The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2013

by P Eggleton BSC(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/13/2204292
51 Hope Street, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 7SB

- 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 Paul Johnson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2013/0301 was refused by notice dated 1 August 2013.
- The development proposed is replacement windows.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed with regard to the replacement of the windows in the front elevation. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the rear windows at 51 Hope Street, Glossop, Derbyshire in accordance with the terms of the application, HPK/2013/0301, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, HS51 05, in so far as they relate to the rear elevation only.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The works would include the replacement of the windows to both the front and rear and the introduction of a roof light. The application only related to windows and I have considered the appeal on that basis. The Council's concerns relate particularly to the front elevation.

4. The rear windows are not original. They are not visible from any public vantage point. The roof light would similarly be to the rear. I consider that the benefits of new windows to the rear would outweigh any concerns with regard to the loss of the existing frames. They would not have any material impact on the character or appearance of the area.

5. The windows to the front appear to be original. They are timber sash windows with ornate glazing. They are however clearly in need of repair. Despite their

current condition, they reflect the character and age of the property and they make a positive contribution to the wider conservation area.

6. I acknowledge that in this particular street, there are very few original windows remaining. A number have been replaced in timber but many of these are not of a traditional design. Others have mimicked a more traditional design but have not retained similar opening mechanisms. A significant proportion have been changed to Upvc. Only some of these are reflective of more traditional window designs.

7. I do not find the non-traditional windows to make a positive contribution to the character of these buildings or this part of the conservation area. This property, and number 31, stand out as having retained traditional windows. The further loss of such fabric would detract further from the character and appearance of the conservation area. The application failed to provide details of the frames to be inserted and this adds to my concern. Whilst high quality frames can mimic timber to some extent, this would not make up for the loss of these traditional and distinctive windows.

8. The replacement of these windows, as proposed, would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The loss of this traditional fabric would detract from the character of this street. I find that the changes to the front elevation would be contrary to Policies BC1, BC5, GD4, and H14 of the High Peak Local Plan 2008. These policies accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*. I do not find the public benefit of the works to outweigh the harm that would result to the conservation area.

9. As I do not have concerns with regard to the replacement of the rear windows, I have allowed the appeal in that regard. Although the details are very limited, they are sufficient for this elevation. I am not persuaded that the prevalence of alternative window styles and materials in the vicinity or the improved thermal qualities of new windows would justify the replacement of the front windows with white Upvc frames. I therefore dismiss the appeal in that regard.

10. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans, in so far as they relate to the rear elevation, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR