
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2023

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/23/3319734

1 Rutland Place, Bridge Street, Great Bardfield, Essex CM7 4SZ

- 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 Mr Joe Austin against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00165/HH, dated 22 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of 2 No. wood single-glazing sash windows to the front elevation, with like for-like uPVC double-glazing windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the replacement of 2 No. wood single-glazing sash windows to the front elevation, with like for-like uPVC double-glazing windows at 1 Rutland Place, Bridge Street, Great Bardfield, Essex, CM7 4SZ in accordance with the terms of application 23/00165/HH, dated 22 January 2023, and subject to the following conditions:-
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than three years from the date of this permission.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the following approved plans: -
Location plan ref: TQRQH23021111836860; Window details dated 04/11/22 (First issue Rev A)
 - iii. The colour of the replacement window frames and glazing bars shall conform to those in the remainder of the terraced row.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant in the application form has described the proposed development as the *'replacement of two front of house sash windows, with like-for-like replacements from wood single-glazing to uPVC double-glazing, from a FENSA approved organisation (SEH BAC Windows Ltd.)'*. I have used the description of the local planning authority (LPA) in its decision notice, both in the banner and in the decision, for the sake of brevity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Great Bardfield Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The CA (1969) includes the core of a large rural village. Its streetscape is varied, with buildings ranging in age over several centuries and with different styles, materials, heights and roofscapes.
5. Bridge Street forms a part of the CA which lies in the Pant Valley and where many of the buildings, including the appeal property, follow the line of the road and open directly onto the pavement.
6. The appeal dwelling is the end property of a terrace of two storey, brick built dwellings characterised by their external materials, tall chimneys, double pitched, unbroken roofs and a generally regular window pattern which, whilst designs differ gives a pleasant rhythm to the terrace when viewed as a whole.
7. It differs from the rest of the terrace in that it has been rendered and has an external colour which, while it does not clash with the rest of the brick built terrace, nonetheless differs in its appearance.
8. Its windows reflect those in the rest of the terrace and while the openings differ somewhat from other properties in the row, the differences are not such as to destroy the overall rhythm of the terrace.
9. The proposal is to replace the two wooden sash windows on the front elevation with like-for-like windows but using uPVC. In addition, the replacement windows would be double glazed whereas existing windows are single glazed.
10. The reason for refusal relates to the proposed replacement material of uPVC.
11. The appeal building is not listed and there is no issue therefore, regarding the retention of historic material.
12. The appellant has submitted a drawing to show that the replacement windows would have the same characteristics as the existing windows in terms of the opening mechanism, being genuine sash windows, and the inclusion of the same number and sizes of glazing bars together with the same dimensions for the frame.
13. On my site visit I was able to observe that the overwhelming number of dwellings in the terrace, both at ground floor and at first floor level, already have uPVC windows to the front elevations and with only the rare exception, one of which is the appeal dwelling. Nevertheless, by their common colours and by their regular sequencing along the terrace, this does not detract from the overall attractive appearance created by their general symmetry, even though their actual window styles do differ.
14. I have no information before me to indicate that the use of uPVC windows in the rest of the terrace predates the designation of the CA.
15. While the proposal is to use uPVC rather than wood, and despite the use of double glazing as distinct to the current single glazing, the essential characteristics of the existing windows with narrow frames and glazing bars would be replicated. Therefore, the external appearance of the building and that of the terrace within the CA would not significantly or adversely change.
16. Therefore, for the above reasons ,I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would accord with policies

SP7,LPP36,LPP52 and LP53 of the Braintree District Local Plan 2021 which requires development to be of a high design standard which responds to local character and the context within which it is located, compatible with both the original building and the protection of heritage assets. For the same reason, it would accord with the aims of chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conditions

17. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
18. I have imposed a condition relating to the colour of the replacement windows in the interests of conserving the character and appearance of the terraced row and that of the CA.

Conclusion.

19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR