The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2016

**by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 8 November 2016**

**Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/16/3155306**
**77A Church Street, Pinchbeck PE11 3YA**

- 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 Mr D Drew against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref H14-0257-16, dated 23 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2016.
- The development proposed is replacement windows – retrospective.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The appeal building has been converted into two flats following the granting of planning permission. One occupies the ground floor, the other the first. The development which is the subject of this appeal relates to the first floor of the appeal building only.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Pinchbeck Conservation Area (PCA).

## Reasons

4. The appeal building is detached and arranged over two storeys presenting a steep gable to the road frontage. It is in a prominent street frontage location in the PCA at the end of a run of four hipped roof terraced dwellings. The fenestration detail to the front is simple with a bay to the ground floor and two single windows to the first floor. The side elevation is largely blank brick save for one small window and abuts the forecourt of a commercial premises. The appeal building extends and narrows to the rear and has two very prominent brick chimneys to the side elevation.

5. The simple and traditional proportions and detailing of the appeal building, coupled with its prominent street frontage location, make its contribution to the character and appearance of the PCA a positive one.

6. The appellant's evidence shows that the original first floor windows, to the front elevation at least, were a similar appearance to the ground floor windows which are still in situ. For clarity these were vertical sliding six over six and eight over eight painted timber sashes with narrow glazing bars. The UPVC

frames that have replaced these, whilst aiming to emulate the design, are clearly discernible as being of a modern, chunkier and more sheer external finish which do not reflect the traditional detailing or age of the building. The side and rear of the first floor also utilises vertical and horizontal decorative faux glazing bars and whilst there is some evidence of a more traditional side opening design, frames are still overly wide and less tactile than the originals.

7. These elements to the development combine to result in an addition to the building that is clearly unsympathetic and harmful to its original design and appearance. The development is therefore an inappropriate alteration in a visually prominent position in the PCA.

8. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the Framework[1], the harm that is caused by the development is less than substantial and as such it should be weighed against the public benefits.

9. In this case, the new units likely increase energy efficiency which would contribute to reducing the appellant's carbon footprint and thus assist with the national drive to reduce energy consumption. I further note that newer units require less maintenance from a sustainability perspective and consequently may last longer than timber. I am not persuaded however that these factors, even when taken together, are sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

10. As a result, the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the building and consequently the PCA. The development is therefore contrary to section 12 of the Framework which seeks to protect the historic environment from harm through inappropriate or damaging development.

**Other Matters**

11. I accept that there are examples of UPVC frames in use in other buildings in the PCA. This has had an eroding effect on the character and appearance of some of the PCA's prominent and notable buildings. Nevertheless, this is not sufficient to justify further loss of traditional original features in what is clearly a building of some merit. Indeed, and on the contrary, the number of examples that there are actually reinforces the need to retain original features.

**Conclusion**

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR

[1] The National Planning Policy Framework 2012