



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2010

by **Roland Punshon BSc (Hons) 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:
27 September 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/A/10/2130473

Plots 1 and 2, Marple Road, Charlesworth SK13 5EY

- 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 Mark Brierley against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2010/0121, dated 16 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2010.
- The development proposed is retention of new UPVC windows installed.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matters

2. At the time of my site visit the buildings to which the appeal relates had been completed and the windows had been installed as described in the appeal application. The buildings had been completed in-line with the details shown on drawing no. 0604 01.

Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case is whether the doors and windows which have been installed cause harm to the character or appearance of the Charlesworth Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal buildings are located at the entrance to the Charlesworth Conservation Area and front on to Long Lane. They are grouped with the village primary school with the church at the rear. Long Lane is otherwise residential in character with a mix of modern bungalows and houses. However, these are outside the Conservation Area.
 5. The Conservation Area is made up of a range of small and medium sized stone-built houses and cottages crowded around a network of lanes which is centred on a cluster of shops, public houses and service buildings at the main road junction. In my opinion it is the layout and stonework of the buildings which give the village its distinctive character rather than the intrinsic qualities of the individual buildings. Most of the dwellings in the area surrounding the appeal buildings have windows and doors constructed from UPVC. Even within the
-

Conservation Area these materials are so commonplace that, whilst they are not traditional, they are part and parcel of the character and appearance of the area. However, most are white in colour and this gives a degree of consistency to the surroundings.

6. The appeal buildings are prominently located above the level of Long Lane. On the approach to the village centre from the west, they tend to dominate the street scene. In these circumstances I consider that it is especially important that the buildings should complement the Conservation Area.
7. The appeal buildings are constructed from light coloured stone and the windows are light brown coloured. The window frames are set close to the front face of the stonework with only a shallow reveal. The overall effect is bland and featureless making the building appear particularly bulky and monolithic alongside other nearby structures in the Conservation Area. In my opinion the use of contrasting colouring on the frames and doors together with deeper reveals would add interest to the elevations of the buildings by reinforcing the articulation of the composition. I accept that UPVC is not a traditional material. However, given the number of buildings in the Conservation Area which are already fitted with UPVC windows and doors, I do not consider that the use of this material on what is clearly a modern structure would be unduly harmful provided that the colour and depth of reveal was more sympathetic.
8. In these circumstances I conclude on the main issue that the doors and windows which have been installed cause harm to the character and appearance of the Charlesworth Conservation Area. The works are therefore contrary to Policies BC1, BC5 and GD4 of the High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies 2008.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roland Punshon

INSPECTOR