



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/22/3294675

Severn House, Ison Hill Road , Henbury, Bristol, BS10 7XA

- 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 PfP Capital against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04432/F, dated 13 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Window and balcony door replacement scheme - 16 flats".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for window and balcony door replacement scheme - 16 flats at Severn House, Henbury, Bristol, BS10 7XA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04432/F, dated 13 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BS1162/01, BS1162-06 Revision A, BS1162-08 Revision A, BS1162-9 Revision A, BS1162-10 Revision A and Window Details produced by Sovereign Group Limited – Commercial Fabricators of PVCu Windows & Doors.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area with a mix of residential dwellings and blocks of flats. The appeal building is a 4-storey building which appears to have been built in the late 1980's/early 1990's. It was designed to emulate a Georgian style and is finished in stone and render. There are a number of windows and doors providing light and ventilation to 16 flats. Despite the Georgian detailing it appears as a modern block of flats and is located adjacent to another modern block of flats above a housing estate. uPVC windows and doors are a common feature in the surrounding area, being used in the adjacent block of flats and nearby housing. During my site visit I noted that a number of the existing timber windows were in a poor state of repair.

4. The proposed windows and doors would be uPVC that seek to imitate the existing timber windows and doors. The submitted information details that the proposed windows would be double glazed units with bar detailing to match the existing windows.
5. Details of the glazing bars have been provided on the plans, but as installed those features would be applied to the exterior of the windows and doors, rather than incorporated into the construction of the proposal as would traditionally be the case with timber windows. However, from the evidence submitted by the appellant and from what I saw during my site visit, these timber windows and doors have had the bar detailing applied to the exterior of the windows, with some currently missing.
6. This detail means that the replacement windows and doors would offer the same quality of detailing as the existing. Whilst the proposed windows and doors would be approximately 35mm thicker than existing, given the replication of most other aspects of the design and given that the host building is a fairly modern building set in a modern housing estate, I find that these details would not result in material harm to the appearance of the building.
7. A number of windows have been replaced with somewhat unsympathetic uPVC windows. These would be removed and replaced with the design proposed in this appeal. This would improve the character and appearance of the building, which is currently being harmed by these unsympathetic alterations.
8. Consequently, the replacement windows and doors would not significantly affect the features of the host building. The proposal would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host building.
9. While uPVC windows are potentially less sustainable in their construction than timber, given the minor scale of development the sustainability impact would be limited.
10. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM30 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development contributes positively to the character of an area, reinforces local distinctiveness, and reflects predominant materials. The appeal scheme would also be comply with paragraph 130 of the Framework which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conditions

11. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed in regard to the advice provided in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The appellant has also had sight of the conditions and disputes two of the four conditions requested by the Council.
12. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. I have altered the wording of some conditions in order to ensure they comply with the PPG.

13. With regards to the Council's request for a condition requiring further plans with regards to the window details. I note that provided with the submission is a detailed drawing of the windows with a cross section and measurements. With regards to the condition for matching external works and materials, I note that a schedule of materials is included on the plan. As such, I see no reason that these conditions should be included.

Conclusion

14. The appeal scheme would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal should therefore, subject to the conditions in the schedule, be allowed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR