



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by **J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor**

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

Decision date: 31st July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/W/17/3173629

Greyfriars Court, Greyfriars Road, Lewes BN7 2RF

- 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 Greyfriars Court against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref SDNP/17/00040/FUL, dated 4 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing decayed timber casement and louvre windows with pvc-U double glazed units of a similar design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of existing decayed timber casement and louvre windows with pvc-U double glazed units of a similar design at Greyfriars Court, Greyfriars Road, Lewes BN7 2RF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SDNP/17/00040/FUL, dated 4 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing elevations - 151102B/01; Existing elevations - 151102B/02; Proposed elevations - 151102B/03; Proposed elevations - 151102B/04; Block and Location plans - 151102B/03 A; Type A existing timber window - 151102B/Ext/TypeA; Type B existing timber window - 151102B/Ext/TypeB; Greyfriars window type A proposed - 151102B/Prop/TypeA; Greyfriars window type B proposed - 151102B/Prop/TypeB; Greyfriars post visit - Planning appeal window frame sizes (A3) - 151102B/WFS1; Greyfriars post visit - Planning appeal window frame sizes (A3)(A2) - 151102B/WFS2; PVC Section & P10502 Outerframe; Greyfriars casement window details - Technical Information.

Preliminary Matter

2. In support of the appeal the appellant submitted a number of plans providing technical information for the proposed windows. The Council has, as part of the appeal, had the opportunity to consider and comment on these additional plans. I therefore consider the plans to be admissible and I have considered them as part of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Lewes Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building.

Reasons

4. The host property, Greyfriars, is a modern three storey building in residential use, constructed predominantly of facing brickwork with a slate covered roof. Stricklands Warehouse is a grade II listed building which sits on Railway Lane, opposite the appeal site. The building was erected in the 1990s and is adjacent to, but not within, the Lewes Conservation Area.
5. A number of the buildings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are modern in their design. The windows in the properties at this location do not conform to a particular style; they display a mixture of pvc-U, timber, aluminium and steel frames. The variation in style and design is particularly apparent when looking at the properties from the adjacent ground level public car park, and when standing on Railway Lane. Greyfriars is seen as one of a number of modern buildings which form a prominent and imposing set of structures.
6. Due to its location on the edge of the conservation area, and close to the grade II listed Stricklands Warehouse, alterations to the property should be considered in accordance with the effect that they would have on the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
7. The proposal would result in the replacement of all timber windows with pvc-U windows. These windows are referred to in the evidence as window type A which is the type of window used in the majority of rooms, and window type B which includes the louvre window to the kitchen units. The replacement window type A would have the same design as existing, and the frame would be some 5mm narrower than the existing frame. The replacement window type B is in two parts; the fixed light frame would be approximately 6mm wider than the existing timber frame, and the louvre window would be replaced with a high level opening light which would have a frame in the region of 5mm narrower than the existing louvre window.
8. I have considered the evidence relating to the proposed design of the frames and I consider that the sizes of the proposed frames are sympathetically designed to reflect the existing timber frames. Window type A would be marginally different in respect of its size, the main difference would be the design of window type B due to the removal of the louvre. The proposed design of Window type B is more in keeping with the design of the property's windows when considered as a whole. The change in thickness is minimal and would not result in bulky or clumsy window frames.
9. The careful use of sympathetically designed pvc-U windows would not appear at odds to the surrounding buildings. The design would replicate a strong vertical element as currently exhibited. Although the use of slim profile metal windows would match properties on Railway Lane, it would not respond to the other surrounding buildings within which the appeal site is viewed when standing in the adjacent car park, or travelling along Court Road.
10. At present the property maintains a respectful façade towards the adjacent conservation area and listed building. The pvc-U has been designed to ensure

that it largely replicates the current size and design of the windows. Accordingly, the proposal would not adversely affect but would preserve the setting of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

11. As such, I find that the proposal would not harm the setting of the listed building, and would be consistent with the preservation of the character of the conservation area. It would therefore comply with Policies ST3 and H5 of the Lewes Local Plan 2003 insofar as those policies seek to protect the character of the area.

Conditions

12. In addition to the implementation condition, it is necessary to include a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty.
13. The Council suggested a condition securing the approval of the pvc-U materials. I have included as part of the plans condition a requirement that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the technical information and plans submitted as part of the appeal. Therefore I consider that this matter is adequately addressed in the plans condition.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR