



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/20/3248647

The Parish Office, 7 Lincoln Road, Welton, Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN2 3HZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Julie Murray, Welton Parish Council against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref: 139196, dated 28 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is replacing upstairs Parish office windows from dark wood to white uPVC.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposal is described as uPVC windows in the application form, the Planning Officer's report, the appellant's letter to the Council¹, and the appellant's statement of case. Therefore, notwithstanding the description of the proposed windows as hardwood and timber in the amended 'window details' specification, for the purposes of determining the appeal I assess the proposal as uPVC windows.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Welton Conservation Area (CA), including its effect on the setting of non-designated heritage assets.

Reasons

4. The two-storey building is the Parish Council office. It is located at approximately the centre of a row of mixed-use premises, which includes the Black Bull public house (BB) and shops. The appeal building adjoins the BB and is located within the CA.
5. According to the Welton Conservation Area Appraisal, the BB is a possibly late eighteenth century building, and one of the most imposing in the CA. The Greyfriars and adjoining dwelling building (GF) is located adjacent to the host row of buildings, to the north. The BB and GF are listed in the Conservation Area Appraisal among the Important Buildings in the CA, and, as such, are non-designated heritage assets.

¹ 17 January 2020

6. The CA is characterised by limestone cottages with pantile roofs and later brick buildings, which are located along and leading off the 'spines' of Lincoln Road and Cliff Road, which run through the CA. The appeal building's host row combines with the village green to contribute to a traditional Lincolnshire village scene. As such, the significance of the CA, derives from its traditional village layout and architecture, which includes the non-designated heritage assets.
7. The BB's wide facade, the spacious forecourt in front and sight lines across the village green opposite contribute to making the appeal building's host row a prominent focal point at the heart of the CA. According to the appellant's evidence, the first floor storey of the appeal building - including the windows proposed for replacement - is a twentieth century addition to a probably nineteenth century ground floor shop. Nevertheless, the appeal building's use of traditional frontage materials, including pantile roof and timber window frames and door, contribute positively to the significance of the CA.
8. A mix of timber, and white and brown uPVC window frames are in buildings within the CA. Nevertheless, timber window frames and doors within building frontages facing onto the eastern side of Lincoln Road are a key contributor to the traditional character of the row of buildings, stretching from the GF to the stove and fireplace shop south of the BB.
9. Within the above context, the chunkiness of uPVC frames, along with the synthetic sheen of uPVC, would cause the modernity of the proposed windows to noticeably contrast with the traditional architectural character and appearance of the frontage of the host row. This would detract from the traditional architectural character and appearance of the host row, and visually jar with the adjoining BB and nearby GF non-designated heritage assets.
10. The above impacts would be visible from Lincoln Road, on the approach to the shops and facilities within the appeal building's host row. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to a key vista within the CA.
11. The proposed installation of uPVC windows to the rear of the building would exacerbate the discordance with the prevailing use of timber framed windows within the host row.
12. Thus I find that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. It would also have a negative impact on the setting of the BB and GF non-designated heritage assets. I attach considerable weight and importance to this harm. However, the effect of the proposal would be localised and therefore would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA and the non-designated heritage assets. In such circumstances I therefore necessarily weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. With regard to the above, the appellant sets out that the proposal would save public funds, compared to the cost of timber-framed replacement windows. Be that as it may, the public benefits in that respect are limited by the scale of the development proposed. Consequently, the public benefits do not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of CA and the less than substantial harm to its significance which I have identified.

14. To conclude, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA, including the setting of the non-designated heritage assets. It would therefore conflict with Policies LP17, LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) and Policies D1 and EN5 of the Welton-by-Lincoln Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2035 (2016). Together the policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of appropriate design and appearance to conserve or enhance local character and the historic environment. The policies are broadly consistent with the approach of the Framework in respect of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, with great weight given to the asset's conservation.

Conclusion

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

William Cooper

INSPECTOR