



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/W/25/3366947

25 Osborne Villas, Hove, Brighton & Hove BN3 2RD

- 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 Miss Clementine Douglas against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref is BH2025/00380.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of rear secondary glazing with UPVC windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and street scene and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cliftonville Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The property falls within the CA. CA designations recognise architectural characteristics or historic values of an area that make such areas special and worthy of CA status. The Council highlights that the Cliftonville CA Character Statement states 'Windows and solid panelled doors are important aspects of the area's character. Simple sliding sash window prevail. They normally have 'horns' and are divided by a central glazing bar, except perhaps in the principal front rooms'. The windows provide the CA with a distinctive quality to both the character and appearance of the area and gives this area architectural significance. The dwelling holds architectural distinctiveness being part of those dwellings within the CA.
4. The replacement windows would utilise UPVC, host large window frame sizes that include trickle vents, and would contain a window design and method of opening, which would not reflect the traditional sliding sash windows that prevail within the area and that historically have characterised the area. These windows would be significantly out of character as they would be clearly of a different style and form to those of traditional windows.
5. The proposed replacement windows would represent harmful alterations at the rear of the property to the detriment of the character and appearance of the property,

the Medina Place street scene and the CA. The rear of this property is highly visible and, as such, the harm arising from the proposal would be extremely visually prominent despite there being a tree to the rear of the property. I acknowledge that the existing windows proposed to be replaced may have been fitted sometime in the past and are non-original and of non-traditional form. However, this does not justify replacing these windows with other windows of more overtly non-traditional design, form and materials. Whilst the appellant claims that the previous replacement windows affect the possibility of installing traditional replacement, it has not been clearly explained why this is so.

6. I have been directed to a relatively recent planning permission at the adjacent property, 27 Osborne Villas, in which the local planning authority granted planning permission for UPVC replacement windows, photographs of which have been provided. In that case the local planning authority explains that the windows were considered less dominant as they retained traditional proportions and appearance, as well as being less visually dominant due to the layout and siting of the adjoining property. I agree with those considerations. That planning permission does not set a precedent for the introduction of inappropriate replacement windows elsewhere within Osborne Villas.
7. Other properties along Osborne Villas have replaced windows at the rear. The local planning authority has highlighted that those replacements appear to have been historic and do not benefit from planning permission. Having considered those windows, they do not serve as good examples of non-original windows.
8. The proposal would undermine the purposes of the CA designation. The rear of the property, and where the proposed windows are to be replaced with UPVC, is open and visible in adjoining neighbour's outlook and in public views from the Medina Place. The existence of other non-traditional windows in the area does not overcome the harm I have identified resulting from the proposed development or provide justification for further visually harmful development within the CA.
9. Given the size and scale of the proposal in the CA, I consider there would be less than substantial harm to the character or appearance of the CA. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework), I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would allow the property to be improved to provide safe windows that would comply with modern safety standards. This would be limited to providing a personal benefit for the appellant. There would be no clear benefit to the public that would sufficiently outweigh the harm identified. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would fail to accord with national policy.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and street scene and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cliftonville CA. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies CP12 and CP15 of the City Plan Part One (Brighton & Hove City Council's Development Plan 2016) and Policies DM18, DM21 and DM26 of the City Plan Part Two (Brighton & Hove City Council's Development Plan 2022). These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to raise the standard of architecture and for design in the city to make a positive contribution to the visual quality of the environment and to conserve or enhance the city's built and archaeological heritage and its setting.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR