



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2010

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 October 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/10/2131150
2 Camden Terrace, Brighton, BN1 3LR

- 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 Mrs Kate Larkinson against the decision of Brighton And Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2009/03126, dated 29 January 2010, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2010.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of single glazed timber windows with double glazed UPVC windows.
-

Preliminary matters

1. In the interests of clarity, I have utilized the description of the proposed development used in the decision notice rather than that in the original application form.
2. The original application form is dated 29 January 2010, but the Council's decision notice refers to the application as having been submitted on 22 December 2009. Whilst no explanation has been provided for this disparity, I am content that the decision on the submitted application is that subject of the appeal.

Decision

3. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

4. The main issue is whether the appeal proposals would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. I have been referred to several appeals affecting the appeal property and its semi-detached neighbour, No3, the most recent of which was concerned with a proposal to remove the cladding from the front elevations of both properties (APP/Q1445/A/10/2120741). That appeal was dismissed partly because, in respect of No 2, it would involve the removal of timber lap boarding, an
-

- 'original feature', thus harming the character and appearance of the conservation area.
6. The appeal proposals would see introduced an extensive arrangement of UPVC framed windows into a substantially timber-clad elevation. I noted that No 3 had UPVC windows, and that several other properties in Camden Terrace have had their original windows changed. However, some of these changes have tended to adversely affect the appearance of the individual properties, and the locality generally, and do not justify the use of more UPVC, particularly to the extent proposed.
 7. The replacement windows would be seen at close quarters from the walkway serving the Terrace. Their texture, form and thickness would be significantly different to timber windows, and would appear incongruous, as is the case with the windows of No 3, next door. They would devalue and harm the appearance of the appeal property itself, the visual charm of the Terrace, and the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.
 8. The need for replacement windows and the advantages of using UPVC replacements, to the appellant, are fully understood. However, these factors do not outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusion on the main issue, that the proposed replacement windows would harm the character and appearance of the West Hill Conservation Area. The proposals, accordingly, conflict with the provisions of policies HE6, QD2 and QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan 2005, which require the materials to be used in development to be appropriate, and respectful of the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR