



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/W/22/3296531

2 Grives Farm, The Granary, Lindleys Lane, Kirkby-In-Ashfield NG17 9AL

- 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 Toni McMonigle against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref V/2021/0567, dated 15 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is to install replacement windows and doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a former stone barn which was converted into four dwellings around 2005, and fronts onto an enclosed and gated courtyard area. Although now converted to residential use the property retains the character of an agricultural building, including the retention of original openings and the use of traditional materials. The site is located adjacent to several existing agricultural buildings at Grives Farm which, along with the surrounding farmed landscape, reinforces its strong rural and agricultural character.
4. The Council explain that the converted former barn, including the appeal property, is locally listed and therefore should be considered a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). This does not appear to be disputed and I have found no reason to disagree. The significance of the building as a NDHA is derived from its age, materials, and the retention of its original openings and overall character and appearance which reflects its agricultural origins.
5. Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that when determining applications that affect the significance of a NDHA a balanced judgement is required, having regard to the scale of any harm, and the significance of the asset.
6. The proposal seeks to replace all existing timber windows on the front, side, and rear elevations with 'golden oak' UPVC double glazed windows. In addition, on the rear elevation existing timber French doors would be replaced with full

height 'golden oak' UPVC windows, and the existing doors to the dining room would be replaced with double glazed caramel powder coated aluminium bifold doors. The existing front and rear timber doors would also be replaced with 'golden oak' UPVC composite doors. Whilst it is acknowledged that the condition of some of the existing timber windows and doors has deteriorated, their traditional appearance and form contributes positively to the character and appearance of the building.

7. Although designed to have the appearance of timber, I find that the proposed materials would be unsympathetic to the appearance of the property. In particular, the UPVC windows and doors would be of a more modern and uniform appearance which would fail to relate to the historic character of the building, which is strongly derived from the variation in colour and texture of its traditional external materials. This would represent a detrimental change in appearance and a loss of character, causing harm to the significance of the NDHA.
8. Furthermore, several of the windows on the front and rear elevations are surrounded by timber panelling. The juxtaposition of the proposed modern materials against traditional timber would exacerbate the difference between the consistent and regular appearance of the proposed windows, and the organic appearance and texture of the existing materials. The mix of materials would also eliminate the existing coherent appearance of the appeal property as well as the overall converted former barn.
9. Although not readily visible from external vantage points, the proposed windows and doors would introduce modern materials which would be alien to the agricultural origins and character of the building. Consequently, the proposed development would result in harm being caused to the significance of the NDHA.
10. Some of the existing timber windows and doors are plainly in need of repair or replacement. I acknowledge that their current condition has adverse impacts for the appellant, including difficulty opening some of the doors, safety risks, energy efficiency and carbon footprint. The reasons for the appellant seeking to carry out the proposed development are therefore understood. The appellant contends that the proposed replacement windows and doors would overcome these issues, whilst also benefiting from a longer guarantee and being more cost effective than like for like timber replacements.
11. However, it has not been demonstrated whether the existing windows and doors could be viably repaired. Even if repairs were not possible or viable, it has not been demonstrated that appropriately designed timber replacements could not also overcome these issues at a comparable cost to UPVC/aluminium. There is also no substantive evidence before me to show that like for like timber replacements which were regularly and well maintained would require replacement more frequently than the proposed windows and doors. I therefore give little weight to the matter of cost.
12. I note the appellant's comments that UPVC windows can be found in two nearby properties which are in more prominent locations than the appeal site. However, I have not been provided with the full details of these cases, and I have assessed this proposal on its own merits having regard to the particular circumstances of the case.

13. Overall, I conclude that the proposed replacement windows and doors would detract from the character and appearance of the host property as a NDHA. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the Framework I find that, on balance, the proposed development would be detrimental to the architectural and historic character of the building and hence its significance. The development would therefore conflict with Policy ST1 (b) of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (Adopted November 2002) which seeks to ensure that developments do not adversely affect the character of the environment.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has raised concerns regarding how the planning application was dealt with by the Council, with particular reference to an alleged lack of communication and the length of time it took for the application to be determined. This however is a matter for the appellant to address directly with the Council and does not alter my finding regarding the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the NDHA.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework and worthy of sufficient weight, which would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR