



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/Y/24/3357116

14 Albion Terrace, Hartlepool TS24 0QL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Scott Bolton against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is H/2024/0064.
 - The works proposed are retrospective planning for the replacement of the front windows with timber framed, double glazed, double sliding sash units and replacement of the rear windows with white, uPVC framed, double glazed, double sliding sash windows. Additional works include the installation of new render to the rear elevation of the property and the complete removal of the render to the front elevation with the intention to restore the original brick external finish to match the other dwellings on the terrace row.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal relates to a listed building within a conservation area. As required by sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
3. The application was for a number of works which had been undertaken by the time of my visit. I saw that the replacement, timber framed, double glazed, sliding sash units on the front elevation were acceptable. Moreover, both the lime render that has been applied to the rear of the building, and the removal of render from the front elevation, followed by the cleaning and repointing of brickwork are appropriate. Consequently, these works are acceptable and satisfy the requirements of the Act.

Background and Main Issue

4. The Council's reasons for refusal refers only to the replacement of the rear windows, therefore, the main issue is:
 - whether the proposed rear windows would preserve the grade II listed building, or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and
 - preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Headland conservation area (CA).

Reasons

Special interest and significance

5. The appeal site is part of the listed, 8-12 Albion Terrace, 23 Regent Street, 14 Albion Terrace¹, a row of seven houses, three storeys in height, plus basement. The Welsh slate roof is hipped on each end, including on No 14 Albion Terrace (No 14), which is at one end of the row.
6. On the front elevation, except for No 23, the basement, ground and 1st floor levels have canted bays with sash windows. Most of the properties, including No 14, have a cornice and frieze above the ground floor bay, which continues as a hood over the doorcase. Steps lead up to the front door.
7. Located on the headland peninsula, the special interest and significance of the listed building as it relates to this appeal, derives from its historic and architectural interest. Situated opposite the beach and small seaside promenade, with black railings, it is one of several prominent terraced rows overlooking the sea.
8. With neat front gardens bounded by low stone walls and railings, many with hedges, it is an attractive Victorian terrace. The bay windows on the front elevation, and axial chimney stacks, plus the consistency of materials and features, provide a rhythm to the design and contribute to the grandeur of the architecture. The listed building demonstrates the affluence of the town during the 19th century, following an industrial boom and the expansion of the port.

Effect of works on listed building

9. On the rear elevation, the previous, single glazed, timber casement windows, reputed to be in a mixture of styles and appearance, have been replaced with five uPVC sash windows. Whilst the appellant has stated that the previous windows had significantly deteriorated, the evidence does not include any photographic evidence, or window schedule, documenting their state.
10. The appellant refers to uPVC sash windows being installed on the rear because they would be low maintenance, less visible, cost-effective, and improve the thermal insulation of the house, in addition to retaining the period character of the property. However, no substantive evidence has been provided that details the difference in cost between these and the wooden windows on the front elevation that have been installed. Moreover, there is no documentation from the manufacturer of the windows showing the difference in the lifespan and thermal insulation of uPVC, as opposed to wooden windows.
11. Whilst the new windows are in a sash style, they have trickle vents, which are not traditional, and the horns are differently styled to those on wooden windows. Furthermore, bars have been applied to the glass, rather than being integral to the structure of the windows. Visually, the bars appear unauthentic. This results in the windows appearing unsympathetic to the character of the listed building.
12. Although the appellant has sought to provide a consistency of design to the rear elevation from the previous elements that had been installed, uPVC windows have a regularised form and lack detail. Therefore, they have a different appearance to traditional, wooden windows. Moreover, the material is known to age differently to

¹ Entry Number 1263430

wood, often discolouring, and as they deteriorate, this erodes the character of a building.

13. Whilst the appellant refers to four other properties having uPVC windows on rear elevations, and I could see some of these from the back lane behind the terrace, the Council has stated that there is no record of any consent for these changes. These examples, which are not detailed in the evidence, do not, therefore, weigh in favour of the appeal. Moreover, the introduction of uPVC windows on Albion Terrace is mentioned within the Headland Conservation Area Character Appraisal, 2007, as a change that conflicts with the traditional architecture of the area.
14. Notwithstanding this, No 14 is an end of terrace property, on a corner site. The rear elevation is seen from the adjoining Baptist Street and the lane to the rear. Additionally, the side elevation of No 14's two-storey extension has four traditional wooden sash windows facing Baptist Street. Therefore, the contrast between these traditional wooden windows with the uPVC windows on the rear, increases the disparity between the two elevations, and the inappropriateness of those that have been installed.
15. Given the above, I find that the proposed works would fail to preserve the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This harms the significance of the heritage asset which I must give considerable importance and weight.

Effect on conservation area

16. The CA, which covers the headland peninsula, is where Hartlepool was originally settled, with a monastery established here in the 7th century. During the 12th century, a town existed, and the first docks were constructed. In the Georgian period, following a boom in industry and a thriving port, terraced housing was built, which expanded during the Victorian era.
17. The special interest and significance of the CA results from its archaeological, architectural and historic interest. The street pattern, materials and layout of the Georgian and Victorian terraced housing dominate the CA and give it a unique character. In relation to this appeal, the grandeur of the properties overlooking the coast, highlight the importance of the sea and the wealth generated by industry, the port and the railway. Other key features of the CA, which contribute to its significance, is the open green space of the Town Moor, the Durham Artillery Militia Corps who took up residence in 1855 on the eastern side of the headland, and the extensive breakwater completed in 1870 to protect the North Harbour. Its historical value also results from Hartlepool's association with the First World War, as it is the location of the first hostile action against Britain by German ships.
18. Whilst the appeal site is only one property within the listed terrace, the terrace is a small, but nonetheless important part of the CA. Moreover, the ongoing replacement of traditional windows with uPVC gradually changes and diminishes the appearance of properties and harms the character of an area. Replacing the windows on the rear of this prominent building leads to harm through the erosion of historic and architectural detail. As a result, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.

Public Benefits and Balance

19. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification. I find the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial, and at the lower end of the scale, however, this is, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. The harm to the CA is also less than substantial, and whilst limited in scale, it affects a prominent terrace and important part of the CA.
20. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
21. The Planning Practice Guidance² sets out what may be regarded as public benefits, such as works to a listed private dwelling which secures its future as a designated heritage asset. However, in this case No 14 is already a private house and therefore has an optimum viable use as a dwelling. Whilst some limited economic benefits would result from the manufacture of new windows, windows constructed in an appropriate material would provide similar benefits. Furthermore, whilst the uPVC windows are intended to be energy efficient, there is no evidence to support that the thermal insulation provided by these windows is any greater than the wooden, double-glazed windows that have been installed on the front elevation. Therefore, the benefits are limited and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
22. Given the above, and in the absence of any significant public benefit, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building, and the character and appearance of the CA would be neither conserved nor enhanced. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 212 of the Framework. It would also conflict with policies HE1, HE3, HE4 of the Hartlepool Local Plan (LP), 2018, which collectively requires the protection and enhancement of all heritage assets, and LP Policy HE7 for those classified as at risk.

Conclusion

23. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR

² Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723, 23 July 2019