- 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 Rosa Perry against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2021/0044, dated 11 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is Replacement of Existing Windows with UPVC Windows (revised application following refusal of N/2020/0886).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barrack Road Conservation Area (BRCA).

Reasons

3. St Georges Place is a residential street in an urban setting. The appeal site is a four-storey red brick terraced house within a regimented row of similar style properties. The dwelling includes a substantial chimney stack, decorative stone door lintel and stone gothic arched lintels over first floor windows. The ground and basement level timber sash bay windows are also attractive and prominent features of the dwelling. The dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The Barrack Road Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2010) identifies that the Victorian terraced row of St Georges Place has a unity of architectural style. The significance of the BRCA seems to derive from its inclusion of traditional residential buildings of largely coherent materials and detailing, including many with timber sash windows. Some window frames have been replaced over time with unsympathetic designs, although these seem to have been replaced before the imposition of the Article 4(2) Direction.
5. The proposed window frames would copy the sash window style of adjacent properties and the host dwelling. However, the frames would be substantially wider and deeper than the existing timber frames. The replacement of the unsympathetic UPVC window frames at first and second floor would result in an improvement to the appearance of the building. Furthermore, being at high

level and covering relatively small apertures, the replacement thicker frames would not be highly prominent from street level.

6. However, the window frames proposed for the ground and basement bay would be of a greater scale than those proposed at higher levels. As a result, the thicker frames would be clearly evident from the street. The proposed frames would be disproportionate to the size of the apertures, with greater emphasis placed on the framing. This would be especially prominent and would detract from the attractive traditional features of the building. Furthermore, the proposed mullions would be poorly integrated with the windows forming artificial additions. As such, the proposal would be an overt and prominent intervention that would neither complement the existing dwelling nor neighbouring buildings. Therefore, whilst the use of UPVC can be suitable in some historic settings it would not be suitable in this context.
7. As a result, the proposed windows would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the BRCA. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policies BN5 and S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy – Part 1 (2014), saved policies E20 and E26 of the Northampton Local Plan (1997) and the Framework. These policies, among other matters, seek development to reflect the character of its surroundings and preserve the character of the area.
8. The harm identified to the BRCA would be 'less than substantial'. Paragraph 202 of the Framework, states that where harm to a heritage asset would be 'less than substantial' this should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. The replacement of the unsympathetic first and second floor windows with an improved design, and the security improvements and energy efficiency gains would result in a small public benefit. However, these benefits would be limited and would be insufficient to outweigh the harm found to the conservation area, which the Framework identifies as an irreplaceable resource.
9. The installed window frames at 3 St Georges Place appears to have a wider and deeper profile than adjacent traditional frames. This combined with their artificial mullions moderately detracts from the appearance of the dwelling. However, I understand that these windows replaced previously installed unsympathetic UPVC windows. As such, their replacement appeared to offer some, albeit limited, benefit in favour of that scheme. This decision does not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR