
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/25/3366594

67 Bishop Street, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY2 5HD

- 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 Ms Charlotte Wallace-Tarry against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00137/FUL.
 - The development proposed is remove existing single glaze front and side windows and replace with double glazed windows of the same size and design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The development has already been undertaken. The application has been submitted retrospectively, and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in an established residential area. The site is in the Shrewsbury Conservation Area (CA), within an area known as the Cherry Orchard and Whitehall Special Character Area. This area is generally characterised by late Victorian and Edwardian dwellings which were built as part of the Whitehall Estate. The overall consistency of architectural character and design details of the dwellings in the area contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. The appeal site is located on Bishop Street which features two-storey dwellings which are of a uniform appearance. While there are a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings in the street scene, overall, they form a highly coherent group by virtue of their consistent design and materials. Furthermore, the majority of the dwellings on Bishop Street appear to retain their original timber sash windows, which further benefits the character and quality of the area. These similarities,

including the retention of the original timber sash windows contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

7. While the UPVC windows which have been installed at the appeal property are intended to replicate the design of the original windows, the new windows are formed of noticeably thicker frame dimensions than the generally thinner timber sash windows at properties on Bishop Street. Furthermore, the white UPVC material has an artificial appearance which contrasts with the more natural appearance of the timber windows in the street scene. Consequently, the UPVC windows detract from the consistency and quality of the street scene on Bishop Street and are therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the CA.
8. As I observed on my site visit, whilst there were UPVC windows on a small number of dwellings on Bishop Street, those I saw served to confirm that such alterations are detrimental to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial or less than substantial harm to its significance.
11. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the Framework, I find that as the development is limited to a single dwelling in this part of the CA, the harm to the CA is relatively localised, and therefore the development causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Under such circumstances, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. Sustainability and climate change benefits in terms of improved energy efficiency and thermal insulation, reduced energy consumption and carbon emissions, reduced drafts, as well as an improved energy performance certificate rating, would arise from the proposal. In that regard, it is also the appellant's view that the new thermal efficient windows would provide public benefits in terms of preserving the asset for future generations.
13. Although paragraph 167 of the Framework supports energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, it also states that where proposals affect conservation areas, the policies in Chapter 16 of the Framework which relates to the historic environment also apply. In this context, I afford the benefits limited weight only, given that I have not been provided with any evidence to suggest that the proposal is the only means by which such benefits would be achieved. Furthermore, the potential costs associated with maintaining timber windows is not, in my view, sufficient grounds to justify the use of UPVC in this instance. It has also not been demonstrated that timber sash windows, or their repair, would be more costly than that associated with UPVC.
14. Consequently, the benefits put forward by the appellant amount to a limited public benefit overall and are not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to

the CA and the weight I must apply to the heritage asset's conservation in line with the Framework.

15. I therefore conclude that the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It therefore conflicts with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Council Adopted Core Strategy (2011) and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan Adopted Plan (2015), which require that developments protect and enhance the high quality and local character of the historic environment, reflect locally characteristic architectural details and materials and avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets. Furthermore, and for the same reasons given above, the development fails to accord with those parts of the Framework which relate to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. I have concluded that less than substantial harm is caused to the identified designated heritage asset, but that the harm is not outweighed by the identified public benefits. Consequently, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that outweighs this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR