



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 OCTOBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/22/3305714

7 Cedar Street, Braunston in Rutland, Oakham LE15 8QS

- 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 Angela Lashbrook against the decision of Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0407/FUL, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement windows to front elevation and to entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement windows to front elevation and to entrance porch at 7 Cedar Street, Braunston in Rutland, Oakham LE15 8QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/0407/FUL, dated 29 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the detailed specifications and colour shown on drawing number 943/22/1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the Braunston Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. There is a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. I have not been provided with a Conservation Area Appraisal, Design and Access Statement or Heritage Statement setting out what either of the parties consider to be the special significance of the CA. I am aware that an Article 4(2) Direction is in place, however, the purpose of such Directions is to manage rather than to prevent change.
5. The appeal site is located in a rural village made up of predominantly stone built properties of varying scale, design and detailing. The age, architecture and materials of these buildings contribute towards the historic interest and significance of the CA.

6. 7 Cedar Street comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, set back from the road, which appears to have originally been a pair of semi-detached cottages. A previous front door has been partially blocked up and replaced with a small window and a porch has been constructed to the front of the remaining entrance.
7. Despite having undergone some changes, the property has retained its traditional appearance. It is constructed in stone with a slate roof, brick chimney stacks and it has timber windows and doors to the front. There is a date stone of 1841 on the front of the building. The dwelling undoubtedly makes a positive contribution to the CA.
8. It is proposed to replace the existing timber framed, sliding sash, single glazed windows, and the single glazed porch windows, all of which are painted grey, with PVCu double glazed windows of similar appearance, with face fixed slender section glazing bars, finished in 'Stony Ground' colour. The new windows would be located within the existing openings with no changes to the cills or lintels and no external vents are proposed. The style of the new windows would match that of the existing ones and the colour would be a neutral one, similar to windows and doors in other nearby properties.
9. Within the CA I noted that windows and doors vary considerably in terms of style, material and colour. Whilst I appreciate the Council's desire to encourage the use of traditional timber, the statutory duty is to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. The proposed windows would have a very similar appearance to the existing ones to be replaced and to others within the CA. Thus, they would not appear alien or detract from the positive contribution the property makes to the CA as a whole.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would preserve the appearance of the CA and would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset. As such, the proposal accords with Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Rutland Core Strategy Development Plan Document (July 2011) and Policies SP15 and SP20 of the Rutland Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (October 2014), which seek amongst other things to protect the special features of conservation areas and to ensure that new materials preserve the appearance of the area. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of design or heritage matters.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit, I have conditioned the approved drawing number, which includes the window range, specifications and colour, for the avoidance of doubt as what has been approved.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR