St Roy

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2008

by S J Emerson BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date: 26 November 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/A/08/2082676
Flat 1, 3 Heene Road, Worthing BN11 3RN.

- 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 Whiston against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/07/1536/FULL, dated 12 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2008.
- The development proposed is replacement windows.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the Ivy Place Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Ivy Place Conservation Area covers a couple of short street blocks in West Worthing. The 2 main groups of buildings in the area are substantial early Victorian villas and Edwardian style houses of varying size. Although there are a mix of building forms – detached, semi-detached and short terraces, overall there is a coherent visual character which contrasts with the variety of more modern developments surrounding the conservation area.

4. No 3 Heene Road is one of the larger Edwardian style buildings and occupies a corner position at the junction of Bath Road and Heene Road. Like many of the larger buildings in the conservation area, No 3 has been converted into flats. The largest 3 windows to be replaced are: a window at the side of the building (seen only obliquely from Heene Road); a wide, rectangular bay; and the 5 sides of a projecting turret on the corner facing the junction of Bath Road and Heene Road. These 3 sets of windows have a similar design being sliding sash style windows with the upper windows divided into small panes. The design and appearance of these windows are consistent with the style and age of the building. The other, smaller windows to be replaced are a wooden casement between the bay and the turret and 2 small modern windows on the Bath Road frontage.

5. The proposed windows would be double glazed with white UPVC frames. There would be a readily noticeable difference in the appearance of the proposed 3 largest windows compared with the existing windows. They would have a much flatter, blander appearance. All the glazing would be in the same plane,

as opposed to the recessed glazing of the lower sash at present. The individual small panes in the existing upper windows would be replaced by a single pane with white plastic dividers inside the seal unit. The framing around the windows would be much thinner and lack the articulation of the wooden joinery in the existing windows. Overall, I consider that the proposed replacement windows would result in a loss of character and visual vitality from the building.

6. I saw that many of the first floor windows of the building have already been replaced by modern double glazed units. The appearance of these windows confirms my impression of the negative impact of the proposed change on the character of the building. There would be a jarring contrast between the ground floor windows in the turret and the first floor windows directly above, which are original. Although the front garden of No 3 has some shrubs and some hedging on the corner, I consider that the change to the bay window and the turret and the resulting adverse impact on the character of the building would be readily perceived by passers-by from Heene Road and the end of Bath Road. The proposed alterations conflict with the aim of policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 concerning alterations and extensions to dwellings.

7. The Council's short Conservation Area Appraisal (2001) refers to timber sliding sash windows as one of the original architectural features of the conservation area which should be preserved. My impression is that most buildings in the conservation area have retained their original windows or have new windows in a sympathetic style. There are a group of houses in Bath Road close to the appeal property which have square bays with a very similar window style to those in the bay and turret of No 3. I recognise that there are a variety of window forms in the conservation area and modern UPVC windows can be seen in some of the buildings, but overall I consider that traditional windows remain sufficiently characteristic of the area to add to its visual coherence and interest. The appeal proposal would be a further small erosion of this important characteristic and make it harder for the Council to resist similar changes to other buildings, the cumulative impact of which would have a substantial adverse effect on the quality of the conservation area. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm in a small, but material way the character and appearance of the conservation area in conflict with policy CH4 of the West Sussex Structure plan 2005.

Simon Emerson

INSPECTOR