Online Comment

Application	H16-0098-23
Location	Holland Villas 10 & 11 High Street Spalding PE11 1TW
Proposal	Replacement Windows - re-submission of H16-1048-22

Name	Greg Watkinson
Address	Conservation Officer
Date Submitted	21-03-23
For/Against	Objections

I object to this proposal to replace all existing timber windows with UPVC upon conservation grounds.

A previous proposal at this site which sought the replacement only of rear windows with UPVC was supported. However, this was only due to the fact that the minimal risk of impact upon publicly accessible views indicated no harm would be inflicted upon the character of the Spalding Conservation Area (SCA) in which the proposal site is set. This proposal, instead, proposes the replacement of all windows, including the prominent windows upon the frontage elevation which would be readily visible from the public realm.

Whilst it is accepted that UPVC windows are already present on-site, including on the front elevation at the top floor level, Policy 29, Section B of the SELLP sets out that "proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting". Furthermore, Section B, Subsection 4 states that proposals in conservation areas should "Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment". Because of this, the existence of UPVC on the site, cannot be used to justify the further loss of locally distinctive and traditional materials in a manner which would substantially alter the appreciation of this portion of the SCA from the public realm.

With the above in mind, the removal of traditional, horned timber windows for replacement with modern UPVC on a publicly visible elevation of a historic building within a prominent section of the SCA would be a clear failure to ensure that the proposal preserves, enhances, or reinforces the character of the SCA, and would lead to the loss of a feature which contributes to the local distinctiveness of the SCA. All of the above would, therefore, suggest that the proposal does not comply with Policy 29 of the SELLP.