



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/25/3368941

31 Richmond Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 5NX

- 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 Lisa Wyatt against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/00144/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing white single glazed timber sash and casement windows with white uPVC 'timber alternative' double glazed sash and casement windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached, Victorian dwelling with a low front wall and modest front garden and driveway area. It is red brick and tiles with a projecting double height front gable and bay windows. The dwelling has single glazed timber ornate windows, sliding sash and flush casement, and a timber front door. Apart from some gable details the property is effectively symmetrical in form and detail to the paired attached dwelling. The character of the area is residential in nature with generally villa style homes in the local environs. The appearance of the locality is extremely pleasing with principal architectural features, fine detailing and gardens all coming together to create an environment of high visual quality and a firm sense of place and period.
 4. The proposal is as described above; the Appellant underlines that the material would be of semi-matt woodgrain appearance and with replication in form, design and dimensions. The air gap would be 10mm.
 5. The property lies within the South View Conservation Area and is, understandably, annotated within this as a Notable Building. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a
-

Conservation Area. This is reflected within Policy EM11 of the Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (LP) which takes the same approach and includes a range of elaborating criteria.

6. The Council, through policy protection and practice in development control, seeks to secure that replacement windows in Conservation Areas will be constructed in traditional materials. As a rule, my stance is similar.
7. Looking at this specific case, I do accept that the windows are in poor condition and a combination of repair and replacement would be an expensive task. However, regrettably, replacement with a white woodgrain uPVC will never entirely reproduce what is in situ and this is an instance where I believe every effort should be made to do just that. This is a semi-detached home in a run of impressive properties in an avenue of dwellings which almost all contribute to the street scene by, amongst other things, their, generally, original window forms and materials.
8. It seems to me that a relatively prominent and principal property within a Conservation Area must be a building and a locality where one should take utmost care and seek to encourage sensitive restoration and prevent inappropriate change. The proposed replacements may well be of good quality but in my opinion their use here would be noticeable and would be a retrograde step and dilute local heritage attributes.
9. I should add that I am not persuaded by the energy reduction argument as presently put by the Appellant. This neither fully explores in detail the effectiveness of using timber nor appears to acknowledge that uPVC is not in itself a low energy source.
10. Given all these circumstances and the nature of the scheme I conclude that the proposal would run contrary to the aims of S72(1) of the Act and conflict with LP Policy EM11. I also conclude that the scheme would run contrary to LP Policy EM10 which seeks high quality development with appropriate aesthetic attributes. Furthermore, I would deem there to be breaches of the overarching objectives of the Design and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (2018), the Heritage Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and the South View Conservation Area Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document (2006); albeit I recognise that this guidance cannot be expected to cover every detailed eventuality.

Other matters

11. I understand the Appellant's wish to replace the existing windows not least given the likely cost of repairs. I can see that careful consideration has been given to the replacement product. I am aware that this type of window is present on occasion elsewhere in the Conservation Area.
12. Both principal parties cite addresses where, to my mind, there is not necessarily direct comparison with the appeal proposals applicable due to location, form and finish, applicable planning policies, or immediate context. I should specifically comment on the Appellant's reference to Highfield in Sherborne Road not least because the appeal decision (APP/H1705/W/23/3333709) was my work. I believe I made it very clear in

that decision that my allowing of the appeal and granting of planning permission was very much an exception and I did set out a range of reasons for that determination. In all the specific circumstances prevailing at that property and its immediate location, the outcome, in my opinion, has been satisfactory for that *particular* building. However, I must assess the case before me on its own merits.

13. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

14. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR