



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/25/3363519

Flat 2, 58 East Park Parade, Northampton, NN1 4LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mukesh Joshi against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/5725/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Permission for UPVC window frames'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision refers to the proposed development as 'Replace windows with UPVC window frames and replacement door (retrospective)'. As this describes the proposal more accurately, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the building at no 58 East Park Parade, a non-designated heritage asset, and whether it would preserve or enhance the significance of the Kingsley Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. I have also had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) as amended.
5. The significance of this CA derives from the high quality houses built in the late C19th, mainly in terraces in a Queen Anne Revival style, around the Racecourse, a large open space at its centre. No 58 lies in a prominent position at a main road junction on the corner of East Park Parade and Abington Grove. It is a large, three storey detached building that has its own individual, imposing style in which the stone mullioned window openings in the front elevation together with the remaining timber window frames in both elevations play an important role in contributing to the significance of both the building and the CA.
6. New UPVC window frames have been installed on both the front and rear elevations of Flat 2, a ground floor flat. The Council has said that they have

replaced timber framed windows that on the front elevation were fixed casements and on the rear elevation were sliding sash windows. Such windows remain on the other parts of the building.

7. Having assessed the windows carefully at my visit, I would disagree with the appellant that they replicate the appearance of traditional timber frames. The windows on the front elevation contain opening lights which have a thicker, wider and deeper profile than the non-opening lights within those windows. On the rear elevation, the windows appear to be top-hung sashes that open outwards from the bottom with a thicker horizontal bar at the centre and applied vertical glazing bars. Those lack the detail of, and contrast with, the remaining timber sashes in the windows above. The rear door is of design that includes nine small panes and does not reflect the more solid style of the other doors in the building. On both elevations, the UPVC material of the windows and door, is clearly different in its appearance from the timber above because it has a more reflective surface.
8. The appellant has provided selective photographs taken from viewpoints which include screening by vegetation in support of his case to indicate limited visibility of the proposal. However, at my visit I saw that the differences between the new windows and door and those elsewhere in the building are clearly apparent and can be discerned from the Racecourse and the pedestrian crossing opposite the site and from the opposite side of Abington Grove. This has resulted in a lack of unity in the windows of the building which detracts significantly from its character and appearance and from that of the CA.
9. Whilst there may be examples elsewhere in the CA of variation in windows including the use of UPVC, those do not predominate in this CA and in any case, often do not make a positive contribution to its character or appearance and therefore do not set a precedent for this proposal.
10. I conclude then that, by reason of their design and materials, the proposed windows and door would result in significant harm to the significance of the building and would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the CA. Whilst the harm in this case would be less than substantial and at the lower end of the spectrum, it still carries considerable weight and the Framework requires that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification. Where the harm is less than substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The appellant's reasons for replacing the windows are to improve the energy efficiency of the flat and the state of repair of the previous windows, reducing the need for frequent repairs and improving living conditions. However, I am not persuaded that there are no other more appropriate means of achieving those aims that would have a less harmful impact on the building and the CA or that the continued residential use and viability of the building would be at risk should this appeal fail. Those matters do not, therefore, alter my findings in this case.
12. The proposal would be contrary to development plan policies BN5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part1) (adopted 2014) and ENV6 of the Northampton Local Plan Part 2 2011-2029 (adopted 2023) which together seek to ensure that new development conserves and enhances the historic environment and designated and non-designated heritage assets and requires justification for any harm or loss of an asset.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR