
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/W/25/3374578

13-15 Baker Street, Hull HU2 8HP

- 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 Roland Carlisle against the decision of Kingston-Upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00060/FULL.
 - The development proposed is replace 2 windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form described the proposed development simply as 'new windows'. My understanding from the Council's Delegated Report is that this was initially intended to encompass a number of windows, but that the proposals were subsequently revised to refer only to two windows at ground floor level. The description given on the appeal form is consistent with this, and therefore I have used that in the banner header above.
3. The two windows have already been installed and therefore I have made my determination on the basis that this is a retrospective proposal.
4. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Georgian New Town Conservation Area (CA).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the CA.

Reasons

6. The significance of the CA lies in the layout and architecture found within it, and its association with the expansion of Hull within the Georgian period. The presence of windows of an appropriate design and appearance is a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the CA, and the loss of such features would undermine what is special about the area.
7. The appeal property sits at the end of a short, but visually impressive, row of Georgian properties. For the most part those properties appear to retain a traditional window design and detailing, which is of a clear benefit to the character

and appearance not only of the properties themselves but also to the part of the CA in which they are located.

8. The trickle vents that were installed on the appeal windows have now been removed. However, the windows still sit square within the window opening, with the previously curved top section now a solid panel. They appear visually awkward and incongruous as such, and with reference to the photograph provided in the Delegated Report of the previous windows, are a visually harmful alteration to the property and wider CA. As a result, the character and appearance of the CA has not been preserved or enhanced by these works.
9. Given that the development relates to two windows and that the harm would be localised, I consider that less than substantial harm to the CA has been caused, to the lower end of that spectrum. Nonetheless, in light of the statutory duties that relate to this designated heritage asset, the harm caused carries considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of this appeal.
10. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has not advanced any public benefits in support of the development. The harm is therefore not outweighed in that respect.
11. Whilst there may be benefits to the occupants of the property in terms of insulation and sound proofing, I am not persuaded that the windows that have been installed are the only way in which those benefits could be achieved.
12. The appellant states that they would be willing to amend the windows to address the concerns that have been raised, and to provide decorative additions if appropriate. Whilst they consider that this could be secured by way of a planning condition, I have fundamental concerns as to whether it would be possible to alter the windows that have been installed to replicate what existed previously. I do not consider that this is a matter that could reasonably be left to control by way of a planning condition.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 14 and 16 of the Local Plan 2017 where they seek to promote high quality design and to safeguard designated heritage assets. As the harm caused to the CA, which carries considerable importance and weight, would not be outweighed by public benefits, there would also be a conflict with paragraph 215 of the Framework.

Other Matter

14. The parties refer to advice that was given before the windows were replaced. There is clearly some disagreement in that respect. In any event, that is not a matter which can have any bearing on my determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR